3-31-2016

Situated Directives in Italian L2 Service-Learning Encounters

Kristin Cardellio

Situated Directives in Italian L2 Service-Learning Encounters

by

Kristin Cardellio

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Second Language Acquisition / Instructional Technology
College of Arts & Sciences and College of Education
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Camilla Vásquez, Ph.D.
James Perren, Ed.D.
Adam Schwartz, Ph.D.
Wei Zhu, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
March 10, 2016

Keywords: directives, Italian, pragmatics, relational work,
service-learning, study abroad

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my father, Jesse J. Cardellio, D.O., who instilled in me a lifelong love of learning and the confidence to reach for the stars in whatever I do. I also dedicate this dissertation to my mother, Patricia Cardellio who has inspired me with her independent spirit, love of travel, and curiosity about other cultures. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my sister, Mimi Bradley, my lifelong confidante and best friend.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first and foremost offer my sincerest gratitude to my major professor Dr. Camilla Vásquez. Throughout the process of completing this degree, she has given me thoughtful guidance and direction while always allowing me the freedom to follow a path of my own design. The genuine care and respect she has for her students as well as her commitment to excellence in her work as a scholar are truly inspriring. I consider myself fortunate to have her as a mentor and friend over the past several years. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Perren, Dr. Schwartz and Dr. Zhu for their time and generosity. Each has contributed in a variety of ways to this dissertation and I have truly valued their input and enthusiastic support. I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to all the staff and teachers at the institute in Italy for their immense generosity and support of my research. Without them this research would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the students and Italian community partners who courageously agreed to participate in this research. While pursuing my doctorate I have been fortunate to be surrounded by an extraordinary group of colleagues and close friends who have provided unending encouragement and love over the past seven years - especially Amy, Jane, Nance, Kristin, Laura, Sheila, Charm, Elaine, Barb, Isabel, Fayanne, Phyllis, Cheryl, Adie, Dave, Rich, Becky, MariCarmen, Ann, Beverley, Deb, LJ, Jules, JoJo, and my myoho sisters Deborah, Jenny, Tina and Nina. In addition, I would like to thank the University of South Florida for the Dissertation Completion Fellowship that helped to fund this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iii

ABSTRACT iv

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1
Study abroad 1
Pragmatic competence 2
Service-learning 5
Statement of the problem 11
Significance of the study 14
Importance of examining directives 14
Importance of the Italian language context 16
Importance of the service-learning context 16

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW 19
Speech acts 20
Politeness theory and relational work 22
Literature review 28

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS 43
Research design 45
Setting 50
The Institute 50
Service-learning sites 52
Casa di Riposo 52
Horse Therapy Center 52
Misericordia 53
Participants 54
L2 users 54
Brad 56
Maria 56
Samantha 57
Local Italian speakers 57
Susanna 58
Elsa 58
Pietro 58
Francesco 58
Data sources and collection procedures 59
Audio recordings 59
Interviews 60

Researcher notes 62
Data analysis 63
Institutional Review Board and participant consent 69
Role of the researcher 70
Limitations and delimitations of the study 75
Validity and reliability 76

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS 79
Casa di Riposo - Nursing home 81
Directives 84
Misunderstanding 91
Relational work 99
Horse Therapy Center 104
Directives 105
Misunderstanding 115
Relational work 120
Misericordia 125
Directives 127
Misunderstanding 149
Relational work 158

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 165
Summary of findings 165
Directives 165
Misunderstanding 175
Relational work 178
Conclusion 184
Implications of the research for second language learning 186
Implications of the research for service-learning 192
Limitations of the study and directions for future research 194

REFERENCES 199

APPENDIX A - Interview protocols 221
L2 user retrospective interviews 221
Italian speaker interviews 222

APPENDIX B - Transcription conventions 223
Transcription abbreviations 224

APPENDIX C- Audio recordings 225

APPENDIX D - Institutional Review Board letter of approval 226

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: L2 Users 55

Table 2: Italian Community Partners 58

Table 3: Audio Recordings 60

Table 4: CDR Directives 84

Table 5: CDR - Susanna's directives to Brad 87

Table 6: HTC - Directives 105

Table 7: Misericordia - Directives 128

Table 8: Misericordia - Infinitives as directives 132

Table 9: Misericordia - Directives with the modal "dovere" (must) 134

Table 10: Misericordia - Modification of directives 139

Table 11: Misericordia - Directives as warnings 145

Table 12: Misericordia - Relational work 160

Table 13: Directive types - Summary 166

ABSTRACT

Interaction with local speakers of a second language (L2) in a naturalistic setting during study abroad is beneficial to language learning in many respects; particularly in the development of pragmatic competence, or the awareness and ability to use the appropriate language for a specific social context (Kinginger, 2011; Magnan & Back, 2007; Schauer, 2009; Shively, 2011). Service-learning - volunteering in the local community combined with an academic pursuit - during study abroad provides the opportunity for meaningful interaction between language learners and local speakers of the L2 in authentic and collaborative settings (Overfield, 2007). This study examines the interactions of Italian L2 users and local speakers of Italian while engaged in service-learning in Italy. A sociopragmatic framework revealed emergent trends and linguistic norms of interaction in this context. Using a discourse analytic approach, this study offers a detailed description of directive use of the L2 learners and the local Italian speakers (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Nuzzo, 2007). The study also examines (mis)understandings and relational work (Locher & Watts, 2008) that occur in the interactions. Primary data consists of audio recordings of the naturally-occurring interactions at three service-learning sites during a short-term summer study abroad program in Italy. Secondary data consists of interviews with the L2 users and their interlocutors. The data reveal that the majority of directives came from the local Italian speakers, not the L2 users, likely due to the clear power dynamic and the nature of the activities at each site. The directives were most commonly in the imperative with little or no mitigation for purposes of clarity and/or urgency of the tasks. Misunderstandings expressed by the L2 users were primarily linguistic, although there were also instances of pragmatic

misunderstanding in the interactions (Bazzanella & Damiano, 1999). Relational work emerged in the interactions, yet clear, explicit direction took precedent over face-work and interpersonal talk among the interactants. Findings from this study can be used to inform foreign language pedagogical practice in myriad ways; from developing practical applications for situated language use, to using actual transcripts from the data in pre-departure language and cultural activities in U.S. Italian language classrooms. Findings also provide community partners with data regarding the challenges, linguistic and otherwise, that L2 user/volunteers face during service-learning in Italy, and suggest areas for further research.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Spending time living in a foreign country is believed to be essential to learning a foreign language. Living alongside and interacting with locals in the host country is one of the unique benefits of participating in a university-sponsored study abroad program. “It [study abroad] has the power to expand the four walls of the traditional language classroom to include the local streets and people of any given culture" (Mendelson, 2004, p. 44). Study abroad programs are a way for learners to become immersed in the target language and culture in their everyday lives outside the classroom.

Study abroad

The term "study abroad" is commonly applied to an academic program that takes place in a foreign country where the credit earned can be transferred to a degree program at a domestic college or university. Study abroad programs can vary considerably in terms of academic focus, length of stay, and programmatic design. In 2012, the college students who participated in study abroad, 23% are majoring in social sciences, 21% in business or management and 11% in the area of humanities. Only 5.8% of all participants in study abroad are majoring in a foreign language. The most popular study abroad destinations in 2012 were the United Kingdom (12%), Italy (11%), Spain (9.5%), France (6.2%), and China (5.3%) (*Open Doors Report,* International Institute of Education, 2012). As educators and students across disciplines spend more time abroad and interact with the local population in countries where languages other than English are spoken, the connection between language and culture becomes increasingly evident.

One of the seemingly obvious benefits of study abroad is that it provides the opportunity for participants to interact with the local people and culture on a daily basis. In fact, the advantages of study abroad as a context for second language learning and use are most evident in studies related to social interaction (Kinginger, 2011). Research has shown that interaction with local speakers of a language outside the classroom, in a naturalistic setting can lead to an increase in overall proficiency in a foreign language (Huebner, 1995; Lapkin, Hart & Swain, 1995; Magnan & Back, 2007; Tanaka & Ellis, 2003**).** Learners can be exposed to and participate in spontaneous conversations involving local speakers of the language inside as well as outside the classroom. Study abroad offers learners the chance to interact in the target language (L2) in a variety of social and communicative settings where their language becomes "consequential" (Kinginger, 2011, p. 62). That is, everyday interactions outside the classroom can have an immediate impact on their circumstances. For example, a conversation in a pharmacy could determine whether or not the correct medication is recommended, or asking for directions can have immediate implications. In short, during study abroad, there is the potential for language learners to engage in authentic and meaningful interactions with local speakers of the language in various situations.

Pragmatic competence

The opportunity to interact with local speakers of the second language (L2) in a naturalistic setting is beneficial to language learning in many respects, particularly in the development of pragmatic competence, or the awareness and ability to use the appropriate language for a specific social context (Kinginger, 2011; Magnan & Back, 2007; Schauer, 2009; Shively, 2011). Pragmatic competence is considered to be an essential component of communicative competence in a second language (Canale & Swain, 1980) and includes

successfully negotiating speech acts such as greetings, apologies, and making requests (Barron, 2003; Kasper, 1997). Conversely, by using language inappropriate to the given social context, learners run the risk of appearing rude or of offending their interlocutors. Therefore, pragmatic competence in intercultural communication is an important part of building relationships across cultures. For this reason, study abroad is considered to be beneficial for the development of pragmatic competence. Pragmatics focuses on "comprehension and production of linguistic action in context" (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 3). The development of pragmatic competence is closely linked to the local context and culture and, therefore, can be especially challenging for second language learners who may not be aware of the unwritten, local "rules" of behavior and language they encounter in the target culture. Therefore, information about naturally-occurring language use can shed light on the benefits of this context to language learning and the development of pragmatic competence.

While research supports the idea that study abroad can have a positive impact on language learning, one fact that has become clear to educators and study abroad researchers is that participation in a study abroad program alone does not guarantee language gains. Findings related to proficiency gains have been at times inconsistent and inconclusive (Kinginger, 2011; Freed 1995). Comparison studies have found that although learners who participated in a study abroad program often show overall improvement in proficiency, they did not necessarily have greater proficiency gains than those who studied the target language at a university in the U.S. (Churchill & Dufon, 2006; Freed, 1995). Findings related to the development of pragmatic competence have also revealed that advances have been less substantial than predicted (Dufon, 1995; Barron, 2003). For example, even after spending time abroad, learners often continue to

perform speech acts such as requests, offers and apologies in ways that differ from native speaker norms (Bataller, 2010; Barron, 2003; Taguchi, 2011; Warga & Scholmberger, 2007).

While study abroad may provide the opportunity for learners to have meaningful interaction with speakers of the target language, there are conditions that may impede such interaction. Research has revealed that an array of factors - individual, environmental and programmatic - can influence language learning abroad. Learners may be inhibited, intimidated, or anxious about their language skills or simply lack the language skills to initiate a conversation with local speakers (Freed, 1995). Or, they may choose not to engage with the local population for personal reasons related to their experiences or backgrounds (Magnan & Back, 2007; Talburt & Stewart, 1999). At the same time, local speakers may be hesitant or unwilling to engage with learners, who they may view as outsiders (Segalowitz & Freed, 2004). They may not have the desire or the patience to take on the role of ad hoc language teacher as they interact with the novice L2 learners, especially if the locals speak English. Furthermore, the kind of interlocutors with whom the learners interact may also be limited (Schauer, 2009). Often, learners encounter peers of their own age in informal situations, which limits the communicative style they are exposed to (Barron, 2003). In addition, the study abroad program may, perhaps inadvertently, be set up to encourage learners to remain together as a group rather than to venture out individually in the local community.

Furthermore, even when conditions are favorable, not all interaction has proven to be beneficial to learning. Segalowitz and Freed (2004) and others have found that unguided and informal interaction with native speakers did not necessarily enhance speaking ability. Research on naturally occurring conversations between native speakers and learners has revealed that local speakers, even the host family, may use non-standard language, known as "foreigner talk" or

"faulty input" when interacting with learners in an effort to simplify or adapt their language to what they believe will be more comprehensible to learners (Iino, 2006; Siegal, 1995). In addition, in the course of natural conversation, native speakers may refrain from correcting learners' inappropriate language, especially if the meaning is understood or for reasons of politeness and face (Schauer, 2009). Consequently, language learners may not benefit from interacting with local speakers to the extent imagined.

Given the fact, however, that studies have revealed gains in oral skills, vocabulary and sociopragmatic competence in students who participated in study abroad (Barron, 2003; Collentine, 2004; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004), researchers, educators and study abroad program planners continue to explore the impact of these factors on language learning and to look for ways to enhance language learning in order to take advantage of the unique affordances of study abroad; particularly ways to encourage and facilitate meaningful interactions among language learners and locals during study abroad (Kinginger, 2011, Allen & Dupuy, 2012). In recent years, study abroad programs have begun to incorporate service-learning, or volunteering in the local community, into their curriculum as a way to provide opportunities for students to interact with members of the local community. Service-learning as part of a credit-bearing academic course, has been identified as a way to foster meaningful interaction during study abroad (Overfield, 2007).

Service-learning

The term service-learning has been applied to a wide array of programs with various goals and objectives and is difficult to define with precision. Through participation in a service-learning program, students earn academic credit for their time spent volunteering at local

philanthropic agencies, and then reflect on their experiences. Bringle and Hatcher (2010) define service learning as:

> A course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility. (p. 38)

This broad definition allows for substantial variation in the design and focus of service-learning programs based on the educational goals of the academic course. As expressed in the definition above, service-learning is usually related to an academic endeavor, for example a credit-bearing course at the K-16 level, however, it can also be a standalone program. Service-learning is ideally mutually beneficial to the participant and the local community organization. Participant reflection is a key component of any service-learning project and provides the bridge between the service and the learning related to the course (Billig, 2003; Overfield, 2007). Through a combination of action and reflection, participants can interpret and make sense of their experiences in the field.

The term service-learning was first used in the 1960's and the idea of service-learning began to flourish in institutions of higher learning throughout the United States as a way for educators to add an experiential dimension to their courses while making a contribution to the local community (Taylor, 2007). In the 1970's service-learning programs were implemented on a more widespread basis and two national agencies were founded – Campus Compact and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League – which help to organize service-learning programs in higher education. In 1990 President Bush passed into law the National Community Service Act,

which funds national service programs throughout the country. According to the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse currently at least 25% of colleges and universities in the U.S. have implemented some form of service-learning (Thompson, 2012).

Although service-learning is relatively new to the field of higher education the concept of connecting service to learning dates back to Dewey's (1938) educational philosophy of experiential learning. The pedagogical foundations of service-learning are based on the principles of Dewey's (1938) philosophy of the value of experiential education (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Overfield, 2007). According to this model, learning occurs in a cycle of action and reflection; experience enhances understanding. Service-learning pedagogy is based on the assumption that knowledge is gained from the interactive process of action and reflection (Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999). Rather than focus on measureable outcomes, therefore, experiential education places emphasis on the process of learning (Howard, 2003). A more modern model of experiential education was put forth by Kolb (1984) in which the learning process can be understood as a cycle that begins first with concrete experience, followed by reflection whereby the new experiences are compared and contrasted with past experience. Students generalize and interpret their experiences and determine broader applications for what they have learned. Finally, they test their new understanding in a different context. This model can be applied to service-learning which combines experience and reflection, although the extent to which it is followed varies depending on the academic outcomes of the course.

Researchers in the area of service-learning across disciplines have investigated constructs such as intercultural awareness, civic-engagement, and motivation related to experience with service-learning. One of the primary reported benefits of service-learning is the opportunity to interact in meaningful ways with people from diverse backgrounds. Eyler and Giles' (1999)

research on service-learning describe the benefits as increased tolerance towards others, personal development, interpersonal development and community connections. Overall, students in Eyler and Giles' study reported that they experienced personal growth, made connections in the community, and developed a greater understanding and appreciation for different cultures as a result of participation in service-learning.

In the past two decades service-learning programs related to language learning have become increasingly more prevalent (Thompson, 2012). Service-learning provides potential and possibilities for second language acquisition in an authentic and collaborative setting. Foreign language educators in the United States have been adding service-learning to language courses as a way to connect with a local community of L2 speakers. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language's (ACTFL) guidelines and priorities in language teaching and learning, known as the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (The Standards) name five goal areas known as the 5C's of teaching and learning a foreign language (Communications, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Community). The Standards support the notion that making personal connections with the people and the culture of the target language is crucial to becoming linguistically and culturally proficient in a second language. The goals of Community and Culture in particular are aimed at providing the learner with "immediate and contextualized learning cultural experiences at home and abroad" (Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999, p. 2). While a survey of foreign language learners revealed the goal of Community, or participation in multicultural communities, to be the most valuable of ACTFL's 5 C's of language learning the Community goal is considered by educators to be the most difficult to attain due to the constraints of the foreign language classroom (Allen & Dupuy, 2012). According to McAlpine (2000), the Community goal can be met when students "have a real life experience in either a

domestic or foreign setting that requires them to use their language and cultural skills" (p. 77). Participation in service-learning provides opportunities for interaction between language learners and speakers of the local language in a naturalistic setting, as they collaborate in activities with a common goal of helping others in the local community. By building relationships in the local community educators hope to increase cultural awareness in their students and encourage interaction with speakers of the L2 in the local community. Incorporating service-learning into a foreign language program is one way to bring language learners into the community to collaborate on projects that address a local issue often related to poverty, health care, or education.

For foreign language educators, therefore, service-learning in local communities where the L2 is spoken can bring the culture and the language alive as learners interact with people of different cultures in the target language. During service-learning, learners can use their "experiences as a lens through which to see the functions of the language they are learning" as they interact with local speakers in a variety of settings (Overfield, 1997, p. 490). Service-learning is a way to put the L2 into practice as they make meaningful connections with the local L2 speaking community. Simply traveling abroad is not enough for learners to experience the local language and culture outside the classroom. Service-learning can be the link between learners and local L2 speakers in the community and enrich their experience of the language and culture.

Service-learning abroad adds an experiential aspect to study abroad by providing "authentic and educationally meaningful opportunities for students to interact with, learn from, and contribute to an international community" (Bringle & Hatcher, 2010, p. 15). Service learning abroad provides the opportunity not only for the volunteers to help the locals in need, but also for

learners to engage with the local culture and interact with local speakers of the L2. In a study abroad context, service-learning has become increasingly more popular as program planners and educators seek to connect language learners and the local community in mutually beneficial ways (Overfield, 2007).

Service-learning is an opportunity for the volunteers, in this case language learners, to build relationships with people of the host culture as they work together to help those in need in their local community. Participants in service-learning abroad have the opportunity to engage in a wide range of activities and work collaboratively to accomplish tasks with speakers of the local language (Tonkin & Quiroga, 2004). During service-learning, communication between the participants and their co-workers in the agency as well as the people they serve is often in the language of the host country, the target language for the learners. Therefore, service-learning provides the context for meaningful goal-oriented interaction among participants in a collaborative setting. For example, learners may be working alongside local speakers of L2 on a variety of projects such as a community construction project, a local soup kitchen, or a first aid clinic. The learners will likely find themselves in unfamiliar circumstances, in situations where they may interact with L2 speakers with whom they will be required to cooperate in order to fulfill a role or complete a task. In the field of second language acquisition, research has shown that interaction, among peers or more expert speakers of the target language can result in L2 development through guided support, or scaffolding, during collaborative activities (Donato, 1994). A study of the language used in interactions during service-learning reveals the nature of the interactions in this setting and sheds light on not only the language used, but also the co-constructive nature of the interactions. That is, as the interactions take place, all interactants

participate in the negotiation for understanding in order to complete the tasks they are engaged in.

Statement of the problem

Study abroad offers a unique opportunity for language learners to live immersed in the target language and culture. The opportunity to be exposed to and use language in various contexts sets study abroad apart from studying a language in a domestic setting. Interaction with local speakers of the L2 outside the classroom can facilitate language learning, however, linguistic gains are often not as consistent or as substantial as predicted and there are constraints to such interactions. Furthermore, learners in reality often have limited opportunities to interact with local speakers in the community. Service-learning is a way to bring learners out of the classroom and into the local community in a context that encourages collaboration and meaningful interaction with local speakers. Learners become participants in the community rather than outsiders. However, little is known about the nature of the language used by learners and their interlocutors in this context. A detailed analysis of the language used in naturally-occurring, intercultural interactions between learners and their interlocutors during service-learning will shed light on service-learning as a context for language learning.

During service-learning projects, learners are exposed to a variety of situations as they collaborate with local speakers. One of the many challenges of communication in a multi-cultural environment is negotiation of politeness and issues of face. Often, the unwritten rules of appropriate behavior are culturally-bound, that is, they are determined by agreed upon (yet often unspoken) guidelines within a particular culture. English language speakers, for example, often struggle with usage of the formal or informal address forms, which can lead to misunderstanding, hurt feelings or even a breakdown in communication (Kinginger & Farrell, 2004). According to

Scollon and Scollon (1995), "Many aspects of linguistic form depend on the speakers making some analysis of the relationships among themselves" (p.45). Speakers make linguistic choices based on a shared understanding of the culture of the context, which from a discursive perspective is revealed in the language of the interactions. As learners interact with other speakers of the target language in service-learning environments, social and conversational norms can be negotiated and miscommunications can arise.

Service-learning can be considered an institutional setting in that the discourse and the interactions in this context are conditioned and to a degree constrained by the goals of the activities the interlocutors are engaged in. That is, there may be a certain amount of consistency or repetition in the kinds of interactions that occur over time. For this reason, institutional settings are considered to be well-suited for research investigating the affordances of a particular context for pragmatic development. In an institutional setting according to Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (2005) the advantages of collecting and examining institutional discourse include comparability of language, predictable and high rate of occurrence of pragmatic features, and relative ease of data collection. In addition, “institutional settings also afford researchers the opportunity to observe the acquisition of institutional rules themselves, which represent a microcosm of culture” (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005, p. 1). As the learners interact with locals in this setting, they will be exposed to the micro-culture of the service-learning agencies as well as broader culture of the target language.

Speech acts such as requests, apologies, and compliments are often present in spontaneous conversations in an institutional setting (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005). Requests and the broader category of directives present particular challenges for foreign language learners in that there are myriad linguistic options for forming them depending on

factors such as the weight of the imposition, the distance of the relationship of the interlocutors, and the power differential between them. There is a wide range of linguistic possibilities and in order to choose appropriately, language learners are required to be aware not only of the appropriate pramalinguistic forms and but also the sociopragmatic norms of the situation. Although there is an abundance of research on requests and pragmatic development during study abroad, little research has been conducted on the use of directives in the context of service-learning abroad.

Turning to this study, the focus of the investigation will be directives and requests performed by learners of Italian language learners and local speakers of Italian during their interactions while engaged in service learning in Italy. This study will provide information about situated language use in an Italian study abroad program adding to the scant research in this area. The purpose of this study is to investigate and describe the language used in interactions between L2 users and local speakers of Italian during service-learning programs in Italy. More specifically, what role does the sociocultural context play in the factors such as the negotiation of face and (mis)understanding and relational work in the interactions? And, how can Italian language instructors and study abroad program coordinators use this information to better prepare study abroad participants for the language they will encounter outside the classroom? The research questions guiding this study are:

1. What is the nature of the directives used in interactions between Italian L2 users and local speakers of Italian during service-learning in Italy?
2 In what ways do L2 users and local Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the interactions?

3. In what ways is relational work used to manage (im)politeness and negotiate relationships in the interactions?

Significance of the study

This study will provide a detailed analysis of the language used in authentic intercultural interactions between Italian language learners and local speakers of Italian engaged in international service-learning programs in Italy. An examination and comparison of language use at three different service-learning projects, will reveal social and linguistic norms of people interacting in these settings. Findings will contribute to knowledge about service-learning during study abroad as a potential context for language and cultural learning and shed light on the kinds of interactional opportunities that exist in these settings.

Importance of examining directives. Directives, or attempts by a speaker to ask a hearer to take an action of some kind, have been the most frequently examined type of speech act in interlanguage pragmatic studies (Barron, 2003; Kasper, 1997; Schauer, 2009). The term "directive" has been defined in different ways in speech act research (Vine, 2004). For the purposes of this study, directives fall under the category Ervin-Tripp, et al (1990) refer to as "control acts" which are "any moves which could be interpreted either by the speaker or the hearer as an attempt to affect the behavior of an addressee or hearer" (p. 308). This broader category can include directives, requests, suggestions and advice. According to Searle (1976) the definition of directives is "attempts of varying degrees...by the speaker to get the hearer to do something" (p. 1). Directives differ from requests in that the person giving the direction is often in a position of authority over the person receiving the direction (Searle, 1976). Whether the speech act is considered a directive or a request depends on the context of the utterance. In order

to do analysis of directives therefore, both linguistic and social factors need to be considered (Pufahl Bax, 1986).

Requests are particularly challenging for L2 learners to understand and to perform, and they are commonly occurring in authentic interactions. When making requests, L2 learners need to judge first the social and cultural implications of the situation and then produce the appropriate linguistic form to employ in that situation. Three factors – the weight of the imposition of the request, the relationship of the speaker to the hearer and the power differential of the interlocutors – need to be considered when making a request (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This is particularly challenging for L2 users as these factors tend to be culturally and socially bound. In order to be performed appropriately for a particular social context, requests can include a complex combination of mitigation strategies and modifications – lexical, morphosyntactic and discursive – which require a high level of knowledge of the second language (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Trosborg, 1995; Barron, 2003). For these reasons, examining the L2 user's ability to use the appropriate form can reveal information about the learner's pragmatic knowledge and ability.

Both directives and requests can be considered face-threatening acts (FTAs) to both the speaker, who is in need of something, and the hearer whose freedom is being imposed upon by the speaker. The speaker puts the hearer in the position of either doing something for him/her or having to refuse the request. That is, directives and requests call for some kind of response from the hearer and is, therefore, an imposition in and of itself (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In intercultural interactions the way requests are performed among interlocutors with different language backgrounds can shed light on the relational work necessary to build and maintain positive relationships.

The power dynamic between the speaker and the hearer can also condition the nature of the directive; whether it is framed as a request, for example. If the speaker is clearly in a higher position of power than the hearer (i.e. a supervisor to an employee), the request is considered a directive and is often in the imperative (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003; Vine, 2004). Power relationships can be negotiated and expressed through language use, and will be explored in this study in the analysis.

Importance of the Italian language context. Italy is the second most popular destination of U.S. college students who participate in study abroad programs (*Open Doors Report,* International Institute of Education, 2012). Despite the large number of students studying in Italy, there is relatively little research on language acquisition and use during study abroad in Italy. Empirical studies on the development of pragmatic competence in Italian are increasing, yet researchers have called for more studies in this area (Nuzzo, 2007, 2012; Vedder, 2008). Specifically, there is a need for more authentic data about the functional uses of Italian in naturally-occurring interactions. Italian language textbooks often use communicative language scenarios based on the intuition of language teachers and textbook authors rather than based on empirically-based research findings (Nuzzo, 2012). Because of its focus on Italian language use in authentic conversations, this study can inform pedagogical practices in the classroom to be used to prepare Italian language learners for the language they encounter outside the classroom.

Service-learning researchers have called for more data on languages other than Spanish and ESL as a way to add to the growing research in this area (Thompson, 2012).

Importance of the service-learning context. International service-learning provides a natural setting for intercultural interactions in the target language (Overfield, 2007). Although there is a wealth of research on service-learning, most is related to personal growth of the student

primarily related to the development of intercultural awareness and civic responsibility. There is less research in the area of language learning and language use among participants in service-learning programs. According to Overfield (2007) in her assessment of directions for future research in service-learning:

> Little is known about how participants communicate with each other. While we have information about how students perceive their experiences in service-learning programs, we have yet to see extended discourse analysis that reveals the interactive practices in which novice learners and experts engage when participating in community discourse that is linked to a pedagogically structured setting (p. 76).

More information about the actual nature of the language that learners use and are exposed to while engaged in service-learning abroad can provide valuable information which can guide an agenda for future research. In addition, data on language use in various service-learning programs can inform educators and study abroad program planners about the types of service-learning programs that most lend themselves to language development. Furthermore, they can provide a rich source of samples of authentic interactions that can be used in the classroom to prepare L2 users for the kinds of language they may encounter during service-learning.

In summary, international service-learning combined with foreign language learning is on the rise in the United States and abroad. Few studies have focused on service-learning in Italy as a sociocultural context for authentic language use during study abroad. A precise and empirically-based understanding of the kinds of language that learners may encounter in these settings can be used to inform pedagogical practice at home and abroad in myriad ways; from developing general instruction guidelines for situated language use in service-learning contexts,

to using actual transcripts from the data in pre-departure language and cultural activities in U.S. Italian language classrooms. Educators can use this information to design classes that will address the actual challenges - linguistic, cultural, social and otherwise - that learners are likely to face outside the classroom in order to better prepare them for their time abroad.

In the next chapter I will discuss the theoretical frameworks guiding the study and provide a review of the literature on language use in a study abroad context, and on service-learning research related to foreign language learning.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers currently look beyond the mastery of grammatical forms and vocabulary in a target language as a way to measure communicative competence, which has increasingly come to refer to a broader range of competencies related to appropriate social and functional uses of the language (Canale & Swain, 1990; Hymes, 1972). Interest in the area of communicative competence has lead to a substantial increase in research in the area of pragmatic competence (Barron, 2003). This shift coincides with the increasing interest in situated language use. Building on Hymes' model, Canale's theoretical framework of communicative competence consisted of four parts: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Canale, 1983). Pragmatic competence, although included in the sociolinguistic competency area of Canale's model, has emerged as a distinct component in Bachman's (1990) model of communicative knowledge comprised of both illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence. Illocutionary competence is an understanding of the functional aspect of language including knowledge of speech acts, while sociolinguistic competence refers to knowledge of appropriate linguistic forms for a specific social context. This portion of Bachman's model focuses on language ability or knowledge only and not performance. Another part of his model, strategic competence, concerns the ability to not only assess the situation and decide an appropriate utterance in a target language, but also to perform the utterance. Therefore, strategic competence includes not only knowledge but also appropriate

language use for the context. This concept of communicative ability is essential for communicative competence in an L2 (Kasper, 1997).

Two aspects of pragmatic competence are related to the performance of speech acts: pragmalingustic and sociopragmatic aspects (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983). Pragmalinguistic knowledge refers to linguistic resources available to the speaker "for conveying particular illocutions" (Leech, 1983, p. 11). Sociopragmatics refers to the ability to use the language in a way that is appropriate for the socio-cultural context and requires knowledge of factors such as the weight of the imposition, the relationship and the social status of the interlocutors. Pragmatics is conceptualized as communication in a socio-cultural context and therefore, requires both the knowledge of linguistic forms (pragmalinguistics) and the ability to use the language in a way that is appropriate for the socio-cultural context (sociopragmatics) (Leech, 1983). This conceptualization of communicative competence focuses on language in use and includes "both the actual discourse, individual utterances and sentences, and the sociolinguistic situation with governs the discourse" (Barron, 2003, p. 3). From this standpoint, pragmatic competence is closely tied to the local context and culture. In other words, “linguistic and social development are viewed as interdependent and inextricably embedded in the contexts in which they occur” (Moore, 2008, p. 175).

Speech acts

Speech act theory has been influential in the area of pragmatic competence research. Austin (1976) put forth the notion that through words, a person produces three acts: the locutionary act (the actual phonemes, morphemes and sentences said), the illocutionary act (the speaker's intention expressed in an utterance such as a request or an apology), and a perlocutionary act (the speaker's intended effect of an utterance on the hearer). In other words,

through words, a speaker intends to have an effect on a hearer. Illocutionary force in this model can be altered using linguistic devices such as performative verbs, mood, intonation, and word order (Searle et al, 1980). According to this model, a speech act is not successful if the intended effect on the hearer is not accomplished.

Speech acts can be divided into five categories set forth by Searle (1976) that are most widely accepted by researchers (Schauer, 2009). All speech acts, therefore, fall into one of the following categories: Representatives/Assertives (whereby the speaker (S) commits him or herself to the belief that something is true; Directives (whereby the S attempts to get the hearer (H) to do something); Commissives (whereby the S commits him or herself to a future course of action); Expressives (whereby S expresses his or her psychological attitude towards a prior action or state of affairs); Declarations (whereby S brings about a correspondence between the propositional content and the world; institutionally bound) (Barron, 2003, p. 12-13). Requests, the focus of this study, fall under the classification of directives. In this framework, speech acts, therefore, are classified based on their function from the standpoint of the speaker. With regard to the speech act of requests, for example, certain speech acts in this framework have been identified as direct - the speaker says explicitly what s/he means as in the imperative "Please pass the salt" - or indirect - the speaker means more than what is said, as in the phrase "It's hot in here" which may be an indirect request for someone to open a window (Searle, 1976).

However, there are several criticisms of Searle's and Austin's speech act theory. One of the criticisms is that they consider the speaker's utterance to take precedence, while the hearer is relegated to a more or less passive role in the interaction. In other words, in Searle's framework, the linguistic forms of the speech act as performed by the speaker are the most salient in the analysis. The response(s) of the hearer and the interactional aspects of less importance or are not

considered. The speech act as a unit of analysis is, therefore, analyzed on its own rather than as part of the broader interaction. In this way, there is less focus on the social or cultural context of the speech act.

Another criticism of speech act theory debated in the area of pragmatics is the idea of universality of speech acts. The degree to which speech acts follow similar patterns and strategies across languages and cultures has been the subject of strong debate among researchers in pragmatics. Those in favor of universality, including early speech act theorists Searle and Austin, contend that the performance of speech acts follow the same principles and functions across languages. They believe strategies of indirectness and directness are universal and guided by principles of "felicity" conditions of conversation. In fact, empirical research findings have shown there are certain areas of speech act realization that appear to be universal such as the existence of inference (Blum-Kulka, 1989), the use of pragmatic routines (Coulmas, 1981), the basic speech act categories (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996), external and internal modification (Blum-Kulka, 1991) and certain realization strategies for the speech acts of apology and request (Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989). On the other hand, research has also shown there to be cross-cultural differences in speech act realization; different cultural norms may determine the way speech acts are performed. For example, appropriate use of directness and indirectness can vary not only from one culture to another but also within the same culture among different speech communities (Wierzbicka, 1985).

Politeness theory and relational work

Pragmatics research has focused on politeness theories as they relate to language use in intercultural interactions. Speech communities often use language to build and maintain interpersonal relationships across cultures. The two main approaches that will be discussed in the

context of this study are Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, as well as some criticisms of their theory, and relational work (Locher, 2006; Locher & Watts, 2005; Watts, 2003).

Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness as "redressive action taken to counterbalance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts (FTAs)" (Kasper, 1990, p. 194). Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness has at its core Goffman's (1961) concept of "face". Goffman defined face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (p. 5). Therefore, face can be understood as something a person purposefully puts forth yet is primarily determined by the view of others. Moreover, face is "enacted" during social interaction where interlocutors are attending to both their own face and the face of the other(s). This negotiation of saving one's own face and the face of the other according to Goffman is the "basic structural feature of interaction" (p. 11).

Expanding on Gofffman's theory of face, Brown and Levinson (1987) refer to "positive face" as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (p. 61) or the desire to belong, be valued and be liked by others (Barron, 2003) and "negative face" as "the basic claim to freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (p. 61). Negative face, therefore, is related to independence and autonomy. According to Brown and Levinson, it is in the interactants interest to attend to their own face, as well as their interlocutors', during interactions.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory considers certain speech acts to be "face threatening acts" (FTAs) in that they can potentially harm either the positive or negative face of both or either interactant. For example, requests are considered to be inherently face threatening to both the speaker - who by making a request is admitting a need - and the hearer whose freedom and independence is potentially threatened as they are imposed upon to do something for the benefit of the speaker or to risk appearing impolite by refusing the request. Speakers use certain

linguistic strategies in their interactions to mitigate or "soften the blow" of FTAs and thereby manage face in the interaction. In choosing the appropriate strategy, certain factors are taken into consideration: the social distance between the speaker and the hearer, the relative power of the speaker in relation to the hearer, and the weight of the imposition of the speech act. These factors can vary by speech act and often vary from one culture to another.

While Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory has been praised for creating a theoretical and concrete framework for understanding and analyzing politeness and face in interactions, there are well-known criticisms of the theory. One of the main criticisms has been of the issue of the universality of the concept of face across cultures. Locher (2006) contends, for example, that "no utterance is inherently polite" (p. 251). Furthermore, there has been a complaint by researchers that their theory is biased towards a Western perspective of the self (Kasper, 1994; Gu, 1990). In addition to the universality argument, Brown and Levinson's theory, like speech act theory, considers the utterance on the level of the sentence rather than from the standpoint of the larger interaction. Therefore, the analysis may not consider the broader social and cultural context of the interaction.

A reconceptualization of the Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness has been proposed by Locher and Watts' (2005) "discursive approach to politeness" (Watts, 2006, p. 250). In their model politeness is considered to be relational work carried out within all human social interaction. The concept of "face" is also present in relational work, however, it is constantly being negotiated and reconstructed during the course of the interaction as evidenced in the discourse. Rather than being exclusively speaker-only-focused as Brown and Levinson's theory, Locher and Watts' notion of relational work involves both speaker and hearer. Furthermore, utterances are not considered to be merely "polite" or "impolite" but rather they fall on a

continuum of appropriateness from "direct, impolite, rude, or aggressive interaction through to polite interaction, encompassing both appropriate and inappropriate forms of social behavior" (Locher & Watts, 2005, p. 11). What is considered polite, in other words, is appropriate behavior or speech for a particular social context and is based on interactants' previous experiences, and norms of the society. Or, as Watt's (2006) states, "just as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, politeness depends on the individual's perception as well (p. 252).

When analyzing interactions for research purposes, Locher and Watt's (2005) concept of the difference between first-order politeness and second-order politeness become salient. First-order politeness refers to interpretations that interactants make about the appropriateness or politeness of the interaction. These determinations are generally socially constructed through experience in a particular context or set of circumstances. Second-order politeness refers to a theoretical understanding of politeness as part of a model put forth in the literature, which can include the interpretations of the analyst who may impose his or her own perspective on the deeming of the interaction as polite or impolite. An exchange within an interaction can be considered polite when it is compared to accepted social norms of appropriate behavior. Therefore, in Locher and Watt's (2005) relational model, politeness is not inherent as such but is instead based on interpretations of the interactants as well as the analyst.

Another construct relevant to my study is the concept of "pragmatic failure" as it relates to relational work (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986). In the context of language learning, pragmatic failure is considered to occur "whenever a speaker fails to live up to his interlocutor's expectations in terms of appropriate adherence to regulative maxims" (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986, p. 168). From the perspective of the hearer, pragmatic failure occurs when the hearer misunderstands the speaker's intention of the utterance, and it leads to a breakdown in

communication. Pragmatic failure can occur in intercultural as well as intracultural interactions. In the context of language learning, pragmatic failure is often measured against native speaker norms. There are two main types of pragmatic failure: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic. Pragmalinguistic failure, occurs when the speaker uses inappropriate linguistic forms in such a way that the force of the utterance produced by the speaker is different from the force that a native speaker would assign to the speech act in that situation (Thomas, 1983). An example of this might be when a language learner makes a request and uses a form that is too direct; it may be misinterpreted as a directive or a command (Barron, 2003). Sociopragmatic failure occurs when the speaker misinterprets the social situation and has a different perspective on the appropriate language for that situation than the hearer. In other words, a learner might misinterpret the status of the interlocutor and consequently appear impolite to the hearer (Barron, 2003).

The relationship between politeness and culture has been the focus of a body of research within the field of pragmatics. However, the definition of "culture" has been the subject of debate throughout the humanities and social sciences and is considered an abstract concept, and some researchers have challenged the concept of culture related to politeness (Eelen, 2001). They contend that politeness is not necessarily uniform across cultures or even within cultures, and they take a discursive approach to politeness (Locher, 2004; Locher & Watts, 2008, Mills, 2003; Watts, 2003). Their approach to politeness differs from earlier theories in that they analyze politeness as it emerges in longer passages of authentic interactions (Kádár & Bargiela-Chiappini, 2011). In this way, they are able to situate the politeness in the broader context of the discourse. This contrasts with earlier theories such as Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) universal politeness theory that considers specific stand-alone utterances to be regarded as polite or

impolite. In the discursive approach, both the speaker's language and the hearer's response are considered in the analysis, unlike earlier theories that prioritized the speaker's output. In this framework, what is considered by the interactants to be polite or impolite emerges from the interaction as they create their own cultural norms of the specific context of the interaction. In other words, "culture no longer occurs as a higher-order governing concept but it becomes activated and diffused in interaction and may also help us interpret personal behavioural features of the interactants" (Kádár & Bargiela-Chiappini, 2011, p. 5). In the context of this study, the norms will be considered to emerge from the context of the interactions. That is, pragmatic success or failure will be determined by the interactants rather than by a set framework that considers utterances to be inherently "correct".

The context of this study, service-learning programs, can be conceptualized as taking place in a "workplace culture" defined by Schnurr (2008) as "a system of shared meanings and values as reflected in the discursive and behavioural norms typically displayed by members, that distinguishes their workplace or organisation from others" (p. 80). Therefore, the culture of the individual service-learning settings will reveal itself in the interactions. (Im)politeness in the context of this study will be defined as emergent in the interactions taking place in specific workplace settings.

In summary, this study will examine and describe directives performed by Italian language learners and their interactants in the context of international service-learning programs in Italy. I will examine the interactions through a sociopragmatic framework operationalized through directives and requests performed in the interactions. I will also describe instances of miscommunication that emerge during the course of the interactions and identify any strategies used by the interlocutors to maintain social relationships as they collaborate on a variety of tasks

during various service-learning projects. My understanding of (im)politeness in the interaction may differ from the interactants' since interpretation is shaped by experience and background knowledge. In order to address this challenge, I will acknowledge my interpretations and those of the interactants, which I will elicit from post-interaction interviews. My emic perspective as a bilingual person is an advantage in that I am familiar with linguistic conventions of both English an Italian as well as social and cultural norms of both languages. (Details about the data collection and analysis processes will be discussed in Chapter three.) In the following section I will present a review of the literature that informs this study.

Literature review

In order to situate my study in the larger context of the field of second language acquisition research, I will examine three areas of previous research relevant to my study, which focuses on directives and request strategies of L2 Italian users and local speakers of Italian engaged in service-learning in Italy. First, I will discuss research in the area of study abroad and language learning in general. Then, I will turn to research focused on directives and request strategies in a study abroad context. Next, I will describe the research that has been conducted specifically in the area of service-learning as it relates to language learning. Finally, I will describe the few studies that examine L2 Italian use in the areas related to my study.

Research in the area of study abroad has been an important field of research within the larger field of second language acquisition for several decades. Although there is general agreement that study abroad can be beneficial to language learning, researchers continue to explore factors that may contribute to learning and take advantage of the affordances of study abroad. Early researchers in the area of study abroad relied mainly on testing to measure linguistic gains and changes in proficiency. Studies that focused on fluency and oral proficiency

often used ACTFL's Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) before and after study abroad to measure gains in fluency – a construct operationalized by such factors as length of pauses and hesitations (Freed, et al, 2004). Comparison studies looked at the differences between changes in learner proficiency of study abroad participants and students who studied a foreign language "at home" in a domestic setting (Magnan 1986; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004). Studies revealed learner gains in fluency and overall listening and speaking skills after study abroad and broadened the understanding of the differences between at home and study abroad language programs (Freed, 2008). Yet, other studies were inconclusive and showed little or no difference between study abroad learners and those who studied at their home universities (Brecht & Davidson, 1991; Freed, 1995; Iino, 2006). These studies, according to Dufon and Churchill (2006) show that, "patterns of acquisition of skills and specific forms are far from linear and have proven difficult to consistently record based on pre-post tests" (p. 1). It has been difficult for study abroad researchers to generalize about the precise benefits of study abroad.

The lack of conclusive data about the benefits of study abroad may be due to the variety of study abroad programs and individual differences in learners (Lafford, 2006; Block, 2007; Brecht et al, 1995). It is difficult to replicate studies because of the variation in programs and learners. Furthermore, most early research was limited in scope, focusing on short duration programs only, generally understood as programs lasting from 1-8 weeks, as opposed to semester-long or yearlong programs. Findings were often based solely on test scores and many lacked control groups or strict limitations on variables (Kinginger, 2011). Researchers have cited limitations of the OPI as an assessment tool primarily the lack of theoretical and empirical support for its reliability (Kramsch, 1986; Lantolf & Frawley, 1985). Therefore, few generalizations can be made regarding the specific benefits of study abroad over domestic

language programs.

Early study abroad research did not focus on learners' language use or overall qualitative changes in the learner as a result of study abroad. As a result, more qualitative studies were eventually introduced in an effort to explore factors such as individual learner differences that may have an impact on learning outcomes of study abroad participants (Block, 2007; Dufon & Churchill, 2006; Lafford, 2006). Brecht, Davidson and Ginsberg (1995) conducted one of the first studies using data from student diaries and journals in addition to test results to gain an understanding of the impact of learner characteristics on language gains. They controlled for variables such as gender, knowledge of other foreign languages, and general language aptitude as measured by the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT). Their findings showed that gender and knowledge of other foreign languages correlated with linguistic gains, however, the researchers reported their findings could also be explained by variables that were not held constant, such as prior knowledge of the language. The researchers suggested their findings should help to set the agenda for future study abroad researchers rather than definitively answer questions about learning during study abroad. In fact, much research in the area of learner differences during study abroad followed this study. Constructs such as motivation, cognitive ability, identity and learner attitude have been the focus of a growing branch of study abroad research since the late 1990's (Block, 2007; Isabelli-Garcia, 2006) as researchers continue to explore the role of the student in the learning process.

Research revealed that learner participation in social networks outside the classroom had an impact on learning. Isabelli-Garcia (2006) analyzed the social networks, or informal relationships learners cultivated with native speakers of the L2 to see if they impacted learner motivation. She discovered a connection between learner attitudes toward the host culture,

motivation to learn the language, and social networks learners created. Spontaneous interaction in the L2 with local speakers of the L2 in social networks helped the learners develop oral communication skills. In short, Isabelli-Garcia concluded that although outcomes varied according to the learner, informal contact with speakers of the L2 outside the classroom appeared to enhance acquisition of the L2. This study illustrated that relationships with local L2 speakers in a social setting outside the classroom can enhance learning.

Research on the nature of learners' interaction patterns and the study abroad context found there were certain obstacles – personal, programmatic and environmental - to interaction with local speakers. Talburt and Stewart (1999) found that race and gender can have an effect on whether or not learners are willing or able to interact with local speakers. In their study, a female, African-American student felt harassed by local men in Spain and as a result she refrained from going out or interacting with local L2 speakers, which had a negative impact on her language development. Living arrangements can also mediate the quality and quantity of interaction while abroad. Pellegrino (1998) in an early qualitative study examined student perceptions of their interactions with their homestay families. While host families appeared to be a source of rich interaction in the L2 for learners, Pellegrino's (1998) participants revealed that the conversations with the families were often limited to brief, formulaic exchanges rather than linguistically rich conversations. Pellegrino's (1998) study also demonstrated the value of the students' perspectives in enriching our understanding of the nature of learners' interactions during study abroad. It was clear that the quality of the interactions had an impact on learning and that not all interaction was beneficial to language learning.

In summary, research in the area of study abroad and language learning has revealed that living in an immersion context alone does not guarantee language gains. Instead, the experience

outside the classroom and the nature of the interactions the learner has in the target language determines the difference between studying a second language at home or abroad (Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004).

Researchers in the area of pragmatics and study abroad are interested in the way learners understand and use or "produce action" with words in the target language (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 5). Therefore, researchers have focused on two areas of pragmatic competence; the performance of speech acts and awareness or knowledge of pragmatic norms of the target language. Study abroad is believed to be particularly well-suited for the development of pragmatic competence due to the opportunity for learners to use the target language in a variety of social contexts (Barron, 2003; Kasper, 1997; Kinginger, 2010; Schauer, 2009).

Requests and request strategies have been a popular focus of research in the area of pragmatics research (Kasper, 1997). Broadly defined, a request is an attempt on the part of the speaker to "get the hearer to do something" (Becker, 1982, p. 1). Requests can have a wide range of illocutionary force from a directive to a plea. There are three main reasons requests are a common focus of research in the area of pragmatics: requests are one of the most common speech acts and often occur in daily life; there is a great diversity in the types of requests and therefore a wide range of linguistic choices for making requests; the variety of kinds of people and learners may encounter and need or want to make requests of; there are cross-cultural differences in the way requests are performed (Schauer, 2009). Requests are complex speech acts to perform in that they require an understanding of the social context of the request as well knowledge of a vast array of linguistic resources. Also, the performance of a request varies based on a combination of complex factors such as the weight of the imposition of the request and the relationship of the speaker to the hearer. Therefore, the illocutionary force of a request can vary

depending on these and other contextual factors. According to Brown and Levinson's (1978) model of politeness, requests are considered face-threatening acts (FTAs) in that they threaten the freedom of the hearer by requiring them to respond to the request. An affirmative response by the hearer would mean some kind of imposition and a negative response could threaten to offend or embarrass the person making the request. Therefore, Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) refer to requests as having "high social stakes" for both interlocutors A request could also be interpreted as a show of power (Brown & Levinson, 1987) in that the speaker is asking for something from the hearer who may be of a lower status and may feel obligated to comply.

An aspect of requests that has been of interest to researchers is request modification strategies that can be employed as a way to reduce or increase the illocutionary force of the request. Within Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper's (1989) framework for classifying requests. Requests can be modified here both internally and externally. Internal modifiers are linguistic features that serve to modify the illocutionary force of the request. External modifiers, or supportive moves, are statements that are added to support or possibly explain the reason for the request. In analyzing requests many researchers use a variation of the classification system based on Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper's (1989) Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). Since this is a relatively new area of research coding schemes for request strategies are continuing to evolve based on emergent findings (Schauer, 2009).

A limited number of pragmatics researchers have investigated changes in learner awareness of sociocultural norms in the target language as a result of study abroad. Awareness in this context refers to the hearer's ability to infer an interlocutor's intended meaning (Schauer, 2009). In order to do so appropriately, it is important for the hearer, or the learner in this case, to have a clear understanding of cultural and pragmatic norms of the L2 associated with a specific

context. Incorrect inference can lead to "pragmatic failure" or a breakdown in communication (Thomas, 1983). In one such early study focusing on requests, Kitao (1990) asked a group of learners and native speakers of Japanese to answer a questionnaire about the degree of politeness of a series of direct and indirect requests. The ESL learners ranked the utterances in a way that correlated with the native speakers but the EFL learners did not. Kitao considered this to be result of the context of learning in the target language environment. Schauer (2009) compared the production and awareness of requests of German-speaking learners of English who studied abroad to those who stayed at the home institution to study English. She used a multimedia elicitation task to test the learners' awareness and use of request strategies in English and found that the learners who studied abroad matched the request forms used by native speakers and used a wider range of request strategies than those who studied at home.

Directives have been investigated most frequently in the context of a workplace environment; often in situations in which there is a clear hierarchy of roles. Ervin-Tripp's (1976) seminal work on directive use in a variety of settings distinguished six different types of directives along a continuum of direct to indirect forms. Her framework has since been used freqently by researchers investigating directives (Vine). Some research has focused on the different forms the directives related to the power dynamic of the interactants, and Jones (1992) found that, "directive usage cannot be adequetly understood without considering the specific contexts in which directives occur" (p. 427).

Few pragmatics studies have been conducted focusing on learners of Italian and requests. Nuzzo's (2007) longitudinal study investigated the evolution over a period of six months of the request strategies of three immigrants to Italy. Each participant was enrolled in an Italian language course, two had Spanish as their L1 and had lived in Italy for 18 months, and the third,

a German L1 speaker, had arrived in Italy three months before the study took place. Using open role-plays, the participants were asked to respond to several situations designed to elicit requests, apologies and complaints in Italian. Nuzzo (2007) compared their responses to those of native Italian speakers for the same situations, using a framework for classifying requests based on the corpus developed from the native speakers in the study and informed by previous analyses of requests (Achiba, 2003; Barron, 2003; Blum-Kulka, et al, 1986; Schauer, 2004;Trosborg, 1995). Over the six-month period, Nuzzo (2007) found the requests of the Italian learners had moved closer to the native speaker forms. Specifically, the changes were revealed in the way the L2 users had begun to use internal modifiers in their requests.

Modifiers, or mitigators, in requests refer to strategies for softening or intensifying the illocutionary force of the request. Given the inherent face threatening nature of requests, modifiers are important in "softening the blow" and maintaining a positive rapport between interlocutors. Internal modifiers can be morphosyntactic, lexical, or discursive (Nuzzo, 2007; Vedder, 2007) and occur during the main request act. External modifiers are considered supportive statements either leading up to or following the principle request (Barron, 2003; Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Trosborg, 1987). For example, in the following statement: *Could you give me a hand in the kitchen, please? If not, I'll be late;* the conditional form *could* is an internal morphosyntactic modifier, *please* is a lexical modifier and *If not, I'll be late* is an external modifier that justifies the request (Vedder, 2007, p. 105). The use of modifiers to mitigate or soften a request can be particularly challenging for language learners. They require not only command of grammatical and lexical forms but also the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge to know when it is socially appropriate to use the form. Factors such as the learner's L1 may either facilitate or hinder acquisition of request modifiers due to the fact that while some

"rules" for usage in the L2 may be similar to their L1 others may differ. Also, requests are considered face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Nuzzo (2007) focused the analysis on three categories of modifiers - morphosyntactic, lexical and discursive. All three participants expanded the frequency and variety of their modification strategies over the six-month period and in so doing moved closer to the forms used by the native speakers in her study.

Vedder's (2007) study focused on the use of modifiers in requests of 46 intermediate level Dutch learners of Italian. While Nuzzo (2007) investigated changes over time in the L2 users' requests, Vedder (2007) conducted a study of the nature of the request strategies employed by the L2 Italian learners at one point in time. Similar to Nuzzo's (2007) study, the participants engaged in open role-plays designed to elicit requests in the course of a conversation. The focus of the analysis was the frequency and variation of external and internal modifiers. The corpus of data, which included 23 dialogues totaling approximately two hours of semi-spontaneous dialogue, revealed that the learners used a slightly higher number of internal than external modifiers in their dialogues. This aligns with previous research that has found internal modifiers are used more frequently by L2 learners than external modifiers (Ellis, 1992). The overall frequency of use of either type of modifier was low, and there was little variation in the kind of modifier used. The prevalence of morphosyntactic internal modifiers (the conditional tense and modal verbs were most commonly used) also coincides with findings from previous research (Barron, 2003; Trosborg, 1987). There is little variation in the type of internal modifiers, however. More research in the area of Italian as an L2 will shed light on whether the same results will emerge in different settings.

Language educators in the United States and abroad are increasingly incorporating service-learning into language courses as a way to increase intercultural awareness, to connect with a local community of L2 speakers, and to encourage interaction with speakers of the L2 in the local community. Researchers have found there are benefits not only to intercultural awareness and understanding but also to overall language ability (Hellebrandt & Varona, 1999). By offering an opportunity for sustained and meaningful interaction in the L2, researchers have found service-learning to be beneficial to language learners both at home as part of a foreign language course, and abroad. Studies of service-learning and critical reflection reveal a number of benefits for learners including an increased sense of engagement and social responsibility, improved critical thinking skills as they connect service-learning outside the classroom not only to the academic course but also to their own experiences (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Perren, 2013).

In the context of foreign language learning, service-learning provides the opportunity for learners to be involved in the local community and build relationships with local speakers of the target language through meaningful interaction. Service-learning can also facilitate introducing the culture of L2 into the foreign language classroom. As a result, educators have begun to add a service-learning component to their language courses. A growing area of research explores the benefits of such programs to language students. The studies discussed briefly below will show the various constructs and contexts of research on service-learning and language learning.

An example of service-learning in a foreign language context is a group of French students who volunteered to teach French in a local elementary after-school program (Grim, 2010). In keeping with the goal of the reciprocal benefit of service-learning, the project fulfilled a need for a program the elementary school could not afford and gave the French students the opportunity to use their French skills in the local community. Student reflections revealed that

the learners perceived the experience as beneficial to their language development and motivation to continue studying French. Some students reported wanting to change their major to French and a desire to pursue the field of teaching as a career, based on their service-learning experience.

Service-learning offers the opportunity to interact with people from different cultures outside the foreign language classroom. Bloom (2008) investigated the development of intercultural competence of seven students in their first semester of Spanish who took part in a service-learning project. They helped children whose first language was Spanish by reading to them and preparing study materials for them. Although the students were primarily speaking English with the children, they reported an increased understanding of different cultures. Two students showed a "dramatic" change in their intercultural sensitivity as evidenced in the learners' reflective journals (Bloom, 2008, p. 117).

Weldon and Trautmann's (2003) case study examined ways in which the goals of ACTFL's 5 C's were met by students in their Spanish course after participation in a service-learning project in which they acted as interpreters at a local medical facility. From student journals and final reflective essays the researchers deduced that learning had occurred to some degree for all students in the program based on the 5C's. Students became "accepting" of people of different cultures unanimously endorsed service-learning as a positive experience. In this study, the students were also evaluated by their service-learning supervisors whose reports were also considered in the findings.

Tilley-Lubbs (2004) designed a program, "Crossing the Border through Service-Learning" that became a course for Spanish language learners based on the needs of the local Spanish-speaking community. In class students read articles in Spanish about the situation of Latin American immigrants in the United States and then, they went out into the local

community to work with them in various projects based on their needs. Tilley-Lubbs (2004) explored the nature of the relationships that developed between students of Spanish and the Spanish-speaking families over the course of the semester. Reflective journals, interviews and observations revealed an increase in awareness of social justice issues in the learners, increased empathy for "an oppressed population about which they were hitherto unaware" (p. 135). Similar to Bloom (2008) and Weldon and Trautmann (2003) foreign language learners have developed an intercultural sensitivity as a result of service-learning.

Raschio (2004) initiated a service-learning program for Spanish language learners as a way to connect with the local Spanish-speaking community and improve cross-cultural community relations. In the program, students worked with as tutors in a Spanish immersion K-12 school. The goals of both projects included a better understanding of the needs of the Latino population, an increase in awareness of the challenges and opportunities of a multi-cultural society, and to practice "linguistically-appropriate language" in real world interactions during service-learning (Raschio, 2004, p. 122). Based on student reflections, the researcher reported the students felt the experience was valuable in learning about the local community. Several students stated their desire to become Spanish teachers as a result of the experience. Others commented on the fact that the experience highlighted their true proficiency level in Spanish. Interacting with young children whose Spanish was well beyond their ability level was humbling for some students. Overall, the goals of this project were met.

Abbott and Lear (2010) investigated the benefits of service-learning to Spanish language learners studying business who volunteered at a community center for Spanish-speaking immigrants wanting to start their own small businesses. The researchers were specifically interested in discovering to what extent students could make connections among the content

goals of the course related to business and entrepreneurship, the Spanish language, and their experiences in the community. Data - including student reflective journals, instructor observations, Spanish language quizzes, and a final project in the form of a business plan developed together with the community partner - revealed enhanced knowledge of social entrepreneurship, as well as gains in Spanish language ability and an increased understanding of Latino culture. However, the gains fell short of the expectations of the researchers and they concluded the need for more explicit connection between the content studied in the classroom and the experience during service-learning.

In summary, these programs demonstrate a variety of service-learning programs that were successful in exposing foreign language learners to cultures of the L2 they would not otherwise have access to in the classroom. The data was primarily from the perspective of the learners and relied primarily on learner reflective journals, interviews and surveys. Undoubtedly, service-learning has been beneficial to learning, particularly in the area of intercultural awareness and language ability.

Another growing area of research has focused on English language learners (ELLs) in the United States who participate in service-learning. One such study investigated changes in intercultural awareness and advanced language acquisition of 39 ESL students engaged in an 8 - week language immersion and service-learning program (Askildson et al, 2013). Weekly oral and written reflections revealed an increase in an appreciation of social diversity and social justice, an increased sense of citizenship in the ELLs. Researchers administered the TOEFL exam to the students at the beginning and at the end of the 8-week course as a way measure language gains. The learners demonstrated an average gain of 72 points on the TOEFL, which researchers noted was substantially higher than the expected 20-point gain from the equivalent of

200 hours of in-class English instruction. In addition, the reflections from the learners reported that they perceived the importance of interaction with local speakers outside the classroom to language learning.

One study focused primarily on directive use and intercultural interactions in a service-learning context is Perren's (2008) study of directive use and perceptions of English language learners (L2 users) and native English speakers (NESs) engaged in service-learning. Perren's (2008) study focused on naturally-occurring interactions between English language learners (L2 users) and native English speakers (NESs) in a service-learning context. The analysis focused on the use of directives in the instruction-giving process and on the perceptions of the L2 users and their interlocutors of the interactions. The interactions were recorded and the directive encounters classified into the following six categories from most direct to least direct: need statements, imperatives, imbedded imperatives, permission directives, non-explicit question directives, and hints (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Perren's (2008) analysis of the typology of the directives at two service-learning sites revealed that 60% of the directives were either hints or imbedded imperatives, forms which could be considered ambiguous linguistic forms and, therefore, pose a greater chance for miscommunication and/or misunderstanding for the L2 users. Furthermore, the data (transcripts, researcher notes, and follow-up interviews) revealed two additional factors that led to barriers in communication between the L2 users and the NESs: conversational delivery and restraint to engage or avoidance. Conversational delivery, which includes factors such as speed of speech, clarity and content, emerged as a common theme in the transcripts and in the post-interaction interviews as a source of misunderstanding or breakdowns in communication for the L2 users. For example, several L2 users noted the challenges of understanding directions because their supervisor was speaking too fast, or because they had

difficulty understanding the directive (Perren, 2008). Avoidance refers to situations in which either the L2 user or the NES chose to restrain in engaging in an interaction for various reasons. The L2 users, for example, reported avoiding asking clarification questions of the NESs because they did not want to appear rude or lose face by revealing they had not understood the directive.

In addition to barriers to communication, Perren (2008) also described linguistic and behavioral strategies that strengthened social connections and understanding between the L2 users and the NESs such as slower rate of speech, clarity and voice quality by NESs. Data also revealed incidences in the interactions when the NESs or more expert L2 users supported the novice L2 users in the interactions through scaffolding and modeling of linguistic forms.

Perren's (2008) study is significant for several reasons. First, it provides a rich and detailed analysis of the language used in the intercultural interactions in a service-learning context. The interview data of the perceptions of the interlocutors reveal specific instances of misunderstanding and miscommunication that can be used to inform language educators of ways to prepare learners for interactions with native speakers outside the classroom. It also provides information for community partner organizations to use to train individuals who will be working with language learners as volunteers as a way to enhance communication and facilitate the successful completion of tasks. In addition, the microanalysis of the directives used in this context can also inform classroom pedagogy related to pragmatics and add to the growing corpus of authentic language use in a service-learning context.

In this study, I analyze naturally occurring interactions between Italian language learners and local speakers of Italian who are engaged in service-learning. In the next chapter I will discuss the specifics of this study, including procedures for data collection as they relate to each of my research questions along with a rationale for each.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

The methodological approach used to analyze the spoken interactions between the Italian language learners and the local speakers of Italian is discourse analysis. The analysis is informed by several different yet compatible discourse traditions that will be discussed in the following section. As stated in Chapter one this study will address the following research questions:

1. What is the nature of the directives used in interactions between Italian L2 users and local speakers of Italian during service-learning in Italy?
2 In what ways do L2 users and local Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the interactions?
3. In what ways is relational work used to manage (im)politeness and negotiate relationships in the interactions?

To address each of these research questions, a discourse analytic approach will be employed to analyze different features of the discourse. The organizational and structural features of the directive strategies and the relational work used in the interactions are analyzed in order to examine the nature of the language used in the interactions between the learners and local speakers of Italian during service-learning.

There are a variety of interpretations and approaches to the term discourse and discourse analysis. Historically, this type of analysis has been applied to various disciplines such as anthropology, education, philosophy, business, and sociology (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006; Schiffrin, 1994). Discourse is commonly understood as "language above the sentence level"

(Stubbs, 1989, p. 3) and "language in use" (Jaworski & Coupland, 2006, p. 3). According to Brown and Yule (1984), "the discourse analyst treats his data as the record (text) of a dynamic process in which language was used as an instrument of communication in a context by a speaker to express meanings and achieve intentions (discourse)" (p. 26). A text, in this study, refers to the intercultural interactions between the L2 users and local Italian speakers during service-learning.

Schiffrin (1994) states that discourse analysis should view "language as an activity embedded in social interaction" (p. 415). Language, through the lens of discourse analysis, sheds light on social and cultural practices. By analyzing discourse, therefore, the wider sociocultural context reveals itself. There is, therefore, both a social and linguistic aspect to discourse are reflected in the interactions. The view of discourse as language in use and language as social interaction inform this study and the analysis of the interactions. When considering language use in a second language, it is not sufficient to investigate learner output alone, but also learner discourse within the context of the interaction. In other words, interaction "evolves within and emanates from its social and situational context, be that a tutor-learner classroom exchange or a naturally occurring conversation between a nonnative learner and a native speaker in the target culture" (Magnan, 1998, p. 297). Therefore, language use in this study will be considered in it's sociocultural context.

The primary focus of the close analysis of the spoken language in interactions is on directives as they occur naturally in the discourse between Italian L2 users and local Italian speakers working together collaboratively during service-learning. Before the data collection began, the focus of my research was on requests in the interactions between L2 users and Italian speakers. However, it transpired that directives were more prevalent in the data and therefore, the focus of the analysis has shifted to include both directives and requests which are considered as a

type of directive (Ervin-Tripp, et al, 1990). Before collecting the data, I had anticipated that the L2 users would be involved in more collaborative activities during service-learning. However, it transpired that at each site there was a clear hierarchy of roles, and the L2 users interacted primarily with a local Italian speaker who was in a supervisory or trainer position. Therefore, there was an abundance of directives employed by the local Italian speakers with few requests from the L2 users. More details about the power dynamic and the specific activities that the students were engaged in will follow in chapter four.

For this analysis I consider the directives as co-constructed in the context of the interaction. That is, the directives are not identified in isolation but as part of a discursive interplay between speaker and hearer. Using Locher and Watts' framework for relational work (2005) the analysis focuses on linguistic markers, expressions and strategies will be analyzed for signals of politeness, impoliteness or appropriate behavior (Locher, 2006; Locher & Watts, 2005; Nuzzo, 2007; Watts, 2003). Some discourse features considered part of relational work include hedging, intensifiers, placators, minimizers, and the use of humor. Analyses of the directive strategies within the broader context of the interactions will be conducted in order identify and interpret ways in which the relational work emerges in the data.

In the following sections I will describe in detail the research design, setting, participants, data collection, data analysis procedures, issues of validity and reliability and my role as the researcher.

Research design

This study takes an ethnographic approach to the data collection of naturally occurring spoken interactions between Italian learners and local Italian speakers engaged in service-learning projects. Saville-Troike (1982) emphasizes that ethnographic investigations are essential

in order to gain an adequate understanding of the context: "We can begin to understand how language is learned only if we examine the process within its immediate social and cultural setting, and in the context of conscious or unconscious socialization or enculturation" (p. 220-221). By observing and working alongside the participants from within the setting of service-learning, I had a first-hand experience of the context of the interactions from the perspective of a participant as well as a researcher.

There are benefits to collecting naturally occurring data as opposed to simulated data elicited from sources such as discourse completion tasks (DCTs), role-plays or questionnaires. Naturally occurring conversations outside the classroom allow for authentic consequences and implications for learners as they interact with local speakers outside the classroom (Shively, 2011). While DCTs have the advantage of allowing the researcher to collect a large amount of data in a short time (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Barron, 2003; Kasper & Rose, 2002; Shardakova, 2005), simulated or elicited data may not capture a range of strategies or an authentic number of conversational turns that would occur in a spontaneous interaction (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992). According to Kasper and Dahl (1991), "tightly controlled data elicitation techniques might well preclude access to precisely the kinds of conversational and interpersonal phenomena that might shed light on the pragmatics of IL [interlanguage pragmatics] use and development" (p. 242). By studying speech acts in the broader context of a conversation, the data reflect the unique conditions of the context of the interaction. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (2005) state: "The fundamental nature of the very object of study – language use – argues for the study of situated authentic discourse" (p. 7). Kasper and Dahl (1991) have called for more conversational or authentic data to be collected in the field of interlanguage pragmatics, stating that "clearly

there is a great need for more authentic data, collected in the full context of the speech event" (p. 245).

There are, however, known challenges to collecting and analyzing spontaneous interactions (Cohen, 1996). Recording naturally occurring talk is difficult because it requires the researcher to be physically close enough to the interactants to record the interactions without interfering with the spontaneity of the conversation. Recording equipment, especially if visible, can make the participants feel conscious of being watched which may cause them to act differently than usual or in a way they believe the researcher wants. Labov (1972) referred to this phenomenon as "observer's paradox" (p. 209), the paradox being the impossibility of observing someone in a natural state. Capturing naturally occurring data in a natural environment as opposed to a controlled environment, such as a classroom, also means the possibility of the breakdown of recording equipment as well as background noise or other types of interference with the recording (Dufon, 2002).

In addition to the logistical challenges of collecting naturally occurring talk, there are also methodological issues. In a natural setting it is not possible to predict language use with certainty and therefore the researcher cannot be sure they will capture the specific speech act under investigation. The researcher may have to collect many hours of data before the unit of analysis in question presents itself in the data, if at all (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005). However, for the purposes of this descriptive study of situated language use, the benefits to collecting naturally occurring data outweigh the difficulties. Since the focus of this study is an exploration of authentic language use in a service-learning context, it was desirable to record naturally occurring talk.

Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (2005) have found that institutional settings can offer researchers the benefits of collecting naturally occurring talk with the benefit of "comparability, interactivity, and consequentiality" (p. 10) normally not found in spontaneous conversation. In other words, in institutional settings there is often a consistency of language use due to constraints based on similar activities being carried out by people with clearly defined roles. This allows researchers to identify trends and to pinpoint common features within the natural discourse. Also, there are true and immediate consequences to the interactions, attesting to their authenticity in revealing unwritten rules of engagement co-workers are likely to follow. These constraints mean that institutional talk is suitable for an interlanguage pragmatics study due to the possibility to predict and compare discourse features common to the context, while having the benefit of the spontaneity and authenticity of naturally-occurring talk (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1996).

Drew and Heritage (1992) state the following constraints for interaction that takes place within institutions:

1. Institutional talk is normally informed by *goal orientations* of a relatively restricted conventional form.
2. Institutional interaction may often involve special or *particular constraints* on what one or both of the participants will treat as allowable contributions to the business at hand.
3. Institutional talk may be associated with *inferential frameworks* and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

(p. 22)

Drew and Heritage (1992) also state that institutional talk is "task-related and ... involve[s] at least one participant who represents a formal organization of some kind" (p. 3).

The discourse that is the focus of this analysis took place during service-learning at various community service organizations. In this study, at least one person in the interactions was a staff or permanent volunteer at the organization where the interactions take place. There was a mix of permanent staff members who had clearly defined roles, and volunteers who become part of the organization temporarily for brief periods of time. Although they do not take place in a formal institutional setting such as a courtroom or a school classroom, the interactions analyzed in this study are considered to be on the continuum of institutional talk since the interactions are goal and task oriented (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). In a service-learning setting there are often specific activities and tasks that volunteers are expected to perform, and directives occur frequently when people are attempting to complete a task (Pearson, 1989). In the informal institutional setting of service-learning the "participants' institutional identities or professional identities are somehow made relevant to the work activities in which they are engaged" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 4). That is, the interactants, in this case the L2 users and the local Italian speakers, co-construct their roles and relationships with one another through their language while engaged in collaborative tasks (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003).

The naturally occurring talk during service-learning was recorded and then analyzed with a specific focus on request strategies situated in the context of the interactions. Interviews with participants and researcher notes provide supporting information about the nature of the social and cultural context of the interactions and the perspectives of the interlocutors. These data will be discussed in more detail in the following sections. The purpose of the study is to gain insight

into the naturally occurring, situated language use in interactions during service-learning in Italy with a special focus on directive use.

Setting

The setting for this study is three community-based organizations located in a medium-sized city in the region of Tuscany with a population of approximately 60,000 residents. The city is approximately 45.5 total square miles, including a small historic center, which is visited daily by over 100,000 tourists. In addition to permanent residents and day tourists, students from the U.S. participate in over thirty-five different study abroad programs each year. In addition, Italian students from other parts of Italy study at three different national universities in the city. There is, therefore, a multicultural setting as a backdrop to the study and intercultural interactions are a part of the daily life of the residents and visitors.

The Institute. The L2 users in this study were study abroad participants at an Italian Language Institute (ILI), a member of the International Center for Intercultural Exchange founded in 2005 with the mission to promote intercultural exchange in Italy and around the world. ILI has been offering Italian language and culture courses as well as service-learning opportunities for U.S. college students since 2004. ILI offers credit-bearing courses in Italian language and culture during the fall and spring semesters (fourteen-week programs) and the summer (eight-week, six-week and four-week programs). Students live with host families all within walking distance or short bus ride from the main ILI center. ILI's mission is to provide "enhancing strategies through Full-immersion and Service-learning for the development of Reflective Intercultural Competence" (ILI website). I chose to conduct my research at ILI because of their dedication to and experience with service-learning and study abroad and their willingness to allow me to conduct my research with their students and community partners.

Students come to ILI from a variety of U.S. universities. ILI has partnerships with several including several large state universities in the United States and Canada. During the summer I conducted the study, there were a total of eighteen students from eight different universities.

The summer study abroad program at ILI runs from mid-May through July and students participate in either an eight-week, six-week or four-week program. Students in all programs take a combination of Italian language and cultural classes. Upon arrival, they take a placement test to determine their language level and class. Then, they chose culture courses in art history, sociolinguistics, and/or medieval Italian history. In addition to their classroom courses, students at ILI are encouraged to participate in service-learning by volunteering in the community from one to five hours per week. Students can choose from a variety of sites introduced to them at an orientation session when they arrive in Italy. The ILI website states their philosophy regarding service-learning: "Volunteering in the community is an unparalleled way to improve language skills, get involved in the local social fabric and make a genuine contribution to the host community." They believe that service-learning provides an opportunity to practice and learn language skills outside the classroom while engaging with the local community.

To connect the students' service outside the classroom with their academic coursework, students are required to take a course called Reflective Writing. For this course they are required to keep a journal of their experiences both in and outside the classroom, including their experiences during service-learning, and then discuss aspects of their journals during class. The fact that ILI offers a class dedicated to reflection illustrates their commitment to and understanding of service-learning as an integration of both the experience of volunteering and reflection in an academic setting.

Service-learning sites. ILI has been offering service-learning for their students since 2004 and has established relationships with a variety of community organizations in the city. They also continually seek out new opportunities for service-learning for their students. After a presentation given at a student orientation at the start of each term, students fill out a form with their initial choices for service-learning. They can stay with their original choice or change throughout the semester. There are no specific time requirements but students are encouraged to spend at least one to five hours per week at their chosen site. The service-learning coordinator at ILI monitors their participation and is the contact for students and community partners regarding service-learning. The participants of this study performed their service-learning at three different sites which I will now describe in more detail.

Casa di Riposo. The Casa di Riposo (CDR) home for the elderly houses approximately fifty residents. Students volunteer alongside staff members and other Italian volunteers helping with the residents interacting with the residents and the supervisor. Activities included spending time sitting and talking with the elderly, accompanying them to meals, and providing other non-medical assistance as needed. In this context the L2 users interacted with the residents and the staff, all Italian speakers. The conversations with the residents often consisted of asking and answering questions about their lives and their past. This was challenging at times for the L2 users because some residents had difficulty speaking or were unresponsive due to physical impairment, or made remarks that were unrelated to the context due to dementia or other mental disabilities. In the interactions between the L2 users and staff directives were commonly used, by the head nurse in particular, when describing what needed to be done by the L2 user volunteer.

Horse Therapy Center. The Horse Therapy Center (HTC), offers various types of therapy with horses for children and adults with disabilities. Student volunteers perform various

tasks mainly related to taking care of the horses. The level of hands on involvement with the horses varies according to the experience and the comfort level of the volunteer around horses. According to Pietro, the manager of the stables and the volunteer coordinator, the students are involved in all areas of taking care of the horses including cleaning out the stables, brushing, feeding and grooming the horses. Those who are more experienced have the opportunity to ride the horses as well. The interactions for this study took place on a day when Maria, one of the L2 users and an expert rider, was demonstrating a horse training technique called the Parelli method with Elsa, the on site horse trainer. The interactions were between Elsa and Maria, during the demonstration.

Misericordia. The Misericordia ("Mercy") was founded in 1244 in Florence, Italy and is considered the first volunteer organization in Italy. The Misericordia provides various services for the elderly and infirm including a medical care, nursing and assisted-living facilities, food services, and both emergency and non-emergency transportation. Today there are over seven hundred affiliates of the Misericordia throughout Italy, including the site in the city where this study takes place. Students can volunteer in various capacities such as helping to deliver food, loading the truck with supplies, riding in the ambulance, and other duties depending on the needs of the organization at that time. All volunteers at the Misericordia are required to take a hands-on training course to learn about how to use the transport equipment and a brief cardio-pulmonary resuscitation course. After going through the training, volunteers are prepared to accompany the ambulance drivers with one or two Italian volunteers and help them with non-traumatic emergencies such as taking a patient to the hospital or to a doctor's appointment, responding to home emergencies and other services that may be required.

The interactions examined from this service-learning context were from participants involved in a ninety-minute training session lead by the trainer and volunteer coordinator, Francesco. The training was divided into two parts; learning about the ambulance and a brief interactive lesson in CPR. There were three participants in the interactions: Samantha (L2 user), Francesco (trainer) and myself (researcher). Since there were only two trainees including myself, I participated fully in the session alongside Samantha.

Participants

For this research there were a total of seven participants, three L2 users and four Italian community partners. Two L2 users who self-selected to participate in the research were from the group of seven students registered for the eight-week summer program at ILI. The remaining L2 user was a graduate student working on a research proposal with ILI for the summer. Qualitative researchers often purposefully choose participants based on certain characteristics that will fit the parameters of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). All three of the L2 users fit the following criteria for my research: 1) native English speakers, 2) affiliated in some way with ILI for at least six weeks, 3) committed to at least 2 hours of service-learning per week, 4) going to do service-learning in a location where Italian was the main language spoken. The Italian community partners were selected because they 1) agreed to participate in the research, 2) were the people primarily in contact with the L2 users during service-learning, 3) were native speakers or expert speakers of Italian, 4) were in a supervisory position at the community organization.

L2 users. The L2 users who participated in the study were three American college students on a study abroad program in Italy. I choose to use the term "L2 user" and not L2 learner to refer to the U.S. college students in the study because the focus of this research is on language use rather than language learning. Also, L2 user is a more accurate term than L2 learner

because not all the students were on the study abroad program for the purpose of learning the language. One participant was a graduate student who was Italy to develop and write a research proposal, another had been on the program as a language learner in the past and had returned to work as an intern at the institute.

According to staff members at ILI, the summer session tends to have a smaller group of students. In fact, during the summer session that the research took place, there were a total of eighteen students enrolled; seven in the eight-week program, five in the six-week program, and six in the four-week program. I considered as participants only those students enrolled in the six and eight-week programs in order to allow more time to collect data during their service-learning hours. Of the three participants in the study, one was intermediate and two were advanced level students as determined by the placement test and one advanced level based on previous Italian study. Table 1 shows an overview of the L2 user participants.

Table 1: L2 Users

L2 User	Weeks at ILI	Semesters of Italian before ILI	Level at ILI	Service-learning
Brad	6	4	Intermediate	Nursing home
Maria	6	8	Advanced	Horse therapy
Samantha	6	6	Advanced	Misericordia

Recruitment of the participants took place following the orientation session for all new students. I introduced myself and talked briefly about the research including my request for volunteers and what the expectations would be for the participants. I then distributed a one-page summary of the research, including the estimated time commitment involved in participation, along with an informed consent form for them to consider. In both the oral and written overviews, following the guidelines of the Institutional Review Board, I emphasized the fact that

their participation was completely voluntary, anonymous, and would have no bearing on their coursework at ILI. I also discussed what I believe to be possible benefits for them of participating, such as more attention and reflection on their language use mainly through our post-interaction interviews. Over the course of the next week, the students who were interested in participating in the research made themselves known to me verbally and we then made more specific plans for how the research would proceed. Rather than ask the students to contact me regarding when and where they were going to do their service-learning, my point of contact was the staff member at ILI who coordinates service-learning. He communicated directly with me about the participants' service-learning activities. I would usually meet the students at the ILI center and travel with them to the site, which gave me time to get to know them better and make a plan for the research that day. Traveling back to the center together provided an opportunity to discuss and record their perceptions of the interactions that day. Below is a description of each of the L2 users who I will also refer to in the analysis as student volunteers.

Brad. Brad attended a large midwestern state university. This was his first time in this part of Italy and he was placed in the intermediate Italian course based on his four semesters of Italian prior to arriving in Italy. One of his reasons for studying Italian was to be able to converse with family members in Italian and therefore had a heritage connection with the language. Brad volunteered one or two times a week at the home for the elderly.

Maria. Maria was pursing a master's degree in language study and linguistics at a large state university in the Southeast. She was a study abroad student at ILI the previous summer and had studied Italian for four years before coming to Italy. The summer of the study, she was not enrolled as a student in the ILI study abroad program but did attend advanced Italian language

classes on occasion. She had received a grant to work on a research proposal in the area of intercultural learning in the foreign language classroom and that was the focus of her time at ILI. Although Maria was not a summer abroad student, she had an interest and prior experience with horse therapy and was interested in service-learning at the HTC. The staff at the site was enthusiastic to learn of her experience with a technique for training horses called the Parelli method, and they asked her to demonstrate it for them and for the other volunteers.

Samantha. Samantha was a junior at a large Midwestern state university. She had studied Italian for six semesters before coming to Italy and was placed in the Advanced Italian class. This summer was her first time in Italy. Samantha chose two service-learning sites: Misericordia and the horse therapy. For this study I analyzed her interactions at the Misericordia training session.

Local Italian speakers. The second group of participants consisted of staff or local volunteers at the agencies where the service-learning programs took place. For the purposes of this study they are referred to as "local Italian speakers" or "local speakers." The participants fit the aforementioned criteria; that is, they were 1) in agreement to participate in the research, 2) the people primarily in contact with the L2 users during service-learning, 3) native speakers of Italian, 4) in a supervisory position at the community organization.

At each service location I asked the Italian local speaker if he or she would be willing to participate in the research after explaining the scope of the research, the methods I would be using to collect the data, and issues of privacy and anonymity would be protected. At least one participant fitting the above criteria at each organization agreed to participate. Table 2 provides an overview of the Italian community partner participants.

Table 2: Local Italian speakers

Local Italian speaker	Paid staff or volunteer	Position	Organization
Francesco	Volunteer	Coordinator	Misericordia
Elsa	Staff	Horse trainer	Horse therapy center
Pietro	Staff	Director	Horse therapy center
Susanna	Staff	Head nurse	Nursing home

Susanna. Susanna is a nurse at the CDR where Brad did his service. She was in charge of the local Italian volunteers who were taking care of the elderly residents at the home. The main task she was involved in was attending to the needs of the residents; for example, making sure all the patients were moved from their rooms to an outdoor courtyard and given an afternoon snack. There were approximately 50 residents and this took about two hours to complete. The L2 user volunteer helped her with all aspects of this activity.

Elsa. Elsa works at the horse therapy center training and working with the horses. She also takes care of the daily tasks at the stables. She told Maria, the L2 user volunteering at the HTC, that she did not speak English and she only spoke Italian with the L2 user volunteers. One of the other student volunteers described her as "no nonsense" (HTC-SL, 293) as she was working with Maria demonstrating the Parelli horse training technique.

Pietro. Pietro was the director of the HTC and the volunteer coordinator. He also spoke little English to the student volunteers. Pietro had a kind demeanor and was enthusiastic about having the students from ILI volunteer at the HTC. The days that I was there as a volunteer, he spent time teaching us about the various kinds of equipment - saddles, bridles, and other horse equipment - in Italian. He also talked about Italian history and folklore with the students as we were watching the horse training session.

Francesco. In addition to coordinating the volunteers at the Misericordia, Francesco is professor of computer science at the local university. He has been working with American

university student volunteers since 2003 and with the students from ILI's program since 2005. Francesco organized and conducted the training session required of all student volunteers at the Misericordia. His high level of spoken English was evidenced by the ease and frequency with which he switched from Italian to English during the training session. He attributed his fluency in speaking and his vocabulary in English to his time spent working with American volunteers at the Misericordia over the past ten years.

Data sources and collection procedures

The data sources align with the goal of the research which is to respond to the research questions by providing a) a detailed description of the nature of directives and requests used by the L2 users of Italian and local speakers of Italian, b) instances of misunderstanding and strategies for facilitating understanding present in the interactions, and c) an analysis of (im)politeness and relational work in the interactions. An effective way to investigate the realization of speech acts such as directives is to analyze data that has been obtained through observation and the collection of spontaneous spoken language (Wolfson, 1983). Therefore, the primary data for this study consist of audio recordings of naturally occurring interactions, researcher field notes and interviews with L2 users and locals Italian speakers. The data collection took place during an eight-week study abroad program in a city in Tuscany, Italy. In the following section I will provide details about the data sources and the collection procedures for each.

Audio recordings. In order to respond to Research question one, (What is the nature of the directives used by L2 users and Italian speakers during service-learning?) I recorded five and a half hours of naturally occurring speech of L2 users of Italian and local Italian speakers at three different service-learning settings. In order to minimize the presence of the researcher and of the

recording equipment, small digital recorders were used as well as cellular telephones with recording applications. The digital recorders were either placed in the pocket or worn on a cord around the neck of the participant or the researcher. In most cases the recording devices were not in view of the interactants, although everyone involved in the interactions was aware that the recordings were being made. The recordings were then saved to a password-protected computer file at the end of each day in order to ensure their safety and protection.

The following table shows the amount of recording time at each service learning site and the participants included on each recording. As a participant-researcher I worked alongside the L2 users on the service-learning projects and was present during all of the recordings. (NOTE: Two recordings on the same day at the same location means two people were wearing recording devises capturing - at times - the same interactions.)

Table 3: Audio Recordings

Date	Participant(s)	Service-learning site	Recording time hr:min:sec
6/5	Samantha Francesco	Misericordia	1:37:43
6/24	Maria Pietro Elsa	Horse therapy	1:43:42
6/24	Pietro Elsa	Horse therapy	00:10:14
7/15	Brad Susanna	Nursing Home	00:24:57
7/22	Brad Susanna	Nursing Home	1:22:41

Interviews. In addition to the audio recordings and researcher notes, I also conducted interviews with L2 users and local Italian speakers regarding their perspectives on the interactions during service-learning. Retrospective interviews can provide insight into perspectives related to language use in the area of L2 pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford,

2005; Cohen & Oshtain, 1993; Tyler & Davies, 1990). The interviews were used to answer research question two (In what ways do L2 users and Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the interactions?) and research question three (In what ways is relational work used in the requests to manage (im)politeness and negotiate relationships in the interactions?). That is, through retrospective interviews I gained a better understanding of the participants' perspective of interactions. In other words, "the question 'what's going on here?' cannot be answered without reference to the agent's own understanding of what she is doing" (Cameron, et al, 1992, p. 138). Therefore, in keeping with the design of the study, it is necessary to have information about the "social and cultural practices of a group from an insider's perspective" (Roberts, 1996, p. 31) in this case that of the participants as well as the researcher. Interlanguage pragmatics researchers may explore not only the performance of speech acts of learners as compared to local speakers but also the interpretations of the interactions of both the learners and their interlocutors (Felix-Brasdefer, 2004; Perren, 2008; Shardakova; 2005; Shively, 2011). Guided yet open-ended questions were asked as a way to allow the learner to recall and describe moments in the interaction that were particularly challenging or where there were any breakdowns in communication. (See Appendix A for a list of the questions guiding the interviews.)

In this study, I conducted follow up interviews with each of the L2 user participants in which I asked general questions about their overall impressions of their interactions with local speakers as well as more specific questions about any misunderstandings or incidents of miscommunication in specific interactions. While the focus of each interview was on similar questions, I purposely allowed the participants to speak off-topic if they desired in order to see what issues regarding the interactions were salient for them. I added follow up and clarification

questions if necessary. I also interviewed local Italian speakers to elicit and investigate their perspectives of the interactions with the L2 users. Retrospective data collection can enhance understanding about the interpretations of the interlocutors and shed light on their reasons for their language use (Shardakova, 2005).

According to DeWalt and DeWalt (2011), in the participant-observer approach the interview often takes the form of casual conversation. In fact, the interviews with the L2 users and the community partners were at times embedded in naturally occurring conversations before, during or immediately after the service activity. This was an effective way to conduct the interviews given the close working relationship I had with each of the participants.

Since I participated in the service alongside the L2 users, I was also able to ask them about specific events or incidents during the interactions that appeared to me to be challenging for them in terms of the language or behavior of the local Italian speakers. Instead of setting up a follow up meeting with the participants in order to be able to play back the audio of a particular moment during the interaction, I asked them questions about their perspectives before, during or after their service hours. This technique of talking with them informally allowed me to gather the information from the interviews in a timely way. It was appropriate based on the close rapport we had developed from working together. Also, it would have been less convenient for the participants to meet me at a different time since they were busy with classes and cultural excursions each day.

Researcher notes. While audio recordings of language use are the main focus of this analysis, researcher notes provide the researcher's perspective of both the broader macro context of the interactions and the micro context of each specific interaction. According to DeWalt and DeWalt (2011) in participant observation research "the writing of field notes is virtually the only

way for the researcher to record the observation of day to day events and behavior, overheard conversations, and informal interviews" (p. 157). There are several kinds of researcher notes. In the context of this study, researcher notes were a combination of observable facts about the environment of each service-learning site as well as the researcher's reflections. Researcher notes are "simultaneously data and analysis" (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011, p. 159) in that they provide new information to be analyzed and the reflections are one phase of the analysis itself.

The purpose of the observations recorded in the researcher notes is to explore in writing the behavior and the discourse that the researcher observes to be used in this setting. The observations, therefore, help in the description and interpretation of the interactions taking place between the Italian language learners and their interlocutors. I took extensive notes at the end of each day that I had captured the interactions, which were used during the analysis process to aid in the interpretation of the data, mainly to help remind me of the details of the context of the interactions. It was not feasible or desirable for me to take notes while we were engaged in volunteering. There were too few of us and it would have been impossible for me to break away to write things down. Instead I relied on my notes and the recordings. In order to ensure accuracy in what I remembered, I wrote the reflections the same day the recordings were made.

Data analysis

The data analysis was conducted in two stages; the organization and preparation of the data, and the data analysis itself. Each of the steps in both stages will be described in detail in the following sections.

In the first stage of the data analysis I listened to the audio recordings several times and took notes regarding anything I believed would be relevant to the research questions while keeping a "tentative, open-minded approach to the data at hand" regarding any unexpected

phenomena emerged in the data (ten Have, 2007, p. 121). I referred to the notes during subsequent phases of the analysis.

During the next step of this stage of the analysis, I transcribed all of the audio recordings using a modified version of the coding conventions of Jefferson (1979). (See Appendix B for a description of the transcription conventions.) I also coded the interactions in a way that would be easy to reference in the data analysis. (See Appendix C for a key to the transcript coding.) In the transcript I included only linguistic features, and chose to not include paralinguistic features such as intonation, tone and volume. Places in the transcript where I was unable to understand the interaction due to background noise or several people talking at once are indicated. As I was transcribing, I continued to take notes about ideas that came to me related to the context, the interactions and the analysis. I continued to take notes throughout the analysis process.

Once the data were transcribed, I began the second stage of the data analysis. In order to respond to research question one (What is the nature of the directives used in interactions between Italian L2 users and local speakers of Italian during service-learning programs in Italy?), I first identified all directives and requests, including their surrounding turns, in the transcripts of the interactions. During the data analysis it became obvious that the majority of requests employed by the Italian local speakers were directives, defined as "attempts of varying degrees...by the speaker to get the hearer to do something" (Searle, 1976, p. 11). I created a spreadsheet where I noted all request and directive encounters; including the language immediately preceding and the response(s) of the hearer. It was important to consider not only the form but also the function of the utterance before identifying it as a directive. According to Klímová (2004): "nel decidere sulla funzione comunicativa dell'enunciato, bisogna prendere in considerazione oltre agli aspetti morfosintattici anche quelli semantici e pragmatici" ("when

deciding on the communicative function of the utterance, it is necessary to take into consideration not only the morphosyntactic aspects but also the semantic and pragmatic aspects" [my translation]), (p. 95). Therefore, the directives were considered to be any speech act that attempts "to get another to do something" (Goodwin, 1980, p. 157).

Descriptive categories were then used to code the directives by form based on frameworks for analysis of both requests (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Nuzzo, 2007) and directives (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Vine, 2004). Using these frameworks as a point of departure, I coded the directives from the interactions between the L2 users and their interlocutors to reveal the various forms of directives.

In the analytical frameworks mentioned above, both directives and requests are composed of the nucleus, ("head act") or main part of the speech act, and possibly supplemental language in the sequence used to soften or intensify its force. I first isolated the head act of all requests/directives and categorized them by form - imperative, declarative or interrogative. The rationale for this step was to reveal the variety of strategies and the quantity of each form. This would provide an idea of any trends or norms of language use in this context. In addition to the strategies, I also noted the speaker, hearer and task that were associated with each directive. In this way I was able to identify any connections or patterns that emerged that would tie language use to type of activity. It also revealed information "about social features of the speakers and situation, communicative intent and affect" (Ervin-Tripp, p. 26). In short, consideration of the relationship of the speaker to the hearer, their respective roles in the organization, and the nature of the activities they were engaged in shed light on norms of language use in this context.

To respond in more detail to research question one, I then coded the modification strategies, or modifiers, employed by the L2 users and the local Italian speakers in both the

requests and directives. Modifiers can be either internal - part of the head act - or external - language occurring either before or after the head act (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, p. 287). In order to identify the modifiers in the transcripts, I used the criteria suggested by Blum-Kulka, et al, (1989) that states that modifiers are elements in the discourse that are grammatically or semantically "optional" or whose function is exclusively pragmatic in the context in which they appear (p. 19). Modifiers serve to either mitigate or reinforce the illocutionary force of the utterance. Mitigation strategies are of particular interest to this study because they ease or reduce the face threatening nature of speech acts such as requests or directives. Once the directive strategies were coded, I looked for patterns and trends in the data that would shed light on when, or during which activities, and by whom certain varieties of directive strategies were employed.

In order to address research question two (In what ways do L2 users and Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the interactions?), I identified examples of breakdowns in communication between L2 users and the local Italian speakers in the discourse. In order to identify such instances I looked for indications in the transcripts and in the post-interaction interviews, such as statements or reactions from the interactants in which their response did not follow the previous interlocutor's turn or direct expressions from the interactants indicating misunderstanding. My conclusions about misunderstanding were based on the interactions themselves, whenever an utterance was followed by a marked or unexpected response in which one or more of the interactants appeared to experience confusion. Student perspectives regarding misunderstandings in the interactions were also revealed in post-interviews with the L2 users. Considering the data sources together shed light on specific moments in the interaction that the learners or their interlocutors considered challenging or when they revealed difficulty in understanding.

There are various perspectives among researchers regarding the terminology for the concept of misunderstanding in face-to-face interaction. Terms such as "miscommunication", "pragmatic failure" and "infelicities" (Austin, 1975) have been applied to research investigating misunderstanding in discourse. Gass and Varonis conceptualize misunderstanding and incomplete understanding as two sub-categories of miscommunication, which they define as a situation in which the message received by the hearer differs from the message intended by the speaker. In their model misunderstanding means that there has been no attempt at remediation or repair while incomplete understanding is a temporary condition that is resolved or attempted to be resolved through negotiated communication. According to Gass and Varonis (1991): "When interlocutors do not share the same native language or the same sociocultural rules of discourse, the possibility for miscommunication is profound" (p. 122). Intercultural interactions, can be fraught with misunderstanding that can go beyond linguistic deficiencies related to second language use. Socio-cultural differences can also precipitate misunderstanding in intercultural interactions.

In this study, I will refer to instances of misunderstanding as any time one interlocutor indicates non-understanding of the intended message of the other. Misunderstanding could be stated directly through questions or repetition of a word or phrase with a rising intonation, or through an inappropriate or unexpected response or behavior. It is possible that there were times when the L2 user did not understand something and did not indicate it in their speech. Only misunderstandings evident in the transcripts or indicated in the post-interaction interviews will be included in the analysis.

In order to answer research question three (In what ways is relational work used in the requests to manage (im)politeness and negotiate relationships in the interactions?) I examined

issues of face, politeness and relational work in the interactions. According to Locher and Watts (2008): "Relational work refers to all aspects of the work invested by individuals in the construction, maintenance, reproduction and transformation of interpersonal relationships among those engaged in social practice" (p.96). Locher and Watts argue that relational work goes beyond politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and takes a more discursive approach to look at norms of behavior across a spectrum rather than labeling behavior simply as polite or impolite. Locher (2006) states that in relational work there is linguistic behavior that can be considered neither polite nor impolite which can be called appropriate and "politic" (Watts, 1989). Politic or appropriate behavior in this context refers to "that behavior, linguistic and non-linguistic, which the participants construct as being appropriate to the ongoing social interaction" (Watts, 2003, p. 276). The perceptions of the speaker and hearer may differ. For this reason it is important to examine the discourse and elicit the views of all interactants - in the case of the proposed study the L2 users and the local speakers of Italian - in order to have a better understanding of behavior that is considered appropriate for a particular context. For example, the data may show that in the context of service-learning directness takes precedence over conventional politeness due to the risk of misunderstanding and the immediacy of the request. Therefore, an un-mitigated directive such as an imperative may not be perceived as impolite in this context while it might be in another.

In order to interpret how relational work is used in the interactions under analysis, I examined the various reactions of the interactants to the directive encounters in the interactions, especially language use that was considered marked. In this way I was able to discover patterns of usage that emerged in the discourse. These patterns and trends determine what is considered appropriate language use for the context under investigation (Kákár & Bargiela-Chiappini, 2011).

In other words, "the ultimate say in what is considered impolite, non-polite or polite remains with those interactants who are part of a group of interactants who form a discursive practice" (Locher, 2006, p. 263). By identifying the discursive norms of the naturally occurring interactions, politeness norms emerge. In summary, for the analysis for this study I considered the way directives were performed in terms of managing relationships among the interlocutors using the framework of Locher and Watts (2005). In order to do this, I examined the interactions for instances of marked behavior, or language that is "noticed" by one of the interlocutors to be either negatively marked and inappropriate/non-politic (Judgement (a) or (d) in Figure 1, above) or positively marked as polite and appropriate/politic (Judgement (c) in Figure 1) as determined by the (Locher & Watts, 2008, p. 12). In summary, instances in the interactions where language used by the interactants appeared to be used to either help or hinder the building of a positive rapport were identified and described. In order to identify such instances, I identified language in the interactions that was not necessary for completion of a task but was more focused on repairing or building a more positive interpersonal relationship between the interactants. In order to do this I relied on my own interpretation - based on my role as a participant observer and my emic view of the situation - as much as the linguistic features of the interactions. More details about the specific discourse features and the rapport among interactants will be discussed in the analysis section in Chapter four.

Institutional Review Board and participant consent

In order to conduct any study with human subjects, it is necessary to gain the written approval of the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB process for this study was completed and approval was granted before the research begins. The process entailed two levels of consent forms from the participants. The L2 user-participants and the local Italian

speakers who work at the service agencies signed an extensive consent form that explains the nature of the research, the fact that the research would not harm them in any way, and specific information about privacy and security of the data gathered. All participants, including the learners, the agency employees/volunteers and anyone who were audio and/or videotaped signed a release form giving consent for the recordings. A second, less extensive consent form was distributed to anyone who was captured on audio or video during the data gathering on site. They were not the focus of the research but instead were incidental participants simply by being present. Consent forms were distributed and collected in Italy before the research began.

Role of the researcher

My role in the research was that of participant observer based on the following criteria defining this approach:

- Living in the context for an extended period of time
- Learning and using the local language and dialect
- Actively participating in a wide range of daily, routine and extraordinary activities with people who are full participants in that context
-Using everyday conversation as an interview technique
-Informally observing during leisure activities
-Recording observations in field notes
-Using both tacit and explicit information in analysis and writing

(DeWalter & DeWalter, 2011, p. 179)

I took part in the activities with the learners as I observed and investigated their interactions with local Italians. Taking an ethnographic approach to the research in this case means I had the

dual role of both researcher and volunteer working alongside the L2 users and the local Italians at the various sites.

Participant observation has its origins in the field of anthropology and has become a common approach to research in the social sciences. It refers to a way "to collect data in naturalistic settings by ethnographers who observe and/or take part in the common and uncommon activities of the people being studied." (DeWalt & Dewalt, 2011, p. 2). In addition to engaging with people in a community participant observation by definition includes using the information gathered during that time for research purposes.

There are known advantages and disadvantages to the participant observer approach. One advantage is that it allows the researcher to have an "insider's perspective" on the context and on the participants allowing for a richer interpretation his or her of observations. However, some believe it is not possible to be both a participant and an observer in one's own research (Behar, 1996). That is, by observing one cannot fully participate in the communities in the same way as the others, and by participating it is not possible to disengage and observe from the point of view of a researcher. This paradox could effect the interpretation of the data. For this reason, most participant observers collect multiple sources of data in addition to their which can be interpreted along with their field notes. It may be difficult for the researcher to withdraw and reflect on the research if he or she is too closely involved with the community or its members. This could also raise ethical issues if personal relationships become too close and emotional harm comes to the participants. Nonetheless, there has been a greater awareness of the potential challenges of participant observation researchers has become an accepted approach in the social sciences (DeWalter & DeWalter, 2011).

Being a participant observer includes observing "the people and participating in the activities along with the people of that community" (DeWalter & DeWalter, 2011, p. 3). In this approach there are varying degrees to which a researcher is involved in the research alongside the participants from "complete participation" at the most involved - being immersed in and living among the people who are the subjects of the research - to a "non-participant" who is the least involved and remains outside the group using other data sources besides their own observation (Spradley, 1980, p. 53-62).

For this study, my role can be described as that of an "active participant" in that I was seeking "to do what other people are doing, not merely to gain acceptance, but to more fully learn the rules for cultural behavior" (Spradley, 1980, p. 60). Although I was not a student enrolled in the study abroad program at ILI, I was able to get to know many of the students and administrators, as it was a small, tightknit community. I became closest to the participants with whom I volunteered alongside during service-learning. Nonetheless, they came to know me first as someone outside the group and a researcher, which undoubtedly affected their perceptions of me. My participation in the service alongside them, however, from my perspective helped to lessen the divide between us. In summary, by both observing and engaging with the participants from within the setting of service-learning, I was able to view the context and the other participants from an emic perspective.

Participant observation in an international setting can present particular challenges or limitations to the researcher (Guest, et al, 2013). For example, there may be difficulties due to misunderstanding of the language and/or cultural norms that arise which could interfere with the research. There is also the risk of misinterpretation of data collected in an international setting. I have relied on my experience living and working in Italy to interpret the interactions. The

findings are viewed through the lens of that experience as well as the many years of teaching Italian language and culture in higher education.

With regard to the broader Italian context and the more localized contexts of the individual service-learning contexts, I have an insider perspective having lived and worked for several years in Italy. I have also taught Italian language and culture for many years and led educational tours throughout Italy. I have an understanding and insider's perspective on the culture of Italy and as well as a command of the local language spoken in the part of Italy where the research was conducted. This experience affords me the dual perspective of both researcher and insider from the standpoint of the local Italian context. However, I was new to the city in which the research took place and at times felt like an outsider with regard to navigating the city. I unaware of some of the traditions and customs. In addition, although I had some prior experience volunteering in the United States, I was new to service-learning or volunteering of any kind in Italy.

As a researcher in the area of study abroad and as an instructor of Italian, I am aware of the potential challenges learners often face living immersed in the Italian language and culture and have experienced similar challenges when I first arrived in Italy. The way in which I interpreted the data from the interactions was influenced by my own interpretation of the context based on my background. Although I was involved in the service-learning activities with the participants, I have not focused on my language use in the data analysis. I chose to focus instead on the language of the L2 users and local Italian speakers in order to remain true to the research questions. As a participant observer I realized it would be challenging to not interfere with the data. Here is an except from my researcher notes early in the data collection:

> *I also got a glimpse into how hard it will be to NOT interfere with the misunderstandings that I see happening. Poor Maria was up against the horse*

> *trainer who was grilling her (or so it seemed) about her experience with horses. She was struggling and I had to step in and say what she was trying to say. I'll have to somehow balance my natural instinct as teacher and student group leader and my role as observer and researcher.*
>
> (Researcher notes, 5/25/14)

My natural tendency as a teacher is to help students who are struggling with the language. However, in this situation I discovered I would have to refrain from simply translating or answering their questions about the language, which would have interfered with their opportunities for negotiating misunderstanding and the data.

Along with the other L2 users, I engaged in informal conversations with the community partners while volunteering at the service-learning locations. During these conversations, I was able to ask questions about working with American students and other questions related to the research. These spontaneous, conversations, guided at times by my questions, with members of the service-learning community helped me to gain a better understanding of the social and cultural context of the research as well as the perspectives of the Italian speakers.

In summary, I had originally planned to engage with the L2 users in a limited way during service-learning in order to remain an outside observer. However, I found that to be impossible due to the hands-on nature of the service-learning environments and the close rapport I had developed with the participants and the community partners. At each site there were only a few volunteers including myself. It would have been unnatural to retreat from engaging with them during the service since we were all working together. The close contact with the other participants also afforded me an insider's perspective of the context that I would not have had if I had remained an outside observer.

Limitations and delimitations of the study

There were various limitations to this study. First, the findings of the research were limited to the setting and population examined. The study is confined to only seven participants in three volunteer program sites. Another limitation was the brief length of time for the data collection. The summer term was eight weeks long but during the first two weeks the L2 users attended intensive Italian language courses and no service-learning was scheduled. There were also several traditional cultural events that took place during the summer term when service-learning was interrupted. In addition, there was a tenth anniversary celebration at the institute in which cultural and social events for one week caused another halt to service-learning. These unexpected factors meant that the eight-week term became three to four weeks of service-learning limiting the already brief time for data collection. Such unexpected changes to the original plans are inevitable when working in the field collecting naturally-occurring data.

With the limited number of participants and sites, the findings cannot be generalized to all participants in similar service-learning programs in Italy. However, generalization is not the goal of this research. Rather, the intent is to provide a description of the directive strategies performed in this context and to address the research questions in order to learn more about the norms of interaction in this specific context.

More data could have provided more information about trends in language use at the different service-learning sites. However, the purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth analysis of the discourse that L2 users encountered in the service-learning contexts described above, each of which had a unique set of circumstances - goals, types of activities, the role of the L2 users and their relationship to the local Italian speakers. More data would be necessary if the purpose of study was to compare the language use of different speakers across a variety of

situations (Stubbs, 1983). However, researchers in the area of discourse analysis have shown that a close examination of a small amount of data can yield general descriptions about features of the discourse (Sacks, 1972; Goffman, 1971). It would have been impossible to provide the rich contextual information included in this study without working alongside and observing the participants as an insider. A greater number of participants and/or sites would not have been feasible for one researcher to follow to the extent reported in this study.

The analysis is limited to an analysis of request and directive strategies, (im)politeness, and breakdowns in communication in interactions in this context without purporting to be an exhaustive list of possibilities. Additional data from more participants and service-learning sites could provide more general insights. However, since there is no previous sociopragmatic research in the area of situated language use in a service-learning context in Italy, the data shed light on general trends and help to set an agenda for future research, (Duff, 2008).

Validity and reliability

I will now turn to the topic of validity and reliability raised in the study's theoretical and methodological approaches. One way in which the proposed study's soundness has been established is by grounding it in a theoretical framework. Any discourse analysis is an interpretative act, in which multiple interpretations can emerge, underpinning the interpretative process in a theoretical framework provides a sound basis for the interpretation (Crowe, 2005). I collected and analyzed selections of the naturally occurring discourse in order to demonstrate trends and/or emergent themes within each service-learning context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Validity in discourse analysis is made up of four elements: convergence, agreement, coverage, and linguistic details (Gee, 2011). Convergence refers to the way the inquiry is

supported by the analysis. In other words all of the data come together in the analysis to answer the research questions.

In order to assure the soundness of this study, I looked to several places for agreement with my interpretations. To seek validity in the analysis of the discourse features, namely the directives in the interactions, I consulted with several frameworks of analysis in the areas of pragmatics, and Italian language pragmatics. Therefore, the analysis as discussed was a rigorous process of categorizing, reviewing, and revising and can be considered a convergence of several discourse analytic and interlanguage pragmatic traditions.

Coverage refers to the assertion that an analysis is more valid if the findings can be applied to relevant situations. While, as previously stated, generalizability is not the goal of this study, the analysis can be applied to similar service-learning contexts. Since the goals of the activities and tasks remain constant at each of the service-learning sites (i.e. at the nurising home the goal is to attend to residents' needs) and the roles of the L2 users who volunteer at these sites remains relatively constant from term to term, certain findings may be predictable within each location.

Validity is enhanced when the researcher is able to link the discourse that is used to carry out functions specific to that context. In the analysis I have attempted to make this connection by doing a close analysis not only of the language used but by whom and in order to accomplish what kind of task.

Triangulation of the data, that is, consideration and analysis of multiple sources of data, also informed my interpretations of the data (Creswell, 2003). Secondary and tertiary data sources - researcher notes and retrospective interviews - were used to substantiate any

discoveries made from the primary data - audio recordings of the naturally occurring data - in the ways described in the previous section.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will provide an in depth discourse analysis of naturally occurring interactions between Italian L2 users and local Italian speakers at three service-learning sites: the Casa di Riposo (CDR) nursing home, the Horse Therapy Center (HTC) and the Misericordia. The analysis will consider the interactions within a sociopragmatics theoretical framework, using the three research questions as a guide. Each of the three service-learning locations presented a unique environment and circumstances in terms of the type of tasks, goals and expectations of the participants, as well as the role of the community partners. For this reason, I have organized the analysis into three sections, considering each service-learning site as a separate case study. At the end of each of the three sections I will give a brief summary and conclusions related to that service-learning context. Then, I will provide a synthesis of the findings overall. A discussion of the findings, conclusions and implications of the findings will be found in Chapter five.

In order to respond to research question one, (What is the nature of the directives used in interactions between Italian L2 users and local speakers of Italian during service-learning programs in Italy?) I begin each of the three sections with an analysis of the frequency distribution of the form of the head acts of the directives and requests in the interactions. They are categorized as imperatives, declaratives or interrogatives in order to reveal the number and variety of forms of request employed by each speaker in the interactions. As mentioned in Chapter three, in order to identify directives and requests in the interactions, I examined the interaction to determine whether the purpose of the utterance was to coerce or ask someone to perform an action based on the form of the utterance as well as the response or reaction of the

hearer. If so, it was considered a directive if the order was aimed at someone of the same or lower position of power in the context of the interaction.

The next level of analysis related to research question one includes identifying pragmalinguistic for strategies for expressing illocutionary force in the requests. This consists of an examination of the speech act in terms of directness and indirectness including any modification strategies, both internal and external to the head acts. Modification refers to language that is not "essential for the utterance to be potentially understood" (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, p. 19) as a directive, and can be used to either mitigate or intensify the utterance. I discuss the speech acts in terms of explicitness based on frameworks related to directness and indirectness of requests (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Nuzzo 2004) and directives (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Vine 2004).

Explicitness of requests can be related to (mis)understanding in intercultural interactions (Bremer, et al, 1996), which is the focus of research question two (In what ways to L2 users and Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the interactions?) as well as politeness and relational work which relates to research question three (In what ways is relational work used in the interactions?). Misunderstanding in the interactions will first be identified, based on the hearer's response. I refer to two types of misunderstanding that were emergent in the data: non-understanding by the hearer which indicates the utterance was not heard hear or understood as expressed by a token such as "what?" or "huh?, or when some understanding has occurred but it was contrary to the speaker's intended meaning as deduced from the hearer's response. The misunderstandings are categorized by type (linguistic or pragmatic), and factors that inhibit and/or facilitate (mis)understanding in the interactions are also discussed.

To address research question three, I discuss the ways in which language is used to build or maintain rapport between the interactants during service-learning at the three locations using the framework of relational work (Locher, 2006; Locher & Watts, 2005). I then discuss any emergent norms of interaction at each location site based on the analysis of the interactions.

Casa di riposo - Nursing home

The Casa di Riposo (CDR) is a residential nursing home for the elderly located a few kilometers outside the city center. There are 52 rooms for residents on the second floor and a large open-air courtyard bordered by a covered portico area on the ground floor.

On the day of the recordings there were approximately twenty residents seated in the shaded portico area of the courtyard. Susanna and another nurse's aide were attending to the residents at the CDR. Susanna's manner towards the residents and the volunteers was caring and understanding of the residents' needs. I recorded my first impression of her in my researcher notes:

> We met Susanna the woman who's in charge of the residents and of getting stuff done. She was a gregarious, no-nonsense yet kind person who knew all the residents well. They seemed like a family and treated her almost like a mother figure.
>
> (Researcher notes, July 22, 2014)

Brad, L2 user and student from ILI, wore the microphone during his interactions with Susanna and the residents. There were approximately 30 - 40 residents who were present during the day of the recordings. Brad and I arrived at the CDR about one hour before the *merenda,* or afternoon snack, was to be distributed to the residents.

There were three types of activities that Brad and I engaged in which provided the context for the interactions. First, Brad escorted wheelchair-bound residents from their rooms on the second floor down the elevator and outside to courtyard for their snack and for social time

with the other residents. The next activity involved working with Susanna to distribute the afternoon snack to the residents. This excerpt from my field notes describes the snack and the tasks involved in the service:

> They would bring out a cart with hot tea (very sweet) in styrofoam cups with "fette biscottate" (sort of like stale bread/crackers) broken up and put into the cups to soak up the tea. This was prepared by the health aides and/or Susanna from the cart. There were also cookies and yogurt. Susanna would have to tell us who would need to wear a bib and who would get the yogurt and/or the tea based on their dietary restrictions and their eating ability it seemed. Some people had to be fed by one of the volunteers - the yogurt usually.
>
> (Researcher notes, July 22, 2014)

Susanna gave direction to Brad and me regarding how to serve the snack and informed us which residents needed special attention; for example, some residents needed to be spoon-fed while others did not. The third type of activity we engaged in included attending to the residents' needs; any time a resident expressed a need or when Susanna directed Brad or me to attend to a resident in some way including accompany them on a walk or to the restroom.

Throughout the day Brad and I also engaged in casual conversations with the residents. Casual conversation is defined as talk with a social purpose rather than related to the business at hand or task completion (Ventola, 1979). The topics of the social talk can range from personal topics related to the interactants to more general topics such as the weather. Casual conversation or social talk is more likely to take place during breaks in task-oriented activities (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003). At the CDR a limited social talk took place between Brad and Susanna when they were alone in the elevator on their way to escort a wheelchair-bound resident, and between Brad and the residents after their snack was served. Many of the residents of the CDR were hearing or cognitively impaired as made evident by their language use. Also, there were instances when the utterances of a resident did not follow the previous turn in a logical manner or when topics were changed abruptly. In their study of communication patterns of adults with dementia Dijkstra, et

al (2004) reported that the discourse of memory impaired adults had a higher incidence of "discourse-impairing" features such as repetition, empty phrases, indefinite terms, incorrect verb tense, and abrupt topic change (p. 271). There were instances of such features in the interactions at the CDR between Susanna and the residents as well as between Brad and the residents primarily during casual conversations. They posed challenges to understanding for the residents and Brad during the social talk as well as during more transactional talk, interactions related to the accomplishing the goals of the activities (i.e. moving residents, serving the snack and attending to residents' needs). Misunderstandings will be discussed in more detail in the sections that follow.

This analysis focuses on the directive encounters between Susanna and Brad, Brad and the residents, and Susanna and the residents in order to describe the nature of the directives used at the CDR on this occasion. The talk between Susanna and Brad focused primarily on task-related directive encounters regarding moving wheelchair-bound residents, the distribution of snacks, and attending to residents' needs. The interactions between Brad and the residents contained few directives and were mainly attempts to carry on casual conversation. The residents' interactions with Susanna were often in the form of expressions of a want or need.

> They [the residents] would often repeat requests to go home or ask for things that were out of context or difficult to understand. I noticed Susanna said yes rather than refuse their requests, even if they were impossible to fulfill. For example, if a resident asked to go home, she responded in the affirmative and then found a way to distract him or her, rather than refuse the request.
>
> (Researcher notes, July 22, 2014)

In the next section I will give an overview of the directive strategies in the interactions and then describe in more detail the directive use including any modification strategies. The purpose of this section of the analysis is to describe directive use in this context and to explore ways in which the activity and the interactants may be related to the form of the directives.

Overall, there was not much variety in the form of Susanna's directives with the residents and with Brad and me; that is, they were mainly in the imperative.

Directives. On the day of recordings at the CDR there were a total of 102 directives in the interactions. Table 1 shows the breakdown of directive by type and speaker. It is not surprising given her position as supervisor, that Susanna employed the most directives in the interactions (90%). Susanna's directives were

Table 4: CDR Directives

Speaker	Imperatives	Declaratives	Interrogatives	Total Directives
Susanna	57	29	0	86
Resident(s)	5	6	5	16
Brad	0	0	0	0
Total	62	35	5	102

most frequently in the imperative (66%) or the declarative (34%), and she never used the interrogative form. The residents used far fewer directives and most were in the form of a request directed to Susanna or Brad. Their requests were in approximately equal number of imperatives, declaratives and interrogatives. Brad used no directives in the interactions. These numbers align with the fact that Susanna was in a supervisory role with relation to Brad and the residents. The residents were unable to attend to many of their own needs and, therefore, were required to make requests of Susanna or the other volunteers including Brad. In fact, the majority of the directives from Susanna to the residents occurred during times when she was attending to their needs and looking out for their well being. For example, many of Susanna's directives to the residents, therefore, were aimed at telling them to be seated while they were in the courtyard so they would not wander away and get lost or fall. In the following excerpt, typical of the kind of interaction

Susanna had with the residents, it was about to start raining and some of the residents were anxious to move inside. Although Giovanna was not able to walk well on her own, she started to stand up and Susanna told her she needed to wait for assistance before going inside.

Excerpt 1.1 - CDR-SL, 489

1	SUS:	**Giovanna metti seduta**	1	SUS:	**Giovanna**, **sit down**
2		dove vai? **seduta**	2		where are you going?
3		si adesso	3		**sit** yes **we're**
4		**andiamo dentro**	4		**going inside now**

Susanna began the directive with a vocative, addressing Giovanna by name. It is customary in Italian to use the formal form of address with someone older, not a first name which would be considered impolite. Also, Susanna used the "tu" form of the verb, an informal second person form not commonly used with someone older than the speaker. However, politeness can be "expressed according to the sociocultural expectations or cultural norms of the community of practice" (Félix-Brasdefer, 2015, p. 204). By calling the elderly residents by their first names and using the informal form, Susanna positioned herself as someone socially close to them, or in a higher status position as their caregiver. And the residents accepted her on those terms based on their response to her in their interactions. Susanna proceeded to give Giovanna the directive to be seated in the imperative ("sit down", line 1) and then repeated it in the next line as an elliptical with no verb ("sit, line 2). She ended the directive with a promise that they would be going inside together soon. The use of the "we" pronoun emphasized the sense of community at the CDR; even though Susanna was the caregiver, they did things together. The use of the "we" pronoun also softened the unmitigated directive in the imperative in this case. Including herself in the directive, Susanna was able to emphasize a closer relationship and minimize the social distance between them. This excerpt is typical of the way Susanna combined a strong directive, intensified by repetition, with moves toward solidarity in her interactions with the residents.

The imperative, considered the most direct or explicit form of directive (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Ervin-Tripp, 1976) was the most commonly used form of directive in all of the activities. It was important for Susanna to communicate clearly with the residents who were often hearing and/or cognitively impaired. According to Ervin-Tripp (1976), "Task relevant and role-appropriate directives are more likely to be direct rather than imbedded or embroidered imperatives since they need to be marked less for attentional purposes" (p. 59). In Susanna's case, as the supervisor of the residents, her directives needed to be direct in order to be understood by the residents and because their safety was at stake. And her role as caregiver and supervisor was clearly defined.

Susanna often employed the modal "must" in her directives to the residents, which is considered an obligation statement and a direct form (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989). According to Ervin-Tripp, in a want statement that uses the modal "what is wanted is as baldly stated as in an imperative" (p.29). In the following selection Susanna used a combination of explicit declaratives and an imperative to convince another resident to remain seated during snack time. Susanna was distributing hot tea to the residents and it was important for them to remain seated for their safety and so the snacks could be distributed to all.

Excerpt 1.2 - CDR-SL, 41-42

1	SUS:	**Anna tu non devi andare**	1	SUS:	**Anna you must not wander**
2		avanti e dietro **metti seduta**	2		around **sit down** where I
3		dove ti ho messo seduta	3		seated you Anna **you must**
4		Anna **devi stare seduta**	4		**stay seated**

This except is very similar to Excerpt 1.1 in that Susanna first addressed the resident by her first name, (line 1), followed by the informal second person pronoun "tu" (you) for emphasis. As mentioned regarding Excerpt 1.1, it is customary to use the formal pronoun "Lei" (you formal)

with someone who is older and "tu" (you, informal) with peers or someone younger. Susanna often used the vocative, or first name of the resident, at the opening of a directive in order to gain the attention of the addressee, especially when there were several residents in the vicinity as in this case. Susanna then issued a prohibitive using the modal "must" in the negative, urging Anna not walk up and down the corridor and to stay seated. Susanna followed the modal with a more explicit imperative command ("sit down", line 2). In the extract above she repeated the directive for Anna to stay seated three times in slightly different ways (lines 1-4). Susanna often used this pattern of repeating or rephrasing a directive in the same turn to intensify the directive in order to ensure understanding. She also repeated Anna's name twice to draw her attention. As shown in this excerpt, Susanna used explicit directives at times when the resident's safety was at stake.

In her directives to Brad, Susanna used imperative forms, at times intensified by repetition as with the residents. Table 3 illustrates examples of Susanna's directives to Brad.

Table 5: CDR - Susanna's directives to Brad

Directive		Form
guarda vieni vieni prendi lei mettila lì mettila lì metti vicino alla porta metti bavaglia non lo buttare i bicchieri	look come here come here take her put her there put her there put [her] near the door put on the bib don't throw away the cups	Imperative - 2nd person sg
andiamo andiamo al primo piano vediamo qualcuno là	let's go let's go to the first floor let's see someone there	Imperative - 1st person pl (invitation)
di qua dia qua piano piano a lei (--) a lei yogurt	this way this way slowly slowly to her yogurt for her	Elliptical
i bicchieri devi tenerli perchè i bicchieri non ce l'ho	you must keep the cups because I don't have any cups	Declarative with modal "must" plus explanation

Susanna's imperatives were either in the second person singular when directed at Brad only or in the first person plural when they were both involved in the task such as going to pick up a resident from the second floor. There were several cases in which Susanna used the elliptical form, often with spatial deictics such as "here" or "there" when the action to be taken and the agent were inferable from the context. On one occasion Susanna used a declarative with modal "must" when she told Brad to keep the cups and not throw them away. Overall, her directives were in the imperative, short and concise with directional words to clarify or indicate where a resident was to be placed.

The residents used both requests and directives aimed at Susanna and Brad, and were frequently regarding something they needed or a desire to go home. They were often framed as requests and more indirect than Susanna's directives. In the following selection, a resident used hints and questions to Brad and Susanna while they were in the elevator on the way from the second floor to the courtyard for the snack.

Excerpt 1.3 - CDR-SL, 129-144

1	RES:	**se ho sete lo posso dire?**	1	RES:	**if I'm thirsty can I say so?**
2	SUS:	si	2	SUS:	yes
3	RES:	eh?	3	RES:	huh?
4	SUS:	cosa?	4	SUS:	what?
5	RES:	se ho sete?	5	RES:	if I'm thirsty?
6	SUS:	si adesso si mangia la merenda	6	SUS:	yes now we'll have our snack
7	RES:	eh?	7	RES:	huh?
8	SUS:	un altro pochino si mangia a	8	SUS:	in a short while we'll have our
9		merenda	9		snack
10	RES:	ma si la merenda ma (--) la	10	RES:	but if the snack but (--) the
11		merenda?	11		snack?
12	SUS:	ah no ancora devi fare un po'	12	SUS:	ah no you have a little to wait
13	RES:	**a me mi gocciola anche il naso**	13	RES:	**my nose is dripping too**
14	SUS:	ah va bene ti do adesso un	14	SUS:	ah ok I'll give you a napkin
15		tovagliolo si	15		yes
16	(elevator opens)		16		(elevator door opens)
17	RES:	(---) (---sete) (---soffia il naso)	17	RES:	(---) (---thirst) (--blow my
18		**non ti fa freddo?**	18		nose) **aren't you cold?**

19	SUS: ma che freddo	19	SUS: what cold
20	BRAD: freddo? caldo	20	BRAD: cold? hot

The resident used an interrogative to ask a hypothetical question of Susanna ("if I'm thirsty can I say so?", line 1). The request was framed as a hypothetical question in which the resident asked permission to state a need (thirst) if he were to have one. Susanna responded to his question in the affirmative giving him permission to state his need, but she did not respond to his indirect request for a drink. In the next turn, the resident replied with a token of surprise or non-understanding ("huh?", line 7) which prompted Susanna's response question resident was trying ("what?", line 8). The resident then repeated a portion of his request in the same form of a hypothetical question ("if I'm thirsty", line 5). Susanna then finally addressed his request, also in an indirect way, by stating that the snack would be served very soon. Even though it was not a direct response to the resident's question, it showed that Susanna had understood his request for something to drink despite the fact that it was framed as a hypothetical. The resident, however, did not hear or did not understand Susanna's response as indicated by his question token. Susanna then repeated her statement that the snack would be served soon. It was common for there to be a interruptions in the flow of conversation between Susanna and the residents due to mis- or non-understandings. (Misunderstanding will be addressed in more detail in the following section related to research question 2.)

Continuing with Extract 1.3, in line 13 the resident used a hint to make a request for a handkerchief stated as a declarative ("my nose is dripping too", line 13). This time Susanna responded to his request in the following turn ("ok I'll give you a napkin", line 14). The resident's third request was another indirect request in the interrogative form ("aren't you cold?", line 18). According to Ervin-Tripp (1976) this type of question imperative, although it looks like a question about the hearer's well-being, is easily recognizable as a directive. In this case, the

resident is expressing that he is cold and needs something, perhaps a blanket. Since it was a hot day, both Susanna and Brad responded with surprise and neither attended to his request ("what cold?"/ "cold? hot", lines 19-20). In this exchange, the resident used three indirect requests in the form of hypothetical questions and strong hints to express his basic needs to Susanna. In each case, Susanna understood the requests, however, she determined which were necessary to attend to immediately (the dripping nose), which could be put off until later (his thirst) and which was not logical and therefore not responded to (he was cold). In Excerpt 1.3, the resident's varied indirect forms of request contrasted with Susanna's frequently unmitigated imperatives or forceful declaratives, which she used for reasons of clarity. People in lower positions of power tend to use indirectness more frequently with their superiors in requests (Scollon & Scollon, 1983). In this context the residents could be considered to be in the subordinate position in relation to Susanna since they had to go to her in order to have their needs met.

Brad did not use any directives in his interactions with Susanna or with the residents. His interactions with Susanna mainly consisted of backchannel comments to confirm understanding of her direction. With the residents he was either trying to initiate a casual conversation, respond to their questions or ask a clarification question. This aligns with the fact that his role as a "helper" to Susanna rather than in a position to convince the residents to do something, which was Susanna's role. He was in more of a support and companion role to the residents and to Susanna.

In summary, Susanna's directives were most commonly in the imperative form to the residents and to Brad with no mitigation. In order to ensure understanding, Susanna used repetition to intensify the force of the directive. The priority for her language use was to be clear and easily understandable to Brad and to the residents. While Susanna's declarative directives

used the modal "must" and "need to", some residents made indirect requests to express their needs to Susanna using hypothetical statements, hints and interrogatives. This may be a reflection of their view of Susanna as caretaker and, therefore, in a position of power in relation to them. Their directives to Susanna were framed more as requests than commands.

Misunderstanding. There were many instances of misunderstanding in the interactions at the CDR; particularly during interactions between Brad and the residents. Brad had little difficulty understanding Susanna's directives, which were often concise or formulaic regarding, for example, where to place the residents or how to administer their snacks. (See Table 3 for examples of Susanna's directives to Brad). Most of Brad's misunderstandings occurred in his conversations with residents. In a post-interview Brad discussed his difficulty understanding the residents:

BRAD:	so I can pick up most of the time what they're saying at least like a word or two
RSR:	mm hm
BRAD:	and then I'll like understand what they're saying but some of them some of the people it's just like slurring words **they're talking very softly and I can't understand which I mean in any language it would be hard but let alone Italian**
RSR:	so it's not the Italian necessarily
BRAD:	**it's not necessarily the Italian** it's I'm not really sure what they're saying cuz **I can't hear them is part of it**

(Brad, post-interview, June 24, 2014)

Brad had difficulty understanding the residents' speech at times, rather than the Italian language they used. In fact, at times Susanna also had difficulty understanding the residents who would sometimes use the wrong word for the context as in Excerpt 1.4:

Excerpt 1.4 - CDR-SL, 71-80

1	RES:	io non voglio piu' perchè	1	RES:	I don't want more
2		lui mi sta facendo (4) **un**	2		because he is doing (4) **a**
3		**preso**	3		**taken**

4	SUS:	**un che? un che?**	4	SUS:	**a what? a what?**
5	BRAD:	**preso?**	5	BRAD:	**taken?**
6	SUS:	boh che cosa ti sta	6	SUS:	I don't know what is he
7		facendo?	7		doing to you?
8	RES:	cosa?	8	RES:	what?
9	SUS:	(louder) **cosa ti sta**	9	SUS:	(louder) **what is he**
10		**facendo?**	10		**doing to you?**
11	RES:	ma lo sa lui	11	RES:	well he knows
12	SUS:	ah si boh	12	SUS:	ah yes I don't know
13	BRAD:	**ah si?**	13	BRAD:	**ah yes?**
14	SUS:	**lui no lo sa no**	14	SUS:	**he doesn't know no**
15	RES:	insomma io sempre	15	RES:	anyway I always want to
16		voglio ritornare a casa	16		go back home
17	SUS:	si (1) subito [to Craig]	17	SUS:	yes (1) right away
18		prendi lei [to RES]	18		[to Craig] take her [to
19		**andiamo in casa**	19		RES] **let's go at home**
20		**andiamo a casa dai**	20		**let's go home come on**

In this selection the resident tried to express why she did not want to go with Brad, but her utterance did not make sense: ("he is doing a taken to me", line 2-3). Susanna then expressed her confusion ("what? a what?", line 4) and asked for the resident to repeat her previous statement. Brad repeated the verb that he had heard ("taken?", line 5) with a rising intonation to indicate his misunderstanding. The resident responded with an expression of non-understanding ("what?", line 8) which Susanna believed to mean that she had not heard the question, so she repeated it in a louder voice. Then, instead of answering Susanna, the resident replied that Brad knew what she was talking about ("well he knows", line 11). Brad questioned her response and Susanna denied that Brad knew what she was talking about ("no he doesn't know", line 14). In the end they both remained uncertain about what the resident was trying to say, however, not due to Brad's non-understanding of the resident's utterance. The reason for his non-understanding was that the resident's words did not make sense in that context.

Susanna tried to repair the breakdown by asking the resident clarifying questions and by repeating her questions in a louder voice. However, the resident was not able to make herself

understood. She ended the exchange by stating her desire to go home. The word "sempre" (always /still, line 1) alluded to the fact that her request had been turned down in the past and she knew it would not most likely not be complied with this time. Susanna responded with a sarcastic remark, "yes, right away" (line 3), however, in this context it can be understood as Susanna's way of not flatly refusing the request of the resident, which was not possible. In the same turn Susanna directed Brad to "take her" (line 4) using an imperative, and then turned back to the resident repeating her response in the affirmative to her request to go home ("andiamo a casa" / let's go home, lines 4-5). Despite the misunderstanding, Susanna was able to attend to the face needs of the resident by not ignoring or denying her request to go home.

As mentioned in the previous section, Brad and Susanna both had difficulty understanding the residents when they used a word or phrase that did not make sense in the context. In Excerpt 1.5, Brad and Susanna were taking a resident to the courtyard and she made a request of Brad ("give me a beard", line 1) using the formal form of the imperative. The fact that the resident used the formal form with Brad, someone younger than she was, indicates that she viewed him as someone in a higher position of authority, perhaps due to his role as her caretaker.

Excerpt 1.5 - CDR-SL, 478-488

1	RES:	**mi dia una barba**	1	RES:	**give me a beard**
2	SUS:	barba?	2	SUS:	beard?
3	BRAD:	una barba?	3	BRAD:	a beard?
4	SUS:	tieni no no è lei	4	SUS:	take this no no to her
5	RES:	**me ne dai una**	5	RES:	**are you going to give me a**
6		**barba? eh?**	6		**beard? huh?**
7		giovanotto	7		young man
8	SUS:	dai metti seduta	8	SUS:	come on sit down
9	RES:	**me ne dai una**	9	RES:	**will you give me a**
10		**palma?**	10		**palm?**
11	SUS:	la maglia? ecco	11	SUS:	the sweater? ok enough
12		basta no	12		no

The resident insisted by repeating the request using an interrogative ("are you going to give me a beard? huh?", lines 5-6). The second request was less forceful and posed as a question, however the tag question "huh?" intensified the request. After the resident repeated the request twice and both Susanna and Brad expressed their non-understanding by repeating the word with rising intonation ("beard?" "a beard?", lines 2,3), she addressed Brad directly ("young man", line 7) and asked him for a "palm" (line 10), which did not make sense either. Susanna then ended the exchange by showing her misunderstanding of the request ("sweater?" line 11) and then ended the exchange with a final statement ("ok enough no", lines 11-12). In the recording of the interaction I heard the resident say "palma" whereas Susanna apparently heard "la maglia", neither of which made sense in this context[i]. It appeared that the resident wanted to request something but could not find the right word. In each of the interactions above both Susanna and Brad misunderstood the residents' requests due to their not being able to express their needs in a way that could be understood. This exchange illustrates the kind of challenge to understanding that both L2 and L1 users face in this context.

Other instances of misunderstanding of a similar type occurred often between Brad and the residents during casual conversation. In the following selection, Brad was trying to have a conversation with one of the residents after the snack had ended.

Excerpt 1.6 - CDR-SL, 414-422

1	RES:	il gallo si il gallo	1	RES:	the rooster yes the rooster
2	BRAD:	**gallo?**	2	BRAD:	**rooster?**
3	RES:	io parlo degli animali	3	RES:	I'm talking about animals
4	BRAD:	ah ti piace gli animali?	4	BRAD:	ah do you like animals?
5	RES:	ma ci sono dei galli	5	RES:	but there are roosters
6	BRAD:	**cavallo?**	6	BRAD:	**horse?**
7	RES:	ci sono (dei) galli	7	RES:	there are roosters
8	BRAD:	gatti	8	BRAD:	cats
9	RES:	un (-) pulito (-) gli	9	RES:	a (---) clean (---) animal
10		animali puo' andare	10		can also do just fine

11	anche bene	11	as well

This interaction had several breakdowns in communication between the resident and Brad. The resident initiated the topic of roosters rather abruptly ("the rooster yes the rooster", line 1). Brad did not appear to know the meaning of the Italian word for rooster as he repeated it with a rising intonation in the next turn ("gallo?" line 2). The resident then tried to clarify by stating that the topic of the conversation was animals ("I'm talking about animals", line 3). This showed that the resident was aware of the fact that Brad had not understood and he was presenting a frame of reference, a context for the conversation. Brad then posed a general question about whether the resident liked animals. Since Brad's question was not a logical follow up to the resident's previous comment about roosters, rather than reply to Brad's question the resident tried to steer the conversation back to the topic of the roosters ("but there are roosters", line 5). Brad then thought he heard the word for "horse" ("cavallo", line 6) which rhymes with the word for "rooster" in Italian ("gallo") and he asked for confirmation of understanding by using a rising intonation once again. The resident repeated his previous statement ("there are roosters", line 7-8). That time Brad heard the word for "cats" (gatti, line 8). At that point the resident appeared to have continued on with the point he was trying to make about roosters despite the fact that Brad did not understand. It was at that point that the conversation had broken down completely. Brad's misunderstanding (line 1) was more due to him not knowing the meaning of the word "gallo" (rooster). Therefore, Brad's misunderstanding was a combination of not knowing the meaning of the word in Italian, ("gallo") as well as his difficulty in understanding the way certain words were pronounced as he reported in his post-interview. The resident tried to address Brad's misunderstanding by using repetition. When that did not resolve the misunderstanding, the

resident continued his story anyway. Casual conversations at the CDR often did not flow in a coherent manner due to the high incidence of dementia among the residents. In this case, however, it was Brad's misunderstanding of the meaning and pronunciation of the resident's words in Italian that caused the communication breakdown.

There were similar misunderstandings almost every time Brad interacted with a resident. In the following excerpt, Brad attempted to initiate a casual conversation with a resident. This time Brad mispronounced a key word, which interfered with the resident's understanding of his question.

Excerpt 1.7 - CDR-SL, 332-337

1	BRAD:	hai **i fili?** hai	1	BRAD:	**do you have wires?**
2		figli?	**2**		do you have children?
3	RES1:	quale fili? quali fili	3	RES1:	**which wires? which wires**
4		sono?	4		are they?
5	BRAD:	hai? figli? no? no tu	5	BRAD:	do you have? children?
6		hai figli?	6		don't you have children?
7	RES1:	**fili cosa? non ho**	7	RES1:	**wires what**? **I don't**
8		**capito i fili cosa?**	8		**understand the wires what?**
9	BRAD:	tu hai--avere fili? tu?	9	BRAD:	you have-- to have children?
10	RES1:	per fare? per prendere	10		you?
11		qualcosa? Lei qual'età	11	RES1:	for what? to take something?
12		c'ha?	12		how old are you?

Brad attempted to initiate a conversation with a resident by asking about her children ("hai i figli?"/ "do you have children?", line 1). However, his pronunciation of the word "figli" sounded to the resident like the word "fili" which means "wires" and the resident was confused about why he was asking about wires. (There is a subtle difference in pronunciation of the diphthong "gli" that is typically difficult for learners of Italian to master.) This time it was the resident who misunderstood and asked the clarification questions during the interaction and Brad who repeated his question four times (lines 1,5,and 9). At one point the resident stated that she did not

understand (lines 7-8). Brad insisted on trying to move the conversation forward by repeating his question. However, in the end they were not able to understand each other. Their conversation was interrupted by another resident (line 12) and the first resident then began a conversation with him that did not involve Brad. Like the resident in Excerpt 1.7, Brad also used repetition to try to facilitate understanding by the resident. However, neither interactant appeared to have the ability to negotiate for understanding, by asking clarifying questions or rephrasing the initial question. Brad as an L2 user did not appear to have the linguistic resources to do so - i.e. the vocabulary and ability to rephrase the question. The resident, perhaps due to cognitive impairment, was unable to intuit from the context - a casual conversation between strangers getting to know each other - that Brad, an L2 user, had mispronounced the word for "children".

There were, however, occasions when the conversation was able to continue and Brad and a resident were able to understand each other. In this extract, Brad was talking to a man who asked him about his job:

Excerpt 1.8 - CDR-SL, 356-365

1	BRAD:	**che cosa?**	1	BRAD: **what?**
2	RES:	(----) **lavoro**	2	RES: (---) **work**
3	BRAD:	u::m non ho un lavoro	3	BRAD: u:::m I don't have a
4		ma ho studio	4	job I have I study
5		sono uno studenta	5	I'm a [female] student
6	RES:	studente studi in Italia?	6	RES: student you study in Italy?
7	BRAD:	si e nei Stati	7	BRAD: yes and in the United
8		Uniti	8	States
9	RES:	e sta qui (---)	9	RES: and you're here (---)
10	BRAD:	all'università	10	BRAD: at the university
11	RES:	e' bella l'università?	11	RES: is it beautiful the university?
12	BRAD:	si si bellissima	12	BRAD: yes yes it's beautiful
13		grandissima	13	very big and there are
14		e ci sono ah sessanta	14	seventy thousand
15		mile persone	15	people yes seventy
16		si sessanta mile	16	thousand
17	ADM:	buona sera buona sera	17	ADM: good afternoon good
		a tutti		afternoon everyone

Brad began with a clarifying question ("what?", line 1) and then understood from the resident's response that he was asking him about his job. (Although parts of the utterance were not clear on the recording, Brad appears to have understood the question.) The conversation proceeded as they talked about Brad's status as a student and a description of his university in the U.S., with no evident breakdowns in understanding. Usually conversations did not last long, however, before they were interrupted, as this was when an administrator came through the courtyard greeting everyone.

In summary, in the interactions at the CDR misunderstandings were common in most interactions between the residents and Susanna or Brad. The residents' had instances of misunderstanding that can be attributed to poor hearing or to cognitive impairment. There were also occurrences of residents misunderstanding Brad due to his pronunciation or use of an inappropriate word or grammatical form. Brad had difficulty understanding when a resident began talking about a topic unrelated to the context or to previous or subsequent turns in the conversation. Also, Brad at times did not know the meaning of a word or phrase or did not understand the way the word was pronounced by the resident. At times residents spoke in muffled voices and about topics that were not related to the context, which caused confusion. Susanna also had difficulty, at times, understanding the residents for similar reasons. And the residents had difficulty understanding Brad at times as well due to mispronunciation.

Susanna used strategies for facilitating understanding in her interactions with residents such as repetition, often in a louder voice the second time, and rephrasing of directives. Susanna consistently called residents by name to gain their attention or designate them as addressee, as there were often several residents in the same area. With Brad, Susanna used clear and concise imperatives in her directives, which were often formulaic since he performed similar tasks each

time he volunteered. Also, the nature of the work, bringing people from their rooms in wheelchairs, passing out snacks, and chatting with the residents, did not require complex verbal explanations. There was not much negotiation for meaning in the interactions, between Brad and the residents due to the cognitive and/or hearing impairment of the residents and Brad's lack of attempts to rephrase or explain what he was trying to say to the them. Between Susanna and the residents there was also little negotiation for meaning when a resident's request did not make sense and she at times would change the subject or end the topic. Despite the difficulties in understanding during casual conversation among the interactants at the CDR, the residents and Susanna appeared to be able to use the strategies described above to achieve understanding of directives that were related to the safety and well-being of the residents.

Relational work. There were several ways that relational work was realized in the interactions at the CDR; through social talk, pronominal choice, address forms and terms of endearment. According to Holmes and Stubbe (2003), "social talk is a means by which we negotiate dimensions of politeness and power in interpersonal relationships at work" (p. 89). In other words, the social conversations are important to developing relationships with co-workers in the workplace. Non-work related conversations often take place at the "boundaries of interaction as well as the boundaries of the working day" during breaks or before service began. That is, participants discuss "off task" topics during times either before or after the volunteer activity. Social talk also allows the interactants to "attend to the positive face needs of their colleagues" (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003, p. 100). Casual conversation unrelated to the tasks in a workplace setting can help to build solidarity among coworkers.

The interactions in this study show that social talk is prevalent even in a temporary workplace environment such as volunteer work during service-learning. At the CDR, casual

conversation or small talk took place between Brad and Susanna during short breaks in the workday, while they were alone in the elevator, for example. There were three times when they rode the elevator alone together on their way to pick up a resident on the second floor. During the first elevator encounter there was ten seconds of silence followed by Susanna's utterance of "mah" a phatic expression that in Italian can indicate a sense of doubt about what will come next. A phatic expression can be used to establish a tone of sociability rather than to communicate information. Susanna then cleared her throat and said "beh, vediamo che c'è" (well, we'll see what's going on here; CDR-SL, line 60). There was no conversation beyond Susanna's expression between the she and Brad during the first elevator trip, yet Susanna used phatic expressions to attempt to establish a social connection with Brad. The next time they rode in the elevator together Susanna initiated a conversation by asking Brad if he was able to access the

Excerpt 1.9 - CDR-SL, 93-102

1	SUS:	**ce l'hai l'internet sul**	1	SUS:	**do you have internet**
2		**telefono?**	2		**on your phone**?
3	BRAD:	no	3	BRAD:	no
4	SUS:	non ce l'hai (2) io	4	SUS:	you don't (2) **every day**
5		**tutti giorni guardo sul**	5		**I look on the computer**
6		**computer il tempo**	6		**at the weather**
7	BRAD:	oh (laughs)	7	BRAD:	oh (laughs)
8	SUS:	ma sempre per vedere	8	SUS:	always to see the
9		il tempo	9		weather
10	BRAD:	ah si?	10	BRAD:	ah yes?
11	SUS:	**perchè tua ragazza non**	11	SUS:	**why didn't your girlfriend**
12		**voleva venire qua?**	12		**want to come here?**
13	BRAD:	ah **lei non ha soldi**	13	BRAD:	**she doesn't have the money**
14	SUS:	ah	14	SUS:	ah
15	BRAD:	si costoso a-	15	BRAD:	yes expensive to-

internet on his phone. She was interested in seeing the weather forecast because it looked like it might rain that day which would have meant moving all the residents from the courtyard inside. Susanna continued talking about herself saying that she often looks at the weather forecast on her

computer. Brad responded "yes?" but did not add anything about himself to the conversation. In the next turn, Susanna asked an seemingly unrelated and personal question of Brad ("why did your girlfriend not want to come here?" lines 11-12). This change to a personal topic showed that Susanna was attempting to create a greater sense of involvement or decrease their social distance (Schneider, 2008). Brad responded that she did not come because "she doesn't have the money" (line 13). There has been a progression from silence with direct interaction beyond Susanna's gesture towards social contact by way of a rhetorical aside ("we'll see what's going on there") during the first elevator ride to the second elevator trip in which she initiates "self oriented" talk about her habits on the computer and then progresses to "other oriented" talk when she asked about Brad's girlfriend. The breaks in the activity with the residents provided an opportunity for Susanna to attempt to build a social rapport with Brad. While the first question about the weather was work-related, Susanna's inquiry about Brad's girlfriend can be considered purely interpersonal talk as it was unrelated to the tasks they were involved in and was a way of building rapport with Brad or beyond simply filling the silence during the elevator ride.

Susanna maintained a familiar rapport with the residents as revealed in her use of proper names and the first person plural of the imperatives in her directives to them, which created a familial atmosphere at the CDR. In the following interaction, Brad was pushing the resident in a wheelchair and Susanna gave him direction regarding where to place the wheelchair using the imperative.

Excerpt 1.10 - CDR-SL, 81-89

1	SUS:	qua (to Brad) a lei- **mettila li'**	1	SUS:	here [to Brad] to her- **put her**
2		**mettila li'** vicino vicino a	2		**there** put her there near near
3		questa porta	3		this door
4	BRA:	va bene?	4	BRA:	ok?
5	RES:	**io capito**	5	RES:	**I understand**

6	SUS:	oh **io capito** che adesso	6	SUS:	oh **I understand** that now
7		piove eh? quando piove	7		it's going to rain, eh?
8		**andiamo** dentro eh?	8		when it rains **we go**
9		**facciamo** un	9		**inside** eh? **let's take a**
10		giro poi se piove	10		**stroll** then if it rains **we'll**
11		**entriamo** dentro no?	11		**come inside**, ok?

Susanna directed Brad to place the resident in the courtyard using repetition of the directive as she often did with the residents: "put her there put her there near near this door" (lines 1-2). Brad addressed his response to the resident asking if she was ok in that position (line 4). The resident's reply, "I understand" (line 5) appears unrelated to Brad's question. Susanna then picked up on and repeated the resident's phrase (I understand, lines 5-6) and used it to make a comment about the weather. In this way, she was involving the resident in the conversation about the weather. Later she used the inclusive "we" in the directives (lines 8-11), which illustrates a rapport-building strategy common in her interactions with the residents. Use of the first person plural in directives from a person of higher rank can be meant to include both the hearer and speaker or just the hearer, as when a doctor asks, "how are *we* doing" (Bazzanella, 2002). She often framed the directive as an invitation to do an activity together ("let's take a stroll", lines 9-10; " if it rains we'll come inside", lines 10-11) rather than a directive meant only for the resident. In this way, Susanna was emphasizing the fact that they would be engaged in it together.

Susanna also used terms of endearment with the residents as in this exchange with Luisa who was feeling agitated and did not want to remain seated during the merenda:

Excerpt 1.11 - CDR-SL, 363-364

1	SUS:	devi stare seduta non puoi	1	SUS:	you must stay seated you can't
2		andare da nessuan parte viene	2		go anywhere come like a
3		come trottola ricordi Luisa?	3		spinning top remember Luisa?

The word "trottola" (spinning top, line 3) is a term used with children who are very active and do not want to sit still. It is more of an endearing term than an admonishment. Using terminology usually reserved for children emphasizes Suzanna's maternal role in relation to the residents.

In summary, the directives in the interactions at the CDR which came from Susanna were primarily in the imperative form and unmitigated for clarity. During casual conversations there was a substantial amount of misunderstanding on the part of the L2 user Brad and the residents. Brad had difficulty maintaining conversations with the residents who at times talked about topics unrelated to the context, often in a muffled tone of voice. When he tried to initiate a conversation it was challenging for the resident to understand either his accent or the topic he was introducing. Conversations went smoother when the resident began the conversation and Brad could then respond appropriately if he was able to understand; although according to Brad they was challenging because the residents were difficult to hear and the topics were not always related to the immediate context.

An important part of the volunteer activity at the CDR involved socializing with the residents through interpersonal talk. Brad learned and employed strategies for interaction with the residents such as repetition and redirection of the conversation if necessary in order to maintain a conversation. Brad also used his smile and laughter to respond to Susanna and to the residents when he did not understand their verbal language. This was a way that he maintained a positive rapport with those he interacted with in a context that was linguistically challenging. The residents were sociable and seemed to enjoy speaking with him, despite the, at times, misunderstandings. In a post-interaction interview, Brad talked about an interaction he had with one of the elderly female residents that captures his appreciation for the interactions he had with the residents:

yeah the one lady kept calling me 'bello' (handsome) I was like thank you thank you

(Brad, post-interview, June 24, 2015)

Horse Therapy Center

The horse therapy center (HTC) was located in a wooded area approximately twenty minutes by bus outside the city. The grounds consisted of a main house, approximately five stables and, several fenced in corrals with horses. The HTC's mission was to offer hippotherapy, or treatment with the help of horses, to children with developmental needs. Specially trained physical and occupational therapists use hippotherapy to treat patients using the horse's movement.

When two L2 users and I arrived on the day of the interactions, Elsa, a horse trainer at the HTC, was seated on the fence of one of the corrals, while Maria, an L2 user and volunteer was working with a horse in the center of the corral. Pietro, the director of the center, greeted us as we arrived and led us toward the corral. Pietro explained to us that Maria was demonstrating the Parelli Natural Horse Training method in the corral with the horse while Elsa, who also knew the Parelli technique well, was prompting Maria to perform certain maneuvers. Maria had learned Parelli before coming to Italy and Pietro seemed enthusiastic about having her work with their trainer to demonstrate the technique to the other L2 users who were observing the training session. According to Pietro, this activity was not typical of service-learning at the HTC and it was unusual for one of the student volunteers to have experience in training horses. Typically, student volunteers work with the horses, grooming them and working in the stalls.

The primary participants in the recorded interactions at the HTC were Elsa and Maria during the Parelli training activity. Pietro also interjected direction and comments from time to

time as did and the other student volunteers. The data analysis focuses mainly on the interactions between Maria and Elsa during the training session.

Directives. There were a total of thirteen directive encounters that contained at least one directive during the training session. Table 6 shows the total number of directives and their form - imperative, declarative or interrogative - as well as the speaker.

Table 6: HTC - Directives

	Imperatives	Declaratives	Interrogatives	Total
Elsa	63	20	2	85
Pietro	6	2	2	10
Maria	0	3	1	4
Total	69	25	5	99

Table 6 shows that Elsa used the highest number of directives (85) and that her directives were predominately in the imperative form (63) and the declarative form (20). All of her directives were aimed at Maria as she was working with the horse. The following excerpt of Elsa's language when giving direction to Maria shows the way Elsa often used a series of imperatives with repetition while Maria was in the ring working with horse.

Excerpt 2.1 - HTC-SL, 155-158

1	ELS:	**cambia fai** questo **per**	1	ELS:	**change do this to attra- to**
2		**attir- per avere**	2		**get** the attention of the
3		l'attenzione del cavallo	3		horse no no the horse (2)
4		no no il cavallo (2) poi	4		then **change** dir- eh **change**
5		**cambia** di- eh direzione	5		direction **make** a change
6		**fai** cambio cambio	6		change change **go change**
7		cambio **vai cambia** direzione	7		direction

Verbs in the form of the imperatives in this turn include: "cambia" (change), "fai cambio" (make a change), and "vai" (go). Elsa used elliptical forms of the imperative leaving out the agent or the complement, and using deictics such as "this" (line 1). Maria was in the ring working with the horse while Elsa was giving her direction, and it was essential that Maria understand and carry them out in real time as they were being given. Vine (2004) calls this type of directive requiring immediate compliance *now* directives - as opposed to *later* directives regarding actions to be carried out at a later time. The sense of immediacy required of the task correlates with the direct imperatives used most prevalently by Elsa during this activity. Repetition of the word "change" reinforced or intensified the directive. Something else of note in this exchange is in line 1 when Elsa began a directive using a certain word and then stopped and rephrased the directive "do this to attra- to get the attention of horse" (lines 1-3). She did this on several occasions as a way to facilitate understanding of her directive by using simpler language. (More on misunderstanding will be discussed related to research question two in the next section.)

Nine out of Elsa's twenty declarative directives use the modal "must" in both the affirmative and the negative. This type of directive, a "need statement" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976) is considered to be one of the most direct forms. In the following directive encounter, Maria was in the ring with the horse and she had not performed a move in the correct way.

Excerpt 2.2 - HTC-SL, 144-146

1	ELS:	**devi girare lei deve** lei	1	ELS:	**you must turn she must** she
2		deve fare questo ok?	2		must do this ok?
3	MAR:	si	3	MAR:	yes
4	ELS:	**ok?** vieni qua ----	4	ELS:	**ok?** come here ---

Elsa used the verb in the second person ("you must turn", line 1) and then in the third person shifting the force of the directive to a more indirect form where the agent was the horse, not

Maria ("she must she must do this", lines1-2). Although the horse was the agent, the directive was obviously meant for Maria who was supposed to cause the horse to do the movement Elsa requested. The tag question ("ok?", line 4) serves as both a clarifying question to be sure she understood the directive as well as a solidarity move after two strong and potentially face-threatening directives with the modals "must". Overall, Elsa's directives were direct and immediate due to the nature of the horse training activity in which there was a necessity for clearly at the moment they were given. She also seemed concerned that Maria understood the direction.

Pietro used only ten directives in the activity, which is not surprising given his role primarily as an observer. Six out of his ten directives were repetitions of Elsa's directives, often to clarify or echo the commands, as can be seen in the following selection:

Excerpt 2.3 - HTC-SL, 91-96

1	ELS:	ok (4) vieni Maria **fai te quello**	1	ELS:	ok (4) come on Maria **you do**
2		**che vuoi** gli spieghi quello che	2		**what you want** explain it to
3		fai in inglese	3		them in English
4	MAR:	ok ma io o te?	4	MAR:	but me or you?
5	ELS:	no te in inglese	5	ELS:	no you in English
6	PIE:	**te fai-**	6	PIE:	**you do-**
7	ELS:	**fai quello che sai fare**	7	ELS:	**do what you know how to do**
8	PIE:	**fai quello che sai fare** te e lo	8	PIE:	**do what you know how to do**
9		**spieghi a loro quello che stai**	9		**and explain to them what you**
10		**facendo** (---)	10		**are doing**

In this directive encounter, Elsa began with a directive to Maria to choose the maneuver to demonstrate and explain to the student volunteers who were watching. Maria had not clearly understood whether she or Elsa was supposed to explain the moves to the audience as indicated in her question ("ok ma io o te?", line 4). Elsa rephrased one part of the directive ("do what you know how to do", line 7) and Pietro then repeated the phrase and added part of Elsa's original

directive ("do what you know how to do and explain to them what you are doing", lines 8-9). Pietro repeated the directive to reinforce Elsa's original directive to Maria. Pietro's role in this encounter and throughout the interaction during this activity was primarily to reinforce Elsa's commands and ensure that Maria had understood.

Pietro also used the interrogative form and other devices to soften his directive to Maria in the excerpt below. This exchange took place at the beginning of the day shortly after we had arrived.

Excerpt 2.4 - HTC-SL, 33-39

1	PIE:	la doma parelli è	1	PIE:	the Parelli training is a
2		una doma **ce la spieghi**	2		training **will you explain it to us a**
3		**un po'?**	3		**little?**
4	MAR:	**io?**	4	MAR:	**me?**
5	PIE:	si a loro gliela spieghi un	5	PIE:	yes to them will you explain it to
6		po'?	6		them a little?
7	MAR:	in inglese o in italiano?	7	MAR:	in English or in Italian?
8	PIE:	in italiano in italiano	8	PIE:	in Italian in Italian

In this encounter, Pietro began to explain the Parelli training technique to us, then stopped and asked Maria if she would explain it to the group. Pietro posed the directive in the form of a question ("will you explain it to us a little?", lines 2-3). He added the phrase "a little" (line 3) as a way to minimize the weight of the request, and indicate he was not asking her to give a lengthy explanation in Italian. Maria responded to Pietro's directive with apparent surprise by asking a clarifying question ("me?", line 4). Pietro reaffirmed that he had asked her to give the explanation by rephrasing the request in the form of a question with the same minimizing phrase "a little" (lines 5-6), this time stating that the explanation would be for the benefit of the other students. In this way he as distancing himself from the task, framing it as a favor to the students rather than a personal directive. Maria indicated compliance with Pietro's request in her next response ("in Italian or English?", line 7). She, therefore, understood Pietro's question ("can you

explain it to us?") to be a directive rather than a literal question about her ability to explain the technique. She then proceeded to to explain the Parelli training technique to the students in Italian. Pietro's request was less face-threatening in that it was framed as a request in the interrogative, giving Maria the freedom to deny the request. However, given Pietro's higher status as the director of the HTC, Maria complied with the request and treated it as a directive, despite being caught off guard and perhaps even not wanting to do it, as evidenced by her question ("me?", line 4). Why then, did Pietro, a person of high status in that context, pose the directive as a request with hedging to soften the face-threatening nature of the directive? Due to his position as the recruiter and administrator of the L2 user volunteers, he was interested in making sure the students had a positive experience at the HTC. Even though they were temporarily volunteering, Pietro was committed to their well-being. By asking Maria to explain the technique to the other L2 user volunteers, in Italian, Pietro was involving the spectators in the training session and created a situation for learning for them. He was also giving Maria the opportunity to practice her Italian and to engage with the other volunteers. In summary, Pietro had different goals than Elsa and it was reflected in his language use.

Maria had only four examples of directives in the interactions with Elsa, declaratives and interrogatives. Maria's one interrogative directive is an example of a "permission directive" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976) that she posed to Elsa regarding her desire to demonstrate a move that she was familiar with called "lateral inflection". This came a few turns after the selection above when both Pietro and Elsa have given Maria the directive to choose what she wanted to do.

Excerpt 2.5 - HTC-SL, 98-99

MAR:	adesso posso fare lateral inflection?	MAR:	**now can I do lateral inflection?**
ELS:	si ok fai	ELS:	yes ok do it

Despite the previous directives from both Elsa and Pietro urging her to choose the maneuver she wanted to do, Maria asked Elsa's permission to allow her to perform a move called "lateral inflection" using an interrogative using the modal "can I". This is considered a permission directive, which aligns with Ervin-Tripp's (1976) finding that people in "lower ranks" (p. 35) do not use the imperative form with people of higher status in the organization. In the context of service-learning at the HTC, the hierarchy of roles was not clearly defined; Elsa was not Maria's supervisor. However, Elsa was clearly the person with more expertise in the Parelli method. Also, Elsa positioned herself as an authority figure with respect to Maria through her continuous instructional commands throughout the demonstration. Maria, in most instances, accepted her role as trainee by following Elsa's directives when she was able. In this case she asked permission to do something different when she was unable to comply.

Directives can be considered on a spectrum of "directness" related to how much inference it requires of the hearer to decipher the intent of the speaker, or to hear the directive the way the speaker intended it (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989). Researchers such as Ervin-Tripp (1976) and Blum-Kulka et al, (1989) have categorized directives and requests respectively based on their degree of directness or "obviousness" (Ervin-Tripp, 1976, p. 29). There were few examples in the interactions of implicit directives, sometimes referred to as hints (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Hints are directives that "contain partial reference to the object or element needed for the implementation of the act" (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, p. 18). In the following selection, while Maria was performing a maneuver in the wrong way, Elsa repeated the question "where are you going?" (lines 1-2).

Excerpt 2.6 - HTC-SL, 293-294

1	ELS:	guardami **dove vai?** no dove	1	ELS:	look at me **where are you**
2		vai? dietro dietro si ok **non**	2		**going?** no where are you going? back

3	**devi seguire** il cavallo	3	back yes ok **you**
4	ecco deve	4	**shouldn't follow** the horse the horse
5	seguire lei te non te lei	5	should follow you not you her
6	**fai** un circolo	6	**make** a circle

Instead of saying directly where Maria needed to go, Elsa posed it as a question. Ervin-Tripp (1976) considers this kind of directive a "question directive", meaning it is a question that does not explicitly state the desired action. The point of the question was to guide Maria to move the horse in a different but unspecified direction.

The majority of the directives during the Parelli training session were explicit and direct, especially in the moments when Maria was working with the horse and Elsa was giving her direction. Clarity and immediacy were important in this context, and therefore the majority of Elsa's directives were in the imperative.

Linguistic features can be used to modify the illocutionary force of the head act of a directive to either intensify or attenuate the speaker's intention (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989; Brown & Levinson, 1978; Faerch & Kasper, 1989). Modification can be internal or part of the head act, or external made up of language that surrounds the head act.

Elsa was the only speaker who used reinforcement, upgraders, in her directives. Her most frequent strategy was repetition, which intensified the illocutionary force of her directives (Blum-Kulka, et at, 1989; Vine, 2004). She used repetition specifically during the moments when Maria was working with the horse. In the following selection, Elsa repeated the directive "cambio" (change) reinforcing the directive and creating a sense of urgency for Maria to follow the instructions.

Excerpt 2.7 - HTC-SL, 156-158

ELS:	...eh cambia direzione **fai cambio cambio cambio** vai **cambia** direzione	ELS:	...eh **change** direction make a **change change change** go **change** direction

As mentioned previously, this type of directive can be considered a "now" directive referring to an action that needed to happen in that moment. Elsa used repetition in this case to reinforce the directive since Maria was not complying with Elsa's direction, as was revealed in a subsequent turn. Maria stated that she does not know how to make the horse change direction: "Non capisco come cambia direzione" (I don't understand how to change direction; HTC-SL, 170). Therefore, it appears that Elsa was repeating the direction as a strategy to facilitate understanding because Maria was not complying with her directive due to lack of knowledge about the move and not lack of comprehension in the L2.

A mitigation strategy Elsa used to minimize or soften the force of her directives was to provide explanations to Maria for why and how certain maneuvers were performed in the Parelli program. In the following selection, Elsa was trying to explain to Maria why it was important to focus on the front legs rather than the hind legs in the maneuver.

Excerpt 2.8 - HTC-SL, 137-140

1	ELS:	**non devi cost**- con un	1	ELS:	**you musn't forc**- with a
2		cavallo come lei è più	2		horse like her it is more
3		importante costare	3		important to force the front
4		l'anteriore perchè lei ha più	4		legs because she has more
5		problemi è più resistente sul	5		problems is more resistant
6		anteriore che sul posteriore	6		in the front than in the hind
7		e quindi è più importante	7		legs and so it is more
8		costi si **deve costare**	8		important that you **the**
9		**l'anteriore**	9		**front legs should be forced**

Elsa began this turn with a directive with strong force using the modal "must" in the negative[ii] but then stopped herself and began to explain the reason for her direction regarding the front legs. Earlier (lines 107-112) when Maria was explaining the same move to the other student volunteers, she was focused on the hind legs. Therefore, Elsa was correcting Maria's previous

maneuver and adding an explanation to attenuate the directive. Elsa interrupted an explicit directive with strong illocutionary force and replaced it with an explanation, or a "grounder", one of the six types of supportive moves to mitigate requests (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989). At the end of the selection, Elsa used a declarative "it is more important that you" (lines 7-8) and then rephrased the directive using the agentless passive, a more indirect form. According to Sbisà (2001), mitigation is sometimes used in combination with reinforcement or harsh criticism as a way to repair the rapport. In other words, mitigation is used to "counterbalance the reinforcement...without cancelling it" (p. 1811).

Pietro used several mitigation strategies in the interactions. As discussed previously, he asked Maria to explain to the Parelli program to the student volunteers in the form of a question, which was less forceful than if he had told her to give the explanation. It communicated that Maria had a choice of whether or not to follow the directive. Pietro also used the phrase "un po'" (a little) to further mitigate or soften the directive. It served primarily to attenuate the directive and make the imposition on Maria to give the explanation appear less imposing.

In summary, Elsa's directives were most frequently in the imperative with no internal mitigation devises. She used repetition as a way to intensify the directives, particularly when Maria was engaged in a maneuver with the horse. On occasion, Elsa stopped to offer an explanation to Maria for why or how a move should be performed. Pietro's directives to Maria on the other hand, took on a different, more indirect form. He used an interrogative directive hedged with a minimizing phrase, which served to lessen the apparent difficulty of the task and attend to the positive face needs of Maria.

The differences in the form of their directives can be traced to their respective roles at the HTC and their relationship to Maria. As director of the HTC and the person responsible for

recruiting and training the volunteers, Pietro had more of a reason to be concerned about interpersonal aspects of interacting with Maria such as politeness and attending to her face needs. It was in his interest, and his concern to be sure the volunteers, in this case the L2 users, had a positive experience and would want to return. This was evident not only in his language with Maria - his directives were in the interrogative or framed as requests, giving her the option of not complying - but also in the way he dealt with all the L2 users. In another activity after the horse training, Pietro took the time to give an extensive lesson in the vocabulary related to the equipment for riding horses; saddles, bridles, etc. Throughout the day he also talked to the L2 users about Italian culture and travelling in Tuscany. For example, he told a story about Italian folklore related to the name of one of the horses. He also recommended nearby places of interest for the students to visit. Pietro also offered to drive the L2 users home at the end of the day; something they welcomed since it prevented them from being late for dinner at with their homestay families! In short, Pietro was invested in building a rapport with the volunteers. Elsa on the other hand, did not usually interact with the volunteers. In this case, she worked with Maria because she had experience with the Parelli method and therefore became involved. Based on their interactions, there did not appear to be an interest on Elsa's part to build a rapport with Maria. It was a temporary situation and there was nothing at stake if they did not get along well; unlike in a typical workplace context in which it is necessary to continue a working relationship over time. (More will be discussed on this topic in the section on relational work.) However, it was important for Elsa to communicate the directives in way that was understood by Maria, which accounts for her unmitigated and therefore unambiguous directives.

Misunderstanding. To address research question two (In what ways do L2 users and local Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the interactions?) I will describe the types of misunderstandings in the interactions and whether or not the interaction ended in understanding. I will also discuss ways the interactants facilitated or inhibited understanding.

In the following directive encounter Elsa asked Maria to perform a move and Maria's response was to give the directive that Elsa then do a different maneuver. Elsa was confused by Maria's remark. A closer look at the interaction shows the way they negotiated to reach alignment in their understanding. Elsa gave the directive to Maria to do a move called "friendly game" with the horse ("you do the teacher friendly game, lines 1-2). Maria, then, responded with

Excerpt 2.9 - HTC-SL, 62-79

1	ELS:	**fai the teacher** (2) friendly	1	ELS:	do the teacher (2)
2		game	2		*friendly game*
3	MAR:	**poi fai lateral** flection?	3	MAR:	then you do lateral [in]flection?
4	ELS:	**cosa**?	4	ELS:	what?
5	MAR:	fare questo?	5	MAR:	do this?
6	ELS:	prima gioco dell'amicizia	6	ELS:	first friendly game
7		friendly game	7		*friendly game*
8	MAR:	**no**	8	MAR:	**no**
9	ELS:	**[no?**	9	ELS:	[**no?**
10	MAR:	[**non l'ho mai::**	10	MAR:	**[I've never :::**
11	ELS:	**non conosci?**	11	ELS:	**you don't know it?**
12	MAR:	no	12	MAR:	no
13	ELS:	ok prima gioco Parelli (2)	13	ELS:	ok first Parelli game (2)
14		friendly game (2) **spiega in**	14		*friendly game* (2) **explain**
15		**inglese** con un cavallo che non	15		**in English** with a horse
16		conosci	16		that you don't know
17	MAR:	**lo conosco ma mai fatto**	17	MAR:	**I know it but never done**
18	ELS:	**ah ok spiega a loro**	18	ELS:	**ah ok explain to them**
19		cavallo che non conosco io che	19		horse that I don't know that I've
20		non ho mai visto faccio con la	20		never seen I work with
21		stick ma (----) il gioco	21		the stick but (---) the
22		dell'amicizia per vedere se il	22		friendly game to see if the horse
23		cavallo è (---) dalla se ha paura	23		is (---) by the- if it's afraid if it's
24		se non ha paura faccio questo	24		not afraid do this
25	MAR:	in inglese o italiano?	25	MAR:	in English or Italian?
26	ELS:	no in inglese a loro	26	ELS:	no in English to them

a question in the same imperative form to Elsa ("then you do the lateral flection?"). She was attempting to request to do a different maneuver that she was more familiar with. Elsa did not understand or was surprised by her request based on her response ("what?", line 4). Maria responded with a slightly more ambiguous utterance ("do this?", line 5). Elsa then exercising her higher status position stated "first friendly game" (line 6). Maria then flatly refused ("no", line 9). Elsa was surprised by her refusal as evidenced by her repetition of Maria's refusal ("no?", line 9) with rising intonation. Maria tried to explain her reason for the refusal in the next turn ("I have never-" (line 10), but Elsa interrupted her and guessed what she thought Maria was going to say ("you don't know it?", line 11). Maria's next response ("no", line 12) was ambiguous in that it could have meant "no I do not know it" or "no that is not what I meant". Elsa's response revealed that she believed Maria meant that she was not familiar with the move. Elsa's next directive was for Maria to explain the "friendly game" to the student volunteers in English ("explain in English", line 14-15). Maria reiterated that although she knew it, she had never done the maneuver before ("I know it but never before", line 17). Elsa confirmed understanding ("ah ok", 18) and then told Maria what she should say to the student volunteers to explain the "friendly game". Maria then paraphrased Elsa's directions in English.

In summary, in this excerpt there was a misunderstanding among the two interactants related to their respective views regarding their positions of power to decide which maneuvers would be executed. Maria's request to perform a different maneuver than the one Elsa had directed her to was unexpected by Elsa. Up to this point in the interactions, she had been the one giving direction to Maria. Therefore, when Maria suggested doing a different move, Elsa was surprised but appeared willing to allow Maria to do the other move after she did the "friendly game". Maria's refusal to comply was "bald on record" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 74) or

direct without mitigation, which again took Elsa by surprise, revealing that in her view the direct refusal of her directive was not appropriate in that context. It is possible that Maria did not have the linguistic resources in Italian to mitigate her refusal. She did attempt an explanation in the following turn. Elsa took control again, however, by not allowing Maria to finish her explanation. In the end, Maria acquiesced and followed Elsa's directive to describe the "friendly game" to the other students. Elsa refused to concede control at this point. Later in the interaction, she directed Maria to do whatever move she wanted but it was on her terms, not in response to Maria's request, however.

In the next excerpt, there was another example of a breakdown in communication due to an unexpected or inappropriate response. Just before this exchange, Elsa had repeated the

Excerpt 2.10 - HTC-SL, 181-188

1	MAR:	**Non capisco come cambia**	1	MAR:	**I don't understand how**
2		**direzione**	2		**change direction**
3	ELS:	**ho visto**	3	ELS:	**I can see that**
4	MAR:	**huh?**	4	MAR:	**huh?**
5	ELS:	**ho visto** devi allora mettiti al	5	ELS:	**I can see that** you need ok -
6		centro e fai un circolo ti	6		get in the center and make a
7		insegno vai vieni al centro	7		circle I'll teach you go come to
8		del campo centro manda il	8		the center of the ring the center
9		cavallo in circolo (2) circolo	9		send the horse in a
10		(2) si al passo (---) ok (10)	10		circle (2) circle (2) yes walking
11		cammina **in dietro** no no no	11		(--) ok (10) walk **backward no**
12		no **in dietro** no no	12		**no no no backward no no**
13	MAR:	**cos'è 'in dietro'?**	13	MAR:	**what is 'backward'?**
14	ELS:	ho detto- **ok non ti**	14	ELS:	I said- **ok don't**
15		**preoccupare**	15		**worry**

directive several times for Maria to change the direction of the horse. Finally Maria responded, " I don't understand how to change direction", lines 1-2). She had understood Elsa's directive but was unable to perform the maneuver. Maria's declarative statement could have been meant as an explanation for why she was not complying with Elsa's directive and also an indirect request for

assistance or more information from Elsa. Elsa's sarcastic response ("I can see that", line 3) was unexpected by Maria who responded "huh?" (line 4), with a rising intonation as a way of asking for further explanation. Elsa, treated Maria's question token ("huh?") as a sign that she did not hear and Elsa repeated her retort (" I can see that", line 5), followed by the explanation Maria had requested. The fact that Elsa proceeded to explain the move to Maria without further request from Maria reveals that Elsa had, in fact, understood Maria's initial declarative to be a request for help. Yet, her response did not address Maria's request for more information. It is possible that Maria had not heard or not understood the meaning of Elsa's remark, which prompted her questioning response. However, it is also possible that Maria was confused by the sarcastic tone of Elsa's response to her face-threatening admission that she did not understand Elsa's original directive. In that case Maria's surprise indicated her perspective of Elsa's comment as an inappropriate response to her request for help.

As the interaction continued, Elsa attempted to explain to Maria how to make the horse change direction, repeating the phrase "backward" (lines 11-12) twice. Maria was not performing the manuever correctly based on Elsa's repetition of "no " (lines 11-12) six times. When Maria inquired directly about the meaning of the phrase ("what is 'backward'"?, line 13), Elsa began to repeat herself ("I said", line 14) but stopped and told Maria not to worry about it. Rather than respond the Maria's request, Elsa dismissed it and Maria and moved on to the next maneuver. In this case, the misunderstanding was not resolved.

In the above excerpts, there were instances of both linguistic and pragmatic misunderstanding. Maria did not know the meaning of a key word in Elsa's directive, which prevented her from being able to comply. The strategy Maria employed to alleviate her misunderstanding was to ask Elsa the meaning. Unfortunately, Elsa chose to close the topic

without giving an explanation. Maria also did not have the linguistic ability to mitigate her refusal of Elsa's directive and her flat out refusal caused confusion to Elsa, which Maria attempted to remedy by giving an explanation for her refusal.

Maria used several strategies for understanding in the interactions. She was able to make herself understood as shown in the previous selection by repeating her desire to demonstrate a move she knew well and by refusing to do what she did not know how to do. She also asked directly for the definition of a phrase and in that case was not successful in reaching understanding.

During the training Maria had to rely on inference as a strategy for understanding since Elsa was not always forthcoming with explanations. Maria described how her past experience with Parelli training helped her to understand most of Elsa's directions.

> RES: how do you think you knew what she meant can you think like
> MAR: I mean I think maybe because I like like I did know more or less what I was doing or like what I was supposed to do at least so **I had kind of like a built in framework**
> RES: yeah
> MAR: like what was supposed to be going on **so I just kind of fit what she said into that** um
> RES: so you kind of knew that that was happening at that point
> MAR: more or less yeah or like you know when I think about the lessons I've had in the US and I think about the things that like my instructor there has said to me um like in a similar situation trying to do similar things and then like when she said it and I was trying to process like what she had just said like kinda going through like like obviously she wasn't gonna say something about like green beans or something
>
> (Maria, post-interview, July 16, 2014)

Maria's previous experience had given her a framework for understanding the vocabulary of the training and helped her narrow down the possible things that Elsa could be talking about at any given point. She was relying on her background knowledge and her understanding of what would be contextually relevant.

Elsa failed to understand or respond to Maria's request to perform a move that she preferred instead of the maneuver Elsa asked her to demonstrate. In this context, Elsa was typically the person in a position of giving direction to Maria during the session. By making the request Maria stepped out of her role as "trainee" and Elsa failed to understand Maria's refusal to comply with her directive as a request. This was a pragmatic misunderstanding in that Elsa did not expect Maria to make a request in that context; something she may have believed to be inappropriate given their respective roles in the training session.

Relational work. Locher and Watts (2008) refers to the way interactants use language to negotiate their relationships with others. In each of the three service-learning settings in this study participants used language not only as a way to accomplish the goals of the organizations and the activities they were engaged in but also to manage relationships among the people with whom they were working alongside. Consequently, there was a combination of what is known as transactional language (Brown & Yule, 1983), meaning that the primary purpose of the language is to convey information and accomplish tasks, and interactional or interpersonal language, which is used to "establish and maintain social relationships" (p. 3). In the context of the HTC during the Parelli training the object of activity was for Elsa to correct and guide the movements of Maria as she was training the horse. Therefore, Elsa's language was primarily transactional and she had little time during the activity for social talk. Also, there was little incentive for her to be concerned with building a rapport with Maria, who was only at the HTC temporarily. Her main focus was on giving direction to Maria. Speakers who use transactional language often prioritize conveying the information over politeness or maintaining rapport with the hearer and can appear abrupt or brusque. Nonetheless, Elsa did weave affirming language and even praise with the strong directives as in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 2.11 - HTC-SL, 276-278

1	ELS:	(to Maria) **guardami dove**	1	ELS:	(to Maria) **look at me where**
2		**vai? no dove vai?** dietro	2		**are you going? no where are**
3		dietro **si ok non**	3		**you going?** backward backward
4		**devi seguire**	4		**yes ok you shouldn't follow** the
5		il cavallo **ecco** deve	5		horse like that ok she should
6		seguire lei te non te lei fai un	6		follow you not you her make a
7		circolo	7		circle

Just before this sequence, Elsa had been directing Maria to perform a move that she was not able to do. Elsa was here communicating to Maria that she needed to go in a different direction with the horse. She began with a stern alerter to gain Maria's full attention ("look at me", line 1) followed by repetition of the question ("where are you going? no where are you going?", lines 1-3). Elsa's question was not meant to be taken literally because she could see where Maria was going. Instead it served the purpose of letting Maria know, in a demeaning way, that she was going the wrong way. Elsa then gave her direction about which way she should have been going "backward, backward" (line 3). Repetition of the question further intensifies the directive. Elsa then adds an affirmation to tell Maria that she was then doing it right ("yes ok", line 3). She then provided a longer description of how it should have been done using the deontic modal "should" in the negative in the second person directed at Maria. Elsa had a pattern of following strong directives and somewhat critical utterances with supportive language to soften the directive and repair the rapport. Maria's overall impression of Elsa, described below in an interview the day after the recording, was that while Elsa's behavior was similar to horse trainers she had worked with, Maria remained uncertain about what Elsa thought of her.

> I think **that was pretty typical of like any riding lesson I've ever had** because like they're always kind of like you know like similar like persona and everything and like they never tell you when you're doing something right like they always like yell at you when you're doing something wrong and so and then too I think one of the only things I would understand was she was like no she kept yelling and like I kind of **like part of me thought that was normal based on like past**

> **experience but then part of me kind of wondered like you know is she really angry like does she think I'm like a complete idiot** is you know like that sort of thing um I wasn't really sure
>
> (Maria, post-interview, July 16, 2014)

Maria was unsure about whether Elsa was angry or personally critical of her in a way that went beyond Maria's expectations of a similar type of encounter she has had in the past. Her perception of Elsa was similar to other riding teachers she has known who were also critical and did not give positive feedback. However, Maria then wondered if Elsa was angry at her based on the way she "kept yelling" at her or even that Elsa thought she was "a complete idiot". From Maria's perspective Elsa may have expressed anger and been more abrasive than Maria would have expected from a horse trainer.

When positive reinforcement is imbedded in strong face-threatening language, it is possible it will not be heard. Although Maria's perception was that Elsa did not praise her, in fact, there were a few instances in the interactions where Elsa gave positive reinforcement to Maria. For example in the following selection Elsa praises Maria:

Excerpt 2.12 - HTC-SL, 157-159

1	ELS:	allora lei vuole andare piu'	1	ELS:	ok she wants to go slower
2		piano (35) come stai adesso?	2		(35) how are you now? (10)
3		(10) **brava** (5) cambia fai	3		**good job** (5) change do this
4		questo per l'attir- per avere	4		to attra- to get the attention of
5		l'attenzione del cavallo no no	5		the horse no no the horse then
6		il cavallo poi cambia di- eh	6		change dir- eh change
7		cambia direzione vado vado	7		direction go go be still go go
8		sii fermo vado fai cambio	8		change change change change
9		cambio cambio vai cambia	9		go change directions from
10		direzione da da ---	10		from ---

Elsa began this sequence referring to the horse ("she wants to go slower", lines 1-2). After a long pause while Maria was working with the horse, Elsa asked how she was doing ("how are you now?", line 2). After a shorter pause, Elsa praised Maria ("good job", line 3) followed by a series

of and then gave her a series of strong directives asking Maria to make the horse change direction. Elsa's directives were following a protocol for the Parelli technique and for that reason she was very specific about the sequence of maneuvers. Maria's impression of this and other interactions with Elsa was that Elsa was not only critical of her performance but also possibly angry with her. Maria reported feeling nervous as a result of the criticism she felt she received from Elsa:

> ...but um a lot of it was translated into Italian and it wasn't stuff that I had ever done before so then when she was like well then every time she said like do this and I was like I've never done that before she was like you've never done this before? and I got really nervous
>
> (Maria, post-interview, July 16, 2014)

Relational work also emerged in the form of Elsa allowing Maria the freedom to perform the maneuver of her choice ("do what you want", lines 1-2). The following selection occurred after a potentially face-threatening exchange, described in the section on misunderstanding, in which Elsa insisted that Maria demonstrate a move she was not familiar with. However, even this was framed as a directive:

Excerpt 2.13 - HTC-SL, 91-100

1	ELS:	ok (10) vieni Maria **fai te**
2		**quello che vuoi** (5) gli spieghi
3		in inglese
4	MAR:	ok (4) ma io o te?
5	ELS:	no te in inglese
6	PIE:	te fai-
7	MAR:	**ma che faccio?**
8	ELS:	fai quello che sai fare
9	PIE:	fai quello che sai fare te e lo
10		spieghi a loro quello che stai
11		facendo
12	MAR:	e **adesso posso fare lateral**
13		**inflection?**
14	ELS:	**si fai ok**

1	ELS:	ok (10) come on **Maria do**
2		**what you want** (5) explain to
3		them in English
4	MAR:	ok (4) but you or me?
5	ELS:	no you in English
6	PIE:	you do-
7	MAR:	**but what do I do?**
8	ELS:	do what you know how to do
9	PIE:	you do what you know how to
10		do and you explain to them
11		what you are doing
12	MAR:	and **now can I do lateral**
13		**inflection?**
14	ELS:	**yes do it ok**

Elsa addressed Maria by name and then gave her the directive to "do what you want" (lines 1-2). Maria was still not sure what she was supposed to do ("but what do I do?", line 7). Both Elsa and Pietro repeated the directive and even then Maria asked the question "now can I do lateral inflection?" (lines 12-13) to be sure she had permission to perform the move. The word "now" confirms that it was a move she had wanted to perform previously but was constrained by Elsa's directives and her misunderstanding of Maria's request. Elsa responded in the affirmative ("yes do it ok", line 14) and Maria then performed and explained the move in English to the students. Even though Elsa and Pietro offered Maria the option to perform the move she wanted as a way to attend to her positive face, Maria still used a request for permission to confirm her freedom to do that maneuver, maintaining her position as trainee and Elsa as trainer.

Despite her somewhat negative or ambivalent feelings about her experience working with Elsa, Maria was enthusiastic about going back to the HTC and repeating the experience:

> RES: and how do you feel about going back to do it again?
> MAR: I really want to do it again that was like one of the just the coolest learning experiences I've ever had and like the whole time I was having it I was just like oh my God this is so cool and and yeah I liked the stuff that she was talking about
>
> (Maria, post-interview, July 16, 2014)

Elsa's manner did not discourage Maria from returning to the HTC to repeat or continue the activity. According to Maria, working with the horse and learning from Elsa was exciting enough for Maria to want to return.

The goal of the activity at the HTC was for Elsa to guide Maria to practice and perform various maneuvers of the Parelli horse training technique. Overall, the language use was constrained and conditioned in various ways by the goal of the activity, the relationship of the interactants and their respective roles in relationship to each other. Elsa, as the horse trainer used a high number of directives and the majority were in the imperative form. It was important for

her to communicate to Maria in strong explicit directives due to the immediacy of working with a horse. Maria's misunderstandings were language-related, both lexical and syntactic. Strategies that Maria used to facilitate her own understanding in the interactions were 1) repeating her request in different ways until it was understood, 2) asking the meaning of a word or phrase and 3) stating that she did not know what something meant. Elsa tried to facilitate Maria's understanding by using repetition and by interrupting herself and rephrasing using simplified language. She also used gestures and even went out into the ring to show Maria what she needed to do. This last strategy, which Maria referred to as "puppeting", made Maria uncomfortable (Maria, post-interview 7/16/14). Elsa's manner was not untypical of other horse trainers Maria had encountered, however, Elsa's strong unmitigated directives may have been the cause of Maria's questioning of Elsa's attitude towards her. Nonetheless, this did not deter Maria from wanting to return to the HTC.

Misericordia

The interactions at the Misericordia were recorded during a ninety-minute, interactive training session for new student volunteers at the main headquarters of the Misericordia. Franceso, the director of the Misericordia has been leading hands-on training sessions for U.S. college student volunteers since 2005. The purpose of the training session was to introduce future volunteers to the equipment, terminology and procedures they would likely encounter during their service at the Misericordia and to allow them to simulate the maneuvers they could be asked to perform. According to Francesco, volunteers typically ride in the ambulance, help drivers load patients onto stretchers and into the ambulance to bring them to the hospital, and transport elderly people to medical appointments. Volunteers rarely, if ever, attend to victims with traumatic injuries. In attendance during the training session under investigation in this study

as trainees were Samantha, L2 user and prospective student volunteer, and myself, L2 user and researcher. I originally intended to attend the training session as an observer, to record the L2 user's interactions, but since there were only two of us, I also participated fully in the training session. I had communicated the purpose and scope of the research to Francesco prior to the training session and gained his permission to record the session.

During the first half of the training session, Francesco focused on the ambulance; how to take the stretcher out of the ambulance, raise it to its full height, place a patient on board and load it into the ambulance. The stretcher, even without a patient on board, was quite heavy and fitted with hydraulics. It was important that the volunteers learn to maneuver it properly; a wrong move could result in injury to the volunteers or the patient. Throughout the training, Francesco stressed the technical nature of the work: "noi siamo tecnici e quindi dobbiamo comportarci come tecnici"(we are technicians and so we need to behave like technicians, MIS-SL, 482). Although this was a simulation and no patients were involved, Francesco stressed the urgency of performing the demonstrated maneuvers properly throughout the training session. The second half of the training session was a demonstration and simulation of cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). As with the ambulance training, Francesco first explained and demonstrated each step, using a mannequin, and then Samantha and I took turns simulating CPR. Francesco directed and critiqued our simulations. Francesco's goals for the session were two-fold: to convey a large amount of procedural and technical information to the L2 users while not overwhelming them, and to create and maintain a positive rapport with the trainees so they would be willing to return as volunteers. Holmes and Stubbe (2003) had this to say about interactions in an institutional setting:

> Underlying every interaction, and accounting for the form in which directives are expressed or dynamically negotiated, is the delicate balance between the pressure

> to get the job done well and efficiently on the one hand and the *affective* considerations of collegiality and concern for people's feelings, i.e. politeness, on the other. (p. 40)

Francesco's language use revealed strategies he used to negotiate these two goals. It was clear, however, that his priority was the safety of the trainees during the session and of the future patients. Since there were only two volunteers and one trainer, there was an opportunity for interaction among the participants even though Francesco did most of the speaking. As trainees we were encouraged to ask questions during the training when necessary, however, all of the directives in the data came from Francesco.

In order to respond to each of the research questions, I will first describe the various forms and types of the directives in the interactions in this context, including modification strategies to intensify or soften the force of the directives. Next, I will examine incidents of misunderstandings and strategies for facilitation of understanding employed by Francesco and the L2 users. Then, I will discuss the relational work that is revealed in the interactions. I will end this section on the Misericordia training with an analysis of a longer sequence to provide a more discursive analysis of a directive encounter in the interaction with examples of the features discussed in the analysis in context.

Directives. Francesco used an abundance of directives in the session - over five-hundred in the ninety-minute session; most procedural and instructional due to the training context. Francesco would often first describe and/or demonstrate the steps and physical maneuvers involved in various tasks and then ask us to carry them out. Francesco would often repeat the direction as we were performing the tasks. At times, he would describe how a maneuver should be carried out in a hypothetical situation in the future. Throughout the training session, Francesco reiterated that the priority was the safety of the patients, stating: "dobbiamo fare il meglio per il

paziente" (we must do what's best for the patient, line 481). In this section I will give an overview of the directive forms Francesco used including any modification strategies that appeared in the interactions that had the effect of either mitigating or reinforcing the directives in the interactions.

Turning first to directive forms, Table 6 shows there were a total of 501 directives in both activities, the majority during the ambulance activity (304) than during the CPR training (197), even though the two sessions lasted approximately the same amount of time. Francesco's directives in the interactions were in the form of imperatives (70%) and declaratives (30%) during both activities. No interrogatives were used. The fact that the most common form of directive Francesco used in the interactions was the imperative aligns with findings at the other

Table 7: Misericordia - Directives

	Imperatives	Declaratives	Interrogatives	Total Directives
Ambulance activity	210	94	0	304
CPR activity	133	64	0	197
Total	343	158	0	501

sites in this study as well as previous research on directive use in institutional settings which found that supervisors most typically use the imperative when the roles of the interactants are clearly defined (Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003; Vine, 2004). Francesco was in a position of authority in relation to the L2 users in this context as both the leader of the training session and as the volunteer coordinator for the Misericordia. The roles were clearly defined with Francesco in a position of having superior knowledge about the subject matter.

Many directives were in elliptical forms in which either the verb, agent or complement were not stated. Elliptical forms were used when the agent and the nature of the task that needed to be performed were clear from the context. There were examples of ellipticals in which there was no verb or agent, only a complement in the form of a directional word, for example "su" (up), or simply a verb as in "ferma" (stop). In the ambulance activity, ellipticals were often used with repetition during moments of high intensity in the midst of a maneuver with the stretcher as in this example:

Excerpt 3.1 - MIS-SL, 173

1	FRA:	solleva leggermente **giù giù** ora	1	FRA:	lift slightly **down down** now
2		**giù giù giù giù**	2		**down down down down**

In this turn Francesco was directing Samantha as she was attempting to collapse the stretcher. She needed to lift a lever and then to push it down. As she was performing these moves, Francesco guided her with his direction. He repeated the directional word "giù" (down, lines 1-2) several times as she was pushing down to indicate how far down the stretcher had to go. In this case, it was clear to Samantha what she needed to do based on the contextual cues such as Francesco's previous explanation and the physicality of the required move, and therefore the elliptical form sufficed. Since many of the actions during the training were being demonstrated by Francesco and we could see what he was doing, it was common for him to use elliptical forms in his directives.

Francesco's imperatives varied according to agent throughout the interactions. The majority of the imperatives were in the second person singular and plural directed at Samantha and/or I depending on whether the directive was aimed at one or both of the L2 users. In the following selection Samantha and I were working together to try to collapse the stretcher.

Excerpt 3.2 - MIS-SL, 3-5

1	FRA:	**mettete le mani** sulla	1	FRA:	**put your hands** on the iron
2		parte in ferro **non**	2		part **don't touch anything**
3		**toccate** niente di mobile	3		that moves everything
4		tutto fuori carello	4		outside the
5		posteriore si apre	5		back cart opens

Francesco directed us to each take in hand the metal part of the stretcher and to not touch parts that might move as we transported it, using the imperative in the affirmative and the negative. This type of maneuver, which required us to work in unison, was more common in the ambulance activity than in the CPR training where we worked individually on simulation tasks.

Francesco at times used the first person plural of the imperative in his directives to refer to an action to be done by the volunteers only. The first person plural usually refers to the speaker and the hearer and allows the speaker "to conceptualize the speaker and hearer as one group linked to the addresser thus suggesting a closer link between them" (DeCock, 2011, p. 2763). In this inclusive form of the first person plural, both the speaker and the hearer are intended to be in the group referred to in the utterance. When the speaker is not included in the group, it can be referred to as the "inverted we" case, as in the example of a teacher admonishing a student for not doing homework as in "We didn't study very much did we?" The "we" does not include the teacher in this case and it was the student who did not study (Bazzanella, 2002, p. 245). Using the "inverted we" form can be a way to reduce the social distance between the speaker and the hearer as a way to build rapport (Bazzanella, 2002). In the following selection, Francesco used the first person plural in a directive aimed at Samantha and me. Immediately prior to the directive encounter below we had attempted to lift the stretcher up into the ambulance and failed because we had not coordinated our moves. Francesco then reminded us that we needed to work together.

Excerpt 3.3 - MIS-SL, 204-205

1	FRA:	**ci deve essere**	1	FRA:	**there should be**
2		**coordinatament**o ora	2		**coordination** now go to
3		**andate** al metà altezza	3		the halfway height
4	SAM:	ok	4	SAM:	ok
5	RES:	oh	5	RES:	oh
6	FRA:	quindi **cerchiamo di farlo**	6	FRA:	then **let's try to do it**
7		**insieme** questa volta tu tiri	7		**together** this time you pull
8		questa e ti prepari a	8		this and you get ready to
9		premere tu prendi solo la	9		press you take only the
10		leva verde puoi fare un	10		green lever you can make a
11		piccolo scatto	11		small click

Francesco began the directive encounter with the existential "there" and the modal "must/should", stating the need for the movements to be coordinated (lines 1-2). By removing the agent the directive was less face-threatening to us in that we were not directly named responsible for completing the task. By framing it as a general procedural requirement Francesco is distancing himself and us from the directive. Since this was a correction to our previous uncoordinated move, it was less of an affront to our face than if he had stated directly that we had performed the task incorrectly. In the same turn, Francesco used a more explicit directive in by identifying the agents in the verb case ("go", line 3). He directed us to bring the stretcher to the midway point in height. Francesco then restated his previous directive regarding coordinating the movements using the inverted "we" form ("let's try to do it together this time", lines 6-7). Francesco framed the directive as a proposal using the inclusive form "let's" which typically indicates that the speaker is part of the group. However, in this case the directive was meant only for the volunteers. As noted, usage of the first person plural form for a hearer-only centered directive, the inverted first person plural, can have the effect of minimizing the social distance between the speaker and hearer(s) and of softening the force of the directive (Vine, 2004). In addition, by

including himself in the directive, Francesco has lessened the face-threatening nature of the directive (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Banzzanella also notes that in Italian culture the inverted "we" would only be appropriate if used by the person of higher position of power, as in this situation. Later in the same turn, Francesco clarified who should do which movements by using the subject pronoun ("you") for emphasis ("you pull", line 7; " you take", line 9), which confirms that the directive was meant for Samantha and me, despite the fact that Francesco used the inclusive first person plural.

Francesco also used agentless imperatives in the interactions in the infinitive (see Table 8), a form that does not exist in English (Murcis-Bielsa, 2000). In Italian, infinitives as directives, also used in Spanish, are commonly found in written instructions, recipes, or public signs. It is less

Table 8: Misericordia - Infinitives as directives

prendere cosi	take (it) like this
premere nel mezzo	press it in the middle
schiacciare entrambi le leve	press both levers
iperestendere più la testa	hyperextend the head more

common to use infinitives as directives in spoken language (Murcia-Bielsa, 2000). Much of the language used by Francesco was instructional therefore an objectivized form with no named subject fit the context of a training session. As with ellipticals, directives in the infinitive were only used when it was clear who the agent(s) was/were, either directly stated previously in the same turn or because of the physical proximity of the L2 user(s). In the following example, Francesco was directing Samantha while she was trying to maneuver the stretcher into position inside the ambulance.

Excerpt 3.4 - MIS-SL, 237

1	FRA:	**tiri** quella rossa e **spingi spingi**	1	FRA:	**pull** that red one and **push**
2		**spingi** poi la leva verde e **spingi**	2		**push push** then the green lever
3		vai e **spingi schiacciare**	3		and **push** go and **push**
4		entrambi le leve e appoggia la	4		**squeeze** both the levers and rest
5		barella sul fianco	5		the stretcher on its side

Francesco used a declarative directive "(you) pull" (line 1) in which the subject was clear from the verb inflection in Italian. It was followed by several repeated imperatives in the second person singular in which Francesco was directing Samantha to push and then squeeze the levers. In line 4, after a series of imperatives he used the infinitive of "squeeze". It was not necessary to name the agent in this case because it was clear from the context. Based on the examples found in the interactions, this form was used as an alternative to the imperative when there was a series of instructions being given and the agent was understood from the context.

In summary, in both activities Francesco primarily used imperatives in the second person singular and plural when giving direction to one or both of the L2 users about how to perform the technical maneuvers that were typical in both the ambulance and CPR activities. On occasion, Francesco used the first person plural when referring only to the volunteers, an inclusionary move that emphasized the fact that the L2 users were becoming part of the a larger community at the Misericordia. Ellipticals were used at times when it was clear who the agent was and infinitives were used as imperatives when the verb, subject or complement were easily understood from the context.

The remaining directives Francesco used throughout the training session were declaratives formed with modals, as hypotheticals, and as passives. The most common

declarative form was with the modal "must". Table 9 shows the frequency of declaratives with modals with the verb "must" categorized by subject.

Table 9: Misericordia - Directives with the modal "dovere" (must)

Example #	Case	Number in the corpus	Example from the transcript / Translation (line(s) in the transcript)
1	3rd person singular	12	"la barella deve essere sempre orrizontale"/ the stretcher must always be horizontal (72-73)
2	2nd person singular	7	"devi essere perpendiculare al paziente"/ you have to be perpendicular to the patient (1497)
3	2nd person plural	6	"dovete stare attenti" / you (both) need to be careful (744)
4	1st person plural	6	dobbiamo comportarci come tecnici / we must behave like technicians (482)
5	3rd person plural	1	"quelle persone devono essere trasportati così" / the patients must be transported like this (27)

The most frequent form of the directive using the modal "must" was the third person singular or impersonal form as in the example 1 in Table 9: "the stretcher must always be horizontal". As with the infinitive form, the third person impersonal form is agentless and therefore can be considered less face-threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Although no one was specifically named as the focus of the directive, it was clear from the context that Samantha and I were expected do perform the action because the directive came from Francesco. The purpose for us

being there was to follow his instructions and it would have been inappropriate if we had refused. Francesco used this type of instructional language to objectively describe the way things should be rather than a directive aimed at one person in particular.

The more direct and potentially face-threatening forms with the modal "must" were those in the second person singular and plural in which the agent was stated directly. There were relatively few of this type of directive, however; only thirteen out of 501 total directives. They were often used to clarify a previous directive, as in this case when Samantha and I were trying to collapse the stretcher and Francesco was telling us which levers to press.

Excerpt 3.5 - MIS-SL, 291

1	FRA:	al verde **premi tiri** e **premi**	1	FRA:	**press** on the green **pull** and
2		questa non vi coordinate è	2		**press** this don't do it
3		la stessa questa va bene	3		together it doesn't matter
4		anche insieme	4		this is fine together too
5	RES:	Ok uno due tre via giù	5	RES:	ok one two three go down
6	FRA:	il verde **devi premere**	6	FRA:	the green one **you have to**
7		il verde	7		press the green one

Francesco first stated the directives in the imperative (lines 1-2), but I had forgotten which lever to press and which one to pull. It was necessary then for Francesco to correct me as we were engaged in the maneuver ("the green one you have to press the green one", lines 6-7) using the more explicit directive to indicate that only one of us had it wrong. In another exchange, Francesco used the modal "must" in the second person singular with the second person pronoun ("you) to be more even more direct about whose responsibility the action was. Francesco was telling us how to move a patient from the floor to the cloth stretcher by first rolling the patient on his or her side and then onto the stretcher. He used repetition and an imperative to guide our movements (line 1).

Excerpt 3.6 - MIS-SL, 421-425

1	FRA:	**vai su su su su** ok	1	FRA:	**go up up up up** ok **let's put**
2		**mettiamo sotto** basta poi	2		**it down** enough then on
3		noi di qua solleviamo di	3		this side **let's lift up**
4		spalla fianco gamba su	4		shoulder hip leg
5	SAM:	**io?**	5	SAM:	**me?**
6	FRA:	**e te devi estrarre di qua**	6	FRA:	and **you need to pull out of**
7		con queste qua e andiamo	7		**here** with these and we'll
8		giù	8		go down
9	RES:	ok	9	RES:	ok

Francesco then used two verbs inflected in the first person plural form ("let's put it down", line 2; "let's lift up", line 3) this time he was also involved in the task. Samantha then asked the clarifying question ("me?", line 5) and Francesco used the pronoun (you, line 6) to emphasize that she would perform the maneuver ("you need to pull out here", lines 6-7). The modal in the second person singular was used with the pronoun ("you") for clarity in response to Samantha's question.

Francesco used the first person plural with the modal "must" as an inclusionary device when describing rules for appropriate behavior at the Misericordia. These can be considered general procedural directives rather than instructional directives related to the task they were involved with in that moment. In the interaction below, Francesco was explaining to us that when you carry a patient out of their home, they may request to be taken out head first on the stretcher based on a superstition that if one leaves his/her home feet-first on a stretcher they will never return, i.e. they will die. We asked how we should handle that situation, whether we should adhere to the wishes of the patient or not. Francesco's responded:

Excerpt 3.7 - MIS-SL, 480-484

1	FRA:	**dobbiamo fare il meglio**	1	FRA:	**we must do our best**
2		**per il paziente**	2		**for the patient**
3	RES:	ok	3	RES:	ok

4	FRA:	**noi siamo tecnici** quindi	4	FRA:	**we are technicians** so
5		**dobbiamo comportarci**	5		**we must behave** like
6		come tecnici	6		technicians

Francesco was giving us general guidelines for how to behave. By using the pronoun "we" he was including us in the community of Misericordia volunteers. Therefore, in this case the use of the modal "must" was not face-threatening, and can be interpreted as a solidarity move minimizing the distance between us and Francesco.

Francesco also used two declarative forms in the passive voice that are not found in English. They are formed with the verb "andare" (to go) or "venire" (to come) and the past participle, as in the following examples:

"questo non **va toccato**"	this should not be touched (231)
"questa **viene fatto**"	this needs to be done (581)

In the first example, I was guiding the stretcher and had touched a part that I should not have. Francesco used the impersonal, agentless directive. It was not a critical action, that is I was in no danger at the time of dropping the stretcher or harming anyone and there was no sense of urgency in his directive. For that reason he was able to use a more indirect form. Also, it was clear from the context that he was talking to me, and there was no need to state the agent. In the second example ("this needs to be done"), Francesco was describing an action that he remembered we had not completed. In both cases, the directive referred to the tasks we were involved with at the moment rather than general procedural rules.

Hints are considered an indirect type of directive as they do not explicitly state the directive and they "require more inferencing activity on the part of the hearer" in order to understand the statement as a directive (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, p. 280). Hints differ from third person impersonal or agentless declaratives in that they are statements that could have a meaning

unrelated to a directive, which makes them particularly challenging for L2 users to interpret as directives. Below is an example of a hint from the CPR training activity when Samantha was simulating mouth-to-mouth resuscitation on the mannequin. After her first attempt, Francesco wanted to communicate to her that she was not opening her mouth wide enough to cover the mouth of the mannequin, which was necessary to be effective. He stated: "kisses are what you give to your boyfriend", line 1). Samantha's response denied Francesco's critique ("I didn't do it", line 2) Francesco then repeated his statement in English in order to clarify ("kisses only to

Excerpt 3.8 - MIS-SL, 1418-1422

1	FRA:	**i bacini si danno al fidanzato**	1	FRA:	**kisses you give to your**
2	SAM:	**non ho fatto**	2		**boyfriend**
3	FRA:	*kisses only to boyfriends*	3	SAM:	**I didn't do it**
4	SAM:	oh ok ho una domanda	4	FRA:	*kisses only to boyfriends*
5		quando	5	SAM:	oh ok I have question when
6	FRA:	apri molto la bocca *open wide*	6	FRA:	open your mouth wide *open*
7		*your mouth*	7		*wide your mouth*
8	SAM:	si um	8	SAM:	si um

boyfriends", line 3). Samantha then responded as if she had finally understood ("oh ok", line 4) and stated that she wanted to ask Francesco a different question, a sign that she had understood his statement and was ready to move on to a new topic. However, Francesco was not sure she had understood his directive, as he then rephrased the directive in a more explicit way, first in Italian and then repeated in English ("apri molto la bocca open wide your mouth", lines 6-7). Samantha acknowledged that she had understood his explanation and then moved on to ask him a question in English. Francesco took three turns to give the directive that was expressed originally as a hint in order to be sure Samantha had understood. This shows how important it was to Francesco that we understand each step before proceeding with the training.

Modification can either attenuate or intensify the force of a speech act and can be internal to the head act or external language surrounding the head act. In this section I will discuss internal and external modification of the directives on the syntactic, lexical and discursive levels. Table 10 shows examples of mitigation strategies used by Francesco to soften the force of a directive and examples of modification strategies that had the effect of intensifying the force of the directive.

Table 10: Misericordia - Modification of directives

Morpho-syntactic (internal to the head act)		
Mood	Conditional "eviterei di fare cosi"	"I **would avoid** doing that"
Perspective	3rd person (impersonal) "la barella si lascia con la testa verso le scale"	"the stretcher you leave with the head towards the stairs"
	1st person singular "io preferisco stare così e non così"	**"I** prefer to stand like this and not like this"
Modal	Can "andiamo qua **mi puoi aiutare** guidando le ruottole davanti dentro"	"let's go here **you can help me** guiding the front wheels inside"
Lexical / phrasal (internal to the head act)		
Politeness marker	"conta **pure** in inglese"	go ahead and count in English
Hedges	"puoi contare anche in inglese **se vuoi"**	you can **also** count in English **if you want**

Table 10 (continued): Misericordia - Modification of directives

Supportive moves (external to the head act)		
Hypothetical "if clauses"	"**se** scendi con le gambe strette batti le ginocchia nella barella"	"if you go down (the stairs) with straight legs you will hit your knees on the stretcher"
Grounders; explanations	[original in English] "this is important **because** if you make a mistake now the patient go down"	

Morphosyntactic (internal to the head act)		
Modal	must, have to ("dovere") "il verde **devi premere** il verde"	"the green one **you must** press the green one"
Superlative	"quel movimento è **pericolosissimo**"	"that movement is **very dangerous**"

Lexical/ phrasal (internal to the head act)		
Repetition	"vieni vieni ferma ferma ferma"	"come come stop stop stop"
Warning	"no no così è pericoloso"	"no no like that is dangerous"

Francesco employed mitigation strategies during the training session as a way to attend to the face needs of the volunteers. It was important that we not be overwhelmed by too much information or take offense due to face-threatening language. If so, we may not be inclined to return as volunteers and the training session would have been a waste of time and resources. Francesco used both internal and external mitigation strategies throughout the session, which served to downgrade the imposition and the weight of the directives. A mitigating device internal to the head act is the use of the conditional. According to Blum-Kulka, et al (1989), use of the conditional in a directive is considered a mitigation strategy if it is optional, "i.e., it has to be replaceable by an indicative form" (p. 282). In the first example shown in Table 10a, it would make sense as a directive if the verb "avoid" was not in the conditional but in the imperative "avoid doing that". Francesco instead formed the directive in the hypothetical using the conditional form of the verb "evitare" (to avoid) when describing the proper way to hold the stretcher when taking a patient down the stairs:

Excerpt 3.9 - MIS-SL, 434-444

1	FRA:	**io preferisco stare così** e	1	FRA:	**I prefer to stand like this** and
2		non così	2		not like this
3	RES:	oh ok	3	RES:	oh ok
4	FRA:	**eviterei di fare così** perche'	4	FRA:	**I'd avoid doing this** since I'm
5		faccio forza sulle dita	5		putting pressure on my fingers
6	RES:	mm	6	RES:	mm
7	FRA:	**mi posso far male** se sono	7	FRA:	**I can hurt myself** if I'm on
8		sul pulso anche se la mano	8		the wrist even if my hand
9		non tiene il pulso tiene da	9		doesn't have the wrist it will
10		se	10		stay on its own
11	RES:	si ok	11	RES:	yes ok

Francesco began the directive sequence by stating his preference for performing the task in a certain way. Among peers, this could be understood to be a suggestion. However, due

Francesco's superior knowledge and expertise in this context and his position as trainer, I understood it as a directive, as indicated by my response ("oh ok", line 3). In this following turn, Francesco again stated the directive from his perspective, this time using the conditional form ("I would avoid", line 4) adding an explanation, or "grounder" that is considered an external supportive move that further mitigates the directive (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989). In lines 7-10 Francesco continued the explanation from his perspective. An explanation, according to Blum-Kulka (1992), appeals to the hearer as an equal who should have an understanding of why s/he is being asked to perform a task. This excerpt illustrates Francesco's use of the conditional and the I-perspective, which put the focus of the directive on the speaker rather than the hearer. He framed the directive as a suggestion by stating it as a hypothetical. By using himself as the subject of the directive rather than the hearer, he decreased the imposition on the hearer, thus attending to the face needs of the hearer. It also diminished the relational distance between the speaker and hearer by using his preference for how to perform the task as a directive and including himself in the task. Stating what he would do in a similar situation was an inclusionary move drawing attention to the fact that he and the trainees are part of the same community. Not only does it serve to mitigate the force of the directive, it also has an effect on the interpersonal relationship between the interlocutors.

Francesco used agentless directives throughout the interactions ("the stretcher you leave with the head towards the stairs"). Leaving the addressee out of the directive is known as a type of "shield" (Caffi, 1999) in which the responsibility for the act is not assigned to anyone in particular thereby minimizing the responsibility of the hearer to perform the task. However, in contrast to the directives from the I-perspective, in the impersonal "there is a defocalization of the speaker as the agent of the utterance, which is assigned to another impersonal source, that is

made more authoritative and unquestionable by the channel (written code) and by the use of the technical register" (Caffi, 1999, p. 896). Both the impersonal directives and the infinitive form of the directives, emphasize the procedures and code of conduct of the organization rather than the trainer as an individual. This also has the effect of reducing the social distance between speakers and hearer as both being required to follow the directives of the organization as a whole.

In the following selection there are examples of three additional mitigating devices: the use of the modal "can", the additive "also", and the tag phrase "if you want" all in the same turn. Samantha was performing chest compressions on the mannequin during the CPR training. It was necessary for her to maintain a certain speed and rhythm with the compressions while counting out loud to thirty. Samantha started counting in Italian but could not say the words fast enough to perform the compressions in a steady rhythm. Francesco tried to coerce Samantha to count in English.

Excerpt 3.10 - MIS-SL, 1396-1407

1	FRA:	**conta a voce alta**	1	FRA:	**count out loud**
2	SAM:	sei sette otto nove	2	SAM:	six seven eight nine
3	FRA:	**puoi contare anche in inglese**	3	FRA:	**you can count also in**
4		**se vuoi**	4		**English if you want**
5	SAM:	dodici tredici quindici sedici	5	SAM:	twelve thirteen fifteen sixteen
6		diciasette diciotto diciannove	6		seventeen eighteen nineteen
7		venti ventuno ventidue ventitre	7		twenty twenty-one twenty
8		ventiquattro venticinque	8		two twenty-three twenty-four
9		ventisei ventisette vent'otto	9		twenty-five twenty-six
10		ventinove trenta	10		twenty-seven twenty-eight
11	FRA:	questo è il motivo per cui ti ho	11		twenty-nine thirty
12		detto conta pure in inglese	12	FRA:	this is the reason that I said go
13		perchè dovete	13		ahead and count in English
14		essere	14		because you both need to be-
15	SAM:	ok	15	SAM:	ok
16	FRA:	perchè dovete essere veloce e	16	FRA:	because you have to be fast
17		ogni colpo devo durare sempre	17		and every compression has to
18		lo stesso tempo	18		last the same amount of time
19	SAM:	ok **un buon consiglio**	19	SAM:	ok **good advice**

He began with an imperative directing Samantha to "count out loud" (line 1). When Samantha began counting in Italian, he used the modal "can" (line 2). This is considered an imbedded imperative (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). Although there is a literal meaning of being able to do something, it is easily recognizable as a directive unless the action is "not feasible or appropriate" (p. 33).

There are two examples of lexical mitigation external to the head act in Francesco's directive "you can count also in English if you want". "Also" is not necessary to the directive and adds no new information but is used to buffer or "shield" the head act of the directive from the hearer. Finally, the last phrase "se vuoi" (if you want, line 4) is another phrase that is optional to the directive yet gives the hearer the freedom to choose whether or not to comply with the directive, thus attending to her positive face. The directive is phrased as a proposal that the hearer could choose to accept or not. Looking at the directive in the larger context of the interaction shows, however, that Francesco meant it as a command rather than a suggestion, since the way the counting was done was important to performing the action effectively. His choice to use an indirect, mitigated directive was based more on relational work than on the goal of completing the task properly. In Francesco's next two turns, however, he gave explanations for his strong suggestion that she count in English (lines 12-14; 16-18). In the last line, Samantha revealed that she had, however, viewed the directive as "advice" (line 19) rather than a directive. Samantha challenged the notion of Francesco as the expert in this situation. In the end, however, she did comply with his directive to count in English.

Mitigation strategies that are external to the head act include hypothetical statements and explanations. By stating a directive as a hypothetical it reduces the sense of urgency and its force

(Caffi, 1999). In the example in Table 13 Francesco was instructing the volunteers how to carry a stretcher down the stairs:

"se scendi con le gambe strette batti le ginocchia nella barella"	"if you go down (the stairs) with straight legs you will hit your knees on the stretcher"

It was important to keep the knees bent on the way down or we would get hurt. Rather than give us an explicit directive using the imperative "keep your knees bent", Francesco instead gave us a warning by stating the consequences of us walking incorrectly down the stairs. Stating it in the hypothetical removes the directive from the "here - now" (Caffi, 1999, p. 896) to a "fictionalized" reality and thus shifts the responsibility away from both the speaker and the hearer. That is, Francesco described the situation as if it was something that could happen rather than something that was actually happening in that moment, even though it was. It is considered a directive, however, because he was compelling us to change the way we were carrying the stretcher, for our own protection and in order to complete the task in the proper way. Francesco would often use a hypothetical to give us a warning about a potential mishap. Table 11 shows some examples of warnings from the interactions:

Table 11: Misericordia - Directives as warnings

1st person singular	mi posso far male se sono sul palco	I can hurt myself if I'm on the bench
2nd person singular	se scendi con le gambe strette batti le ginocchia nella barella	if you go down with straight legs you will hit your knees on the stretcher
	attenzione alla schiena	be careful of your back
	prendi il mal di vita	you will hurt your lower back
	you never pull up	you never pull up
	non toccare le leve	don't touch the levers

Table 11 (continued): Misericordia - Directives as warnings

3rd person impersonal	cosi e' pericoloso	that way is dangerous
	questo non deve succedere	this should not happen
	la barella dell'ambulanza può scendere quindi occhio	the stretcher can fall out of the ambulance so be careful
	questo movimento è pericolossisimo	this movement is very dangerous

The warnings were given primarily for the safety of the hearer or future patients and were often strong directives in which Francesco stated clearly the consequences of performing the procedure incorrectly. The above examples in the first person singular form, Francesco made himself the subject of the warning, which had the effect of minimizing the distance between the L2 users and him. He put himself in the hypothetical position of the volunteers as he was demonstrating the ambulance maneuvers or CPR to the volunteers. Warnings in the second person singular were the most direct. They warned the L2 users about potentially painful consequences of performing a task in an incorrect way. And the warnings in the third person singular have the effect of hints in that there is not explicit directive but the warning itself is a strong hint that something should or should not be done.

A final external mitigation strategy Francesco employed in the interactions was to either preface or follow a directive with an explanation. Blum-Kulka, et al (1989) refer to this type of mitigation as "grounders". Often this type of mitigation would follow a particularly strong directive or a warning as in this directive encounter:

Excerpt 3.11 - MIS-SL, 144-147

1	FRA:	**vieni vieni ferma ferma**	1	FRA:	**come come stop stop stop**
2		**ferma** ecco con questo pulso	2		here with this wrist on the
3		a terra ora **e' importante che**	3		ground now **it's important**

4		**tu tenga qua perche' se le**	4		**that you hold here because**
5		**gambe davanti non si**	5		**if the front leg doesn't**
6		**aprissero** questo andrebbe a	**6**		**open** this would fall to the
7		terra	7		ground
8	RES:	ho capito	8	RES:	I understand

In this situation, we were attempting to collapse the stretcher to prepare it to be lifted into the ambulance. In lines 1-2 Samantha and I were performing the task and Francesco was using repetition of short imperatives to direct our maneuvers. We were not successful, however ("ferma ferma ferma"/ stop stop stop, 1), and he explained what we did wrong. The use of explanations is considered a supportive move and is often found in the language surrounding unmodified head acts such as those in line 1 of Excerpt 3.11 (Vine, 2004). Explanations can serve to increase the willingness of the hearer to comply with the directive. During the Misericordia training, there was high likelihood of our compliance with Francesco's directives even without an explanation due to our clear role as trainees. Since the explanation was not a necessary part of the directive, it can be considered to be a move to mitigate the potentially face-threatening imperatives in the previous turn.

Francesco also used modification strategies to reinforce or intensify a directive, particularly on occasions when the directive were related to an act being carried out at that moment rather than at a hypothetical time in the future. As discussed regarding the above selection, Francesco used repetition in the most critical moment of the task, when we were attempting to collapse the stretcher. We were not doing it properly and Francesco used repetition to gain our attention and force us to stop: "ferma ferma ferma" (stop stop stop, line 1). This type of repetition using the elliptical form was used when it was clear who was doing the action and

what needed to be done and when something needed to be done immediately. In that case, there was a chance the stretcher would fall to the ground and hurt us.

Another modification strategy meant to reinforce the head act was the use of the superlative suffix "issimo" as in the example "quel movimento è pericolosissimo" that movement is very dangerous. This form was only used once during the interactions to intensify a warning. At the time I was performing a maneuver incorrectly in a way that would be cause me pain if I continued. Francesco communicated the seriousness of the directive by using the superlative form.

In summary, it is not surprising that the majority of Francesco's directives in the interactions were of the transactional nature, related to the task that was being performed. Even more procedural or general directives about conduct at the Misericordia were related to the task we were engaged in at the moment. However, the fact that Francesco used a variety of mitigation devices showed that he was interested in attending to the face needs of the participants as well. The use of the impersonal, hypothetical, and passive forms all had the effect of removing the hearer from the responsibility of complying with the directive. Francesco did not want to overwhelm us or scare us away from wanting to return as volunteers. He also employed linguistic strategies that helped to minimize the distance between speaker and hearer, such as the first person plural, as a reminder to the trainees that we were in the process of becoming part of a larger community of volunteers at the Misericordia.

Samantha did not use any directives in the interactions. The majority of her turns at talk (158 out of 302) were backchannels such as "ok" or "ah si" to confirm understanding of Francesco's directives. Her remaining turns were often clarification questions or requests for

more information, either about the meaning of a word or the way a maneuver was performed. Her strategies for understanding will be discussed in detail in the following section.

Misunderstanding. In order to address research question two (In what ways do L2 users and local Italian speakers negotiate (mis)understanding in the directives?), examples of breakdowns in communication between L2 users and the local Italian speakers in the interactions were first identified and then analyzed.

The most common type of misunderstanding revealed in the interactions during the Misericordia training session were on the lexical level, in which one of the L2 users did not know the meaning of an Italian word or phrase Francesco used during the training session. Rather than misinterpreting the word, Samantha or I would indicate not knowing the meaning of the word in Italian by either repeating the word or phrase with a final rising intonation or ask a confirmation question as in the selections below:

Excerpt 3.12 - MIS-SL, 408-413

1	FRA:	due persone leva	1	FRA:	two people take your hands
2		le mani una mano qui spalla	2		off one hand here shoulder
3		fianco	3		hip
4	SAM:	**fianco è hip?**	4	SAM:	"**fianco" is *hip*?**
5	FRA:	hip	5	FRA:	hip
6	SAM:	ok	6	SAM:	ok
7	FRA:	hip knee ginocchio	7	FRA:	hip knee "ginocchio"
8	SAM:	ok	8	SAM:	ok

In this interaction, Francesco was describing the correct placement of hands during a move to position a person on a cloth stretcher. Samantha asked Francesco to confirm the meaning of "fianco" (line 4). Francesco responded by repeating the English translation, which reaffirmed Samantha's understanding of the meaning of the word "fianco" was correct. Samantha showed her understanding by using the token "ok" (line 6). In the following turn, Francesco repeated the word "hip" and added the term for 'knee' in Italian "ginocchio" (line 7) possibly anticipating that

Samantha was unfamiliar that term. Samantha, therefore, had used a clarifying question to confirm the meaning of a word in Italian. At other times when she did not know the meaning of an Italian word, Samantha would simply repeat the word with a final rising tone as in the following example:

Excerpt 3.13 - MIS-SL, 660-666

1	FRA:	sotto c'e' una specie di	1	FRA:	underneath there's a kind of
2		binario e un gancio che poi	2		track and a hook that will
3		scende	3		come down
4	SAM:	**gancio?**	4	SAM:	**"gancio?"**
5	FRA:	gancio è a hook	5	FRA:	"gancio" is *a hook*
6	SAM:	ok	6	SAM:	ok
7	FRA:	uncino	7	FRA:	little hook
8	SAM:	ok	8	SAM:	ok

Here Francesco was explaining that the stretcher stays in place inside the ambulance because of the small hooks underneath that fit into tracks. Samantha expressed her non-understanding of the word "hook" by repeating it with rising intonation indicating she needed further explanation from Francesco about the meaning of the word. Francesco then repeated the word with its English translation. Samantha acknowledged her understanding ("ok", line 6) and then Francesco gave another word with a similar meaning ("uncino"/ little hook, line 7) and Samantha again signaled her understanding ("ok", line 8). In this interaction, as in the previous selection, Francesco introduced Samantha to new Italian words that were beyond the scope of her performing the task, confirming his role as teacher of Italian as well as trainer for the Misericordia in this context.

At times Samantha used a token of non-understanding when she did not know the meaning of an Italian word as in the following example when Francesco asked her a question she could not answer:

Excerpt 3.14 - MIS-SL, 690-695

1	FRA:	sei destra o mancina?	1	FRA:	are your right or left-handed?
2	SAM:	**uh**	2	SAM:	**uh**
3	FRA:	**right handed or left-handed**?	3	FRA:	***right handed or left-handed****?*
4	SAM:	left handed	4	SAM:	*left handed*
5	FRA:	left handed	5	FRA:	*left handed*
6	SAM:	ok	6	SAM:	ok

In this sequence Francesco was explaining that the task required us to stand with our strongest foot forward. When he asked whether Samantha was right or left-handed (line 1) Samantha could not answer because she did not know the meaning as indicated by her non-verbal response of "uh" (line 2). Francesco repeated part of the question in English ("right handed or left handed", line 3) and Samantha then replied in English that she is left-handed (line 4). The fact that Francesco did not repeat the word for left-handed in Italian may be an indication that in this instance clarity and understanding of the directions took precedence over teaching Samantha the Italian word for left-handed ("mancina", line 1). Or it is possible that Francesco switched to English as a supportive move towards Samantha.

As in previous examples, Francesco also used codeswitching to English as well as repetition when the directions were complex involving several steps and coordinated movements. In this example, early in the ambulance training, Francesco was explaining how to collapse the stretcher only to half-height. In this case Francesco began with the explanation in Italian and then he paraphrased the directive in English (line 4). Francesco was not prompted by an indication of non-understanding by one of the L2

Excerpt 3.15 - MIS-SL, 62-64

1	FRA:	per mettere la barella	1	FRA:	to put the stretcher
2		giu io devo schiacciare le	2		down I need to squeeze
3		leve io sollevo leggermente	3		the levers I lift up slightly
4		te premi verso il basso **I**	4		you push down ***I pull just***
5		**pull just a little and you**	5		***a little and you***
6		**push down**	6		***push down***

users; he likely repeated the directive in English for clarity. This was the first time Samantha performed this rather complicated maneuver in which she had to push down while Francesco was pulling up. Due to the weight of the stretcher, if performed incorrectly the move could have resulted in injury to Samantha or Francesco, therefore, it was important that she understood the directions clearly. Therefore, Francesco employed codeswitching from Italian to English throughout the training session as a way to facilitate understanding even when there was no indication of misunderstanding from the trainees. Francesco explained in the following excerpt why he would at times switch to English during the training session:

Excerpt 3.16 - MIS-SL, 543-553

1	FRA:	questo il telino si arruotola	1	FRA:	this the cloth is rolled
2		da rovescio	2		inside out
3	RES:	si a-	3	RES:	yes on-
4	SAM:	ok	4	SAM:	ok
5	RES:	a rovescio	5	RES:	inside out
6	FRA:	on the reverse side	6	FRA:	*on the reverse side*
7	SAM:	ok	7	SAM:	ok
8	RES:	reverse yeah	8	RES:	*reverse yeah*
9	FRA:	**e piu' corta e viene piu'**	9	FRA:	**it's shorter and comes**
10		**facile tradurre che non**	10		**more easily to translate**
11		**spiegare meglio in italiano**	11		**than to explain better in**
12		**è pigrizia mia**	12		**Italian it's my laziness**
13	RES:	va bene	13	RES:	ok
14	FRA:	si vede che **non sono**	14	FRA:	you can see **I'm not a**
15		**un'insegnante**	15		**teacher**

During this interaction, Francesco was demonstrating that the cloth stretcher we were using in the task needed to be rolled up inside out. He was not sure that we understood the term "a rovescio" (inside out) perhaps because I had repeated it (line 5), although not with a rising intonation, and translated it into English ("on the reverse side", line 6). In his next turn, Francesco explained that it was easier for him to give the meaning of a word or phrase in English than explain it in Italian, which he attributed to his "laziness" (line 12) and the fact that he is "not a teacher" (lines' 14-15). His comment was ironic and contradicted the fact that his role in the training session was the teacher/trainer. Contrary to Francesco's point about being too "lazy" to explain the meaning of words in Italian, he frequently gave explanations of procedures and the meaning of technical terms in Italian without translating in English, as in the following exchange:

Excerpt 3.17 - MIS-SL, 615-616

1	FRA:	allora la barella si usa per	1	FRA:	so the stretcher is used for
2		persone che non caminano la	2		people who don't walk the
3		parola tecnica si chiamano	3		technical term they are called
4		persone **non deambulanti**	4		**non-ambulatory** people
5	RES:	non deambulanti	5	RES:	non-ambulatory
6	FRA:	dea- **allora deambulare vuol**	6	FRA:	amb- so **ambulate means**
7		**dire la parola medica per**			**the medical word for to**
8		**caminare**	8		**walk**
9	RES:	ah ok	9	RES:	ah ok
10	FRA:	**quindi non deambulante**	10	FRA:	then **non-ambulatory means**
11		**vuol dire una persona che**	11		**a person who is not able to**
12		**non e' in grado di caminare**	12		**walk**
13	SAM:	ok	13	SAM:	ok

In this interaction while Francesco was explaining that the stretcher we had just used was for people who are unable to walk he used the term " non deambulante" (ambulatory, line 4). This showed that Francesco not only demonstrated the various tasks, but he also instructed us in the

terminology that we might encounter during our service. Therefore, Francesco's self-deprecating comment in the previous selection could be considered a relational move to lessen the social distance between himself and the trainees, in an attempt to create a closer rapport with us. More about relational language will be discussed in the next section.

In addition to misunderstandings related to knowledge of the language, there were also examples of misunderstandings of socio-cultural factors such as politeness and directness in the directive encounters in this context. Francesco continued to reiterate the importance of our safety and the well-being of the patients throughout the training session. Since it was important for us to execute the tasks in a precise way, there were examples of prohibitions, warnings and negative evaluations if we had not performed the task properly. It was important that we understood when something was not done properly since our safety and the well being of the future patients was at stake.

Often there was no time to soften the directive or the warning and it came across as "stern" (Researcher notes, July 7. 2014). In the following directive encounter Samantha's misunderstanding of the force of Francesco's directive prompted attempts at repair and understanding on the part of both interlocutors. During this task, Samantha and I were trying to pull the stretcher up from ground level to its full height. Since it was quite heavy, there was a hydraulic system of levers to be pushed which allowed the stretcher to release up. This was the second attempt at performing the task. When the lever was pulled instead of pushed, Francesco became more serious and his directives took on a stronger tone through the use of repetition and bald imperatives. Francesco's strong directives prompted an apology from Samantha and repair strategies including a code switch to English from both interlocutors in the subsequent turns.

Excerpt 3.18 - MIS-SL, 78-90

1	FRA:	premi no no non	1	FRA:	push no no don't lift up
2		sollevare **lascia lascia su**	2		**leave it leave it come on come**
3		**su** allora **you never pull**	3		**on** ok ***you never pull***
4		**up**	4		***up***
5	SAM:	ok	5	SAM:	ok
6	FRA:	wheels always on the ground	6	FRA:	*wheels always on the ground*
7	SAM:	ok	7	SAM:	*ok*
8	FRA:	your wheels	8	FRA:	*your wheels*
9	SAM:	**mi dispiace**	9	SAM:	**I'm sorry**
10	FRA:	**no no no I'm very direct**	10	FRA:	***no no no I'm very direct***
11	SAM:	**no that's fine**	11	SAM:	***no that's fine***
12	FRA:	because this is important	12	FRA:	*because this is important*
13		because if you make a mistake	13		*because if you make a mistake*
14		now the patient go down	14		*now the patient go down*
15	SAM:	this is just a weird position to	15	SAM:	*this is just a weird position to*
16		pull down in you know what I	16		*pull down in you know what I*
17		mean?	17		*mean?*
18	FRA:	I know but	18	FRA:	*I know but*
18	SAM:	ok	18	SAM:	*ok*

Francesco used unmitigated imperatives ("premi no no non sollevare" / push no no don't lift up, lines 1-2) intensified with repetition ("leave it leave it come on come on", lines 2-3) followed by a switch to English with a strong prohibition using the pronoun "you" and the lexical upgrader "never" (line 3) to critique Samantha's performance of the task. He added an agentless directive ("wheels always on the ground", line 5) and then repeated it with more intensity and in a more face-threatening manner by emphasizing the agent ("your wheels", line 7). At that point, Samantha performed an explicit apology ("I'm sorry", line 8) (Blum, Kulka, et al, 1989). Francesco denied the need for an apology from Samantha ("no no no", line 9) and then took responsibility using "explicit self-blame" (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, p. 291) acknowledging that he had used a strong directive ("I'm very direct", line 9). Samantha attempted to attend to Francesco's positive face by ensuring that she was not offended by his directness ("that's fine", line 6). Francesco, in the next turn gave an explanation for the strong force of his directive by

using a hypothetical ("if you make a mistake now the patient go down", lines 12-13). Samantha revealed her reason for not being able to perform the move properly ("this is just a weird position to pull down in", lines 14-15) adding the tag question "you know what I mean?" (lines 15-16) as a supportive move. The power dynamic between Samantha and Francesco in this context was evident in the final turns of the sequence when Francesco acknowledged Samantha's explanation and then alluded to the fact that the patient's safety was the priority ("I know but", line 17). Samantha's affirmative response ("ok", line 18) conveyed her acceptance of his explanation and of his position as the expert and trainer in this context. Samantha's apology appears to show that she took Francesco's forceful directive as a personal criticism as warranting an apology. Francesco's strong response "no no no" (line 9) revealed that an apology was not necessary in that context. Samantha had misunderstood Francesco's intent, which was to strongly emphasize the importance of the correct execution of the maneuver rather than to personally criticize her performance. However, Francesco's response revealed that his use of reinforcement in his directives was not meant as a personal affront to Samantha but as a strategy for clarity and safety. Both interlocutors attempted to explain themselves as a way to repair the rapport. For Samantha strong criticism of her meant that she should apologize, but for Francesco, his strong directives were necessary because of the importance of performing the task properly.

This exchange turned out to be instrumental in Samantha's decision not to do her service-learning at the Misericordia. In a post-interview Samantha revealed her impressions of Francesco and her reasons for deciding not to volunteer at the Misericordia:

> when Italians are trying to teach you something they're like they're almost kinda mean you're like I'm so sorry...like when we were at the Misericordia the guy was like- the guy at the Misericordia he was just- he was scary though I think that's one reason I don't want to go back like I don't think I could work under him he scares me I mean I granted he has to like make sure the job is done really well like

> I don't blame him like I understand but it's just not the kind of pressure I want to be under
>
> (Samantha, Post-interview, July 15, 2014)

Samantha specifically referred to making an apology during the Misericordia training and the excerpt above is the only example of a direct apology in the interactions. Therefore, despite the attempts to repair the rapport, the strong intensified directives and what she interpreted as a personal affront left a lasting negative impression on Samantha. She acknowledged that he needed to "make sure the job is done really well", but nevertheless, she revealed it was too stressful for her.

My impressions of Francesco were similar to Samantha's in that I also thought Francesco was somewhat "stern" in his directives, yet I viewed them as appropriate for the context. The following excerpt from my researcher's notes reflects my initial impressions of the training and Francesco's language use:

> There was a lot of new vocabulary to learn and he [Francesco] was very sensitive to that, explaining all the technical terms referring to the different parts of the stretcher and asking us what we thought certain things meant. Because of the high stakes, patients could fall to the ground if it's done wrong, Francesco was very clear and at times seemed stern about exactly how to do everything. It seemed to me he was losing patience with us at times, but then he would explain why whatever it was was important and the tense moment would pass.
>
> (Researcher notes, July 7, 2014)

I considered the "tense moment[s]" typical of the context and temporary lapses in polite discourse were due to the necessity of teaching the proper way to handle the equipment. For Samantha they were indicative of a teaching style that she considered "mean" and even "scary." Her "contextualization conventions" or what she believed to be appropriate language use in this context did not coincide with Francesco's (Gumperz, 1982, p. 131). In this type of pragmatic misunderstanding "neither party is 'right' or mistaken" (Gass & Varonis, 1991, p. 113), both contribute to the communication breakdown based on their understanding of the context.

Different conventions related to the speech act of apology also figure in to the misunderstanding. For Francesco, it was not necessary for Samantha to apologize in that situation, and for Samantha, it was not appropriate for him to be as forceful - and personal - in his directives.

In summary, there were instances of both linguistic and pragmatic misunderstanding in the interactions during the training session. Since there were only two trainees, Samantha and myself, there were opportunities for us to ask clarifying questions or indicate moments of non-understanding.

Francesco made an effort to ensure we understood his directives and that we were able to execute the maneuvers he demonstrated properly. He employed repetition, codeswitching and explanations in both English and Italian in his directives to the L2 users to facilitate understanding. The L2 users indicated non-understanding by either repeating the unknown word with a rising intonation or by asking directly for the meaning of a word. Misunderstandings of a socio-pragmatic nature were more difficult to acknowledge or resolve and in fact, may have contributed to Samantha's decision not to return to the Misericordia for service.

Relational work. The unmarked form of interaction "is one without apparent breakdowns, is one in which balance is maintained in the structure of interdependent social relationships" (Watts, 1992, p. 50). Relational work refers to how interpersonal relationships are negotiated during interactions and includes interpersonal talk embedded in transactional talk. While Francesco's primary goal during the training session was to convey information and procedural protocol regarding volunteer service, his language use revealed that he also consistently made an effort to attend to the relational aspect of the interactions. It was in his interest that the volunteers learn well but also decide to return for service in the future. In the

following excerpt, Francesco tries to reassure Samantha about her concern about not remembering the training session:

Excerpt 3.19 - MIS-SL, 784-789

1	SAM:	**ho paura di dimenticare**	1	SAM:	**I'm afraid I'll forget**
2		**tutto**	2		**everything**
3	FRA:	**dimenticherai tutto e'**	3	FRA:	**you will forget everything it's**
4		**normale**	4		**normal**
5	SAM:	si	5	SAM:	yes
6	FRA:	ma quando farai servizio potrai	6	FRA:	but when you do the service you
7		chiedere alle persone che	7		can ask the people who will be
8		saranno con te gli spieghi che	8		with you explain to them that
9		sono i tuoi primi servizio	9		it's your first service and you
10		chiederai di essere aiutata	10		will ask to be helped

Francesco responded to Samantha's concern with the reassurance that she would in fact forget everything but that it was "normal" (lines 3-4). He then explained that it was customary for volunteers to ask for help from the Italian volunteers. By not discounting or contradicting Samantha's concern, Francesco attempted to reassure her that forgetting the details of the training session was "normal" and that it would not be a problem.

The constraint of having to convey a substantial amount of information to the trainees in a short amount of time meant there was not much time for interpersonal talk, however. Furthermore, the relational work evident in the interactions was often for the purpose of clarifying our understanding of the way the tasks were to be performed. In other words, relational work was done in the context of accomplishing the goals of the training session. For example, Francesco used praise when we had performed a task properly. Table 12 shows examples of words and phrases Francesco used as positive reinforcement of our correct maneuvers, including the number of occurrences of each. In the ninety-minute training session Francesco offered few compliments, however. According to Alfonzetti (2009), compliments can

serve various functions in interactions including increasing solidarity among interactants or "to encourage or reinforce a desired or proper behavior" (p. 568).

Table 12: Misericordia - Relational work

Type of supportive move	Token (number in the corpus)	Translation
Praise	good work (3) andava bene (1) perfetto (1) complimenti (1) bene (2) benissimo (2)	good job *good work* that went well perfect good job well done excellent good exactly

In the following exchange, during the CPR training, Francesco criticized Samantha's breathing technique as "ineffective" (line 1), followed by two directives with the deontic modal "must" in the second person (lines 1-2).

Excerpt 3.20 - MIS-SL, 1446-1454

1	FRA:	inefficace **devi** ventilare più	1	FRA:	ineffective **you must** breathe
2		forte **devi** dare più	2		more forcefully **you must**
3		aria (breathing sound)	3		give more air (breathing sound)
4	SAM:	ok	4	SAM:	ok
5	(Samantha repeats the breath)		5	(Samantha repeats the breath)	
6	FRA:	**oh brava questo ha funzionato**	6	FRA:	**oh good job this worked**
7		**guarda qui** con l'occhio mentre	7		**look here** with your eye while
8		ventili guarda li difficile vedi la	8		you blow watch there it's hard
9		differenza	9		to see the difference
10	SAM:	oh	10	SAM:	oh
11	FRA:	**questo era una ventilazione**	11	FRA:	**this was an effective**
12		**efficace**	12		**breath**
13	SAM:	ok	13	SAM:	ok
14	FRA:	effective breathe	14	FRA:	*effective breath*

Samantha then repeated the breathing, this time successfully. Francesco praised her technique ("oh good job", line 6) and gave her more instructions about where to look during mouth-to-

mouth resuscitation to ensure the proper technique. Francesco repeated the compliment of her procedure (lines 11-12) and again in English (line 14). Francesco once again expressed approval of her breathing technique.

Francesco was responsible for training new volunteers in such a way that they would learn the procedures and maneuvers well and remain enthusiastic about volunteering after the training session. As previously discussed, his priorities during the training session were conflicting; teaching the L2 users how to operate the equipment and perform CPR while not overwhelming them with too much information and attending to their face needs. He used various mitigation strategies such as agentless directives, which allowed him to give direction while minimizing the weight of the imposition of the directive by not assigning responsibility to the volunteers explicitly. While this meant they were less face-threatening, agentless directives "provide a telegraphic style and tend to be interpreted as more distant in tenor" (Murcia-Bielsa, 2000, p. 15). In other words, the directives may have sounded cold. This could in part account for Samantha's feeling that "Italians are mean when they try to teach you something" (Samantha, Post-interview, 6/24/2014). Francesco balanced the impersonal language with supportive moves such as using the first person plural, which conveyed that the volunteers were part of a larger community of the Misericordia.

In order to take a more discursive approach to the analysis, I will discuss a longer selection, which includes various types of directives, examples of strategies for understanding, and relational work. The excerpt took place during the ambulance activity and began with Francesco's description of how to collapse the stretcher to ground level before lifting it into the ambulance. Despite the fact that the stretcher was empty during the simulation, it was still quite heavy. Francesco gave the instructions as if there were a patient on board.

Excerpt 3.21 - MIS-SL, 72-74

1	FRA:	allora per alzare per mettere	1	FRA:	ok to lift up in order to put the
2		la barella giu **io devo**	2		stretcher down **I have to press**
3		**schiacciare le leve io sollevo**	3		**the levers I lift up slightly** you
4		**leggermente** te premi verso il	4		press downward *I pull just a*
5		basso I pull just a little and	5		*little and you*
6		you push down	6		*push down*
7	SAM:	oh	7	SAM:	oh
8	FRA:	**when the legs start close you**	8	FRA:	***when the legs start close you***
9		**immediately stop pushing and**	9		***immediately stop pushing and***
10		**keep maintaining til the floor**	10		***keep maintaining til the floor***
11	SAM:	ok	11	SAM:	ok
12	FRA:	**it seems sembra più**	12	FRA:	***it seems*** **it seems more**
13		**dificile di quello che è**	13		**difficult than it is are you with**
14		**ci sei?**	14		**me?**
15	SAM:	pull down	15	SAM:	*pull down*
16	FRA:	maintain now pull bend your	16	FRA:	*maintain now pull bend your*
17		legs piega le gambe ok uno	17		*legs* bend your legs ok one
18		due tre **su su su su su su**	18		two three up **up up up up up**
19		ok try again quindi io	19		*ok try again* then I push lift
20		schiaccio sollevo tu premi e	20		up you push and then- the
21		poi- **la barella deve essere**	21		**stretcher must always be**
22		**sempre orrizontale**	22		**horizontal**
23	SAM:	ok	23	SAM:	ok
24	FRA:	**ci sei?**	24	FRA:	**are you with me?**
25	SAM:	si	25	SAM:	yes

Francesco began by demonstrating and describing how to move the levers in order to lower the stretcher to ground level using the first person "I have to press the levers I lift up slightly", (lines 2-3). Francesco and Samantha were working together on the demonstration and it was important that they coordinate their movements as he continued with his directive to Samantha: ("you push downwards", line 4). Francesco used the pronoun "te" (you) for emphasis to indicate that Samantha needed to perform that move. He then translated the entire directive to English ("I pull just a little and you push down", lines 5-6). Francesco continued in English communicating the most challenging and important part of the move ("when the legs start close you immediately stop pushing and keep maintaining til the floor", lines 8-10). In this case, English was used for

purposes of clarity since he was describing how to perform the task. As he stated, a wrong move at that point could have resulted in the stretcher falling or in Samantha straining her back. In his next turn, Francesco's language took a relational turn as he switched back to Italian and assured Samantha that the task was not as complicated as it sounded (lines 12-13). This showed Samantha that he was sympathetic to any difficulty in understanding she may have. He then checked Samantha's understanding by asking "ci sei?" (are you with me?, line 13) an expression that has the conventional meaning of checking for understanding as well as checking if she was "with him". This was another relational move designed to check not only her understanding but her morale. He repeated this phrase later in the same encounter (line 24). Francesco's intention in these two turns was to build rapport with Samantha. There was no new information stated about how to perform the task, it was purely his attempt to attend to the face needs of Samantha.

Samantha then responded by repeating what she had understood to be a directive meant for her, "pull down" (line 15). It was therefore, not clear that she was "with" Francesco, or understood the directives at that moment. Francesco continued in English quickly switching to Italian (lines 16-18). As Samantha was executing the moves along with Francesco, he repeated the elliptical directive "su su su su su su" (up up up up up up, line 17) which intensified the directive as she was lifting. His next utterance in English ("ok try again", line 19) indicated that Samantha did not execute the move properly, and Francesco then repeated the directive (lines 19-21). Next he gave a more implicit directive in the passive using the modal "must" ("the stretcher must always be horizontal", lines 20-22). Not directly stating that it was Samantha's responsibility to carry out the directive of keeping the stretcher horizontal, was a politeness move that rendered the directive less face-threatening to Samantha (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Samantha response ("ok", line 29) token revealed that she understood his statement.

Overall, the interaction began with two turns of rather complicated direction from Francesco, followed by a convergence move by Francesco when he told Samantha that the moves are not as hard as they sound. He continued with more directives, this time intensified through repetition as they executed the maneuver together. Francesco then checked on Samantha again ("are you ok?") and when she answered in the affirmative they continued the maneuver during which time he was giving direction, again in short elliptical phrases with repetition. He ended the interaction with a direct critique of her performance ("you never pull up", line 27).

In summary, this directive encounter illustrates the variety of directive forms and modification strategies Francesco used throughout the training session. There are imperatives intensified through repetition during crucial moments during the execution of maneuvers. There are agentless declaratives and hints, which drew the attention and responsibility for the task away from the hearer. There were more direct declaratives formed with the modal "must" reinforced by the use of the pronoun "tu" (you) and how interpersonal language was embedded in the transactional language. Francesco used codeswitiching not only for clarity when giving direction (lines 8-10), but also as a way to give encouragement to Samantha ("ok try again", line 19). There were transitions from high intensity, strong directives to relational moves in order to maintain a positive rapport with us while accomplishing the goal of teaching us how to perform the maneuvers correctly.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to describe the interactions between L2 users of Italian and local Italian speakers during service-learning programs in Italy. Using a pragmatic competence framework and discourse analysis I examined the interactions for directives and requests, breakdowns in communication, and relational work of the L2 users and the Italian speakers during service-learning.

In this chapter I first summarize the findings from the data analysis - including any similarities and differences in language use at the three sites - and then discuss the implications of the findings for language instructors, study abroad program planners and scholars in the field of service-learning. In addition, I present directions for further research based on the findings of this study. The purpose for making comparisons across sites is to identify areas for future research and to determine which sites may be more suited to providing meaningful interaction with local Italian speakers and language learning opportunities.

Summary of findings

Directives. The data confirmed that directive use at each of the three sites was conditioned by the nature of the activity and the power dynamic among interactants. There was a clear division and hierarchy of roles at each of the locations with the L2 users taking direction from a supervisor or a trainer. This meant that there were fewer opportunities for the L2 users to initiate a turn, and instead they were more commonly receivers of direction from the Italian speakers. Brad's interactions with Susanna, for example, were brief and limited to her asking him to attend to the needs of a resident; Brad did not make any requests of Susanna. Maria's role at

the HTC Parelli training session was to take direction from Elsa - at least from Elsa's point of view - and there was little opportunity for Maria to interject a request. Nevertheless, she was able to express her desire to perform a different move, but only after several turns of Elsa's misunderstanding, possibly because she was not expecting Maria to "break rank" and interrupt her direction (see Excerpt 2.9). Samantha's requests during the Misericordia training were limited to confirmation questions about the maneuvers or questions about the meaning of term in Italian ("gancio?", Extract 3.13, line 4). The majority of Samantha's turns at talk consisted of backchannels or confirmation questions regarding either the meaning of a word or how to perform a maneuver. In short, the few directives uttered by the L2 users were requests mainly to clarify a directive from one of the local Italian speakers.

At all three sites directives of the supervisor/trainers were most frequently in the imperative form, considered the unmarked form for giving a command, and the most direct and forceful way to realize a directive (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989). The imperative was used during

Table 13: Directive types - Summary

	Imperative		Declarative		Interrogative		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nursing home (Susanna)	57	66%	29	34%	0	0%	86	13%
Horse therapy (Elsa, Pietro)	66	72%	22	24%	4	4%	92	14%
Misericordia (Francesco)	343	68%	158	32%	0	0%	501	73%
Total	466	69%	209	31%	4	.5%	679	100%

actions that had a sense of urgency and needed to be carried out in the moment, for example, when Maria (HTC) was working with the horse and the actions were being carried out as Elsa was directing her. Similarly, when Samantha was performing a maneuver with the stretcher at the Misericordia training session, especially in moments when there was a chance she could hurt herself or a future patient if she made the wrong move, Francesco often used an unmitigated imperative form. Susanna also used the imperative frequently when directing Brad to take care of a resident at the CDR and the actions had to be taken care of swiftly for a resident's welfare. In short, the imperative was used with "now" directives, for actions in progress at that moment (Vine, 2004). The most direct form of the directive was used when clarity, safety and the well-being of the L2 users and the populations served by the agency were at stake.

There was little mitigation used to attenuate the force of the directives in the interactions. Susanna used no mitigation strategies with Brad. Elsa used explanation as a way to mitigate particularly forceful directives with Maria. Francesco used the passive voice, the third person, or the hypothetical as a mitigation strategy during the training session at the Misericordia. He framed the directives as procedural processes rather than directing them at the L2 users thereby reducing their face-threatening nature. Unfortunately, despite Francesco's strategies to minimize the imposition of the directives on the L2 users, Samantha expressed concerns about the working with him in the future:

> "I think that's one reason I don't want to go back like I couldn't
> work under him he scares me...I don't blame him like I understand
> but it's not the kind of pressure I want to be under"
>
> (Samantha, post-interview, July 22, 2014)

Samantha appeared to be intimidated by Francesco's directives despite his efforts to soften their force.

The interactions at both the Misericordia and the HTC took place during training sessions and many of the directives were instructional; that is, they were meant to give general information about the way things were done in that context. At both locations, there were several occasions in which the trainer gave directives using the declarative form with the modal "must". In Italian the modal "dovere" can be translated as "must" or "have to" and the noun form of the word "dovere" means "duty" or "obligation". For this reason, use of the modal "dovere", translated as "must" is considered to be more face-threatening and to have stronger force than modals that are less coercive such as "should" or "can" (Altman, 1990). In the interactions at the HTC and the Misericordia directives with "must" were typically used to describe or explain procedures for performing a task in a particular way. Murcia-Bielsa (2000), referring to the high frequency of modalized directives with "must" in written instructions, states "directions that are given for the benefit of the reader [hearer in this case] and are imposed by the circumstances, rather than the individual's will, therefore...do not call for negative politeness strategies" (p. 124). Forms that could be considered face-threatening in another context may not have the same force in the context of a training session in which directions are given to benefit the hearer or someone they will be helping in the future. Biber et al. (1999) found that it is appropriate to use the modal "must" when the directive relates to the job obligation of the hearer. In this case, the L2 users "job" was to learn and perform the maneuvers properly and therefore the directives were not meant to be face threatening. Nevertheless, it is possible that for the L2 users hearing "must" in the declarative could have felt too forceful, especially when - unlike written instructions - they were stated in the second person. Elsa and Francesco both used the modal "must" when giving

procedural directions and both L2 users at those sites mentioned the fact that they felt the trainer was "mean" (Samantha) or "angry" (Maria). This suggests that the modal "must" was perhaps more face threatening than intended by the speakers.

Repetition was frequently used with the imperatives, as a way to reinforce or intensify the directives, often for purposes of clarity. At the CDR Susanna used repetition with the residents and in her directives to Brad. She may have used repetition with Brad to be sure he understood her directives due to his status as an L2 user. Elsa and Francesco also used repetition when the directive was regarding action happening in that moment as a way to be sure it was being done properly; for example, when Elsa was turning with the horse or when Samantha was lifting the stretcher. Repetition in those instances was used also as a way to express to the L2 users to continue with the maneuver until the directives stopped. Francesco repeated this directive to Samantha: "up up up up up ok" (Extract 3.6, line 1). As shown in this case, repetition was also often used as an elliptical form when it was clear from the context what action was to be taken.

Directive use was conditioned not only by the type of activity the interactants were engaged in but also by the power relationship among the speakers. At the service-learning settings in this study, while the L2 users were part of the organization only temporarily, there was a person at each location who was clearly positioned in a supervisory or "trainer" role based on their expert knowledge of the tasks in relation to the L2 users and their position in the organization. In the interactions at all of the sites, the majority of the directives were performed by the supervisors or trainers and the L2 users had little voice in the interactions. However, the roles were at times and to varying degrees negotiated or challenged by the L2 users within the micro context of the interactions at the different sites. For example, at the CDR, Susanna was the caretaker and in more of a position of control in terms of which duties Brad would perform, as

evidence by the high number of explicit directives aimed at Brad during the service. Yet, Brad had control over factors such as if and when he would initiate a conversation with the residents. He also decided what days he would volunteer, when he would arrive and leave each time - as did all three L2 users at the various sites; something that in an institutional setting in which one were being paid would be determined by the supervisor. Brad was the one who told Susanna and another female staff member (FSM) when he had to leave as shown in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 4.1 - CDR-SL, 601-609

1	BRAD:	**um bisgono di lasciare**	1	BRAD:	**um I need to leave**
2	FSM:	**ah andare via**	2	FSM:	**ah leave**
3	BRAD:	si	3	BRAD:	yes
4	SUS:	**va bene dai**	4	SUS:	**ok then**
5	BRAD:	grazie per tutto	5	BRAD:	thanks for everything
6	SUS:	niente auguri dai tante	6	SUS:	don't mention it best
7		cose	7		wishes then

Brad did not frame his statement as a request but a declarative stating that it was time for him to leave. Susanna's reply "ok then" (line 4) shows that it was acceptable in this context for Brad to make that decision. This is an example of one of the ways the roles in a service-learning or volunteering context can differ from a workplace context. With regard to the majority of the service at the CDR, attending to the residents' needs, Brad followed the directives of Susanna without question. This could be due to the sensitive nature of the population in that their safety and well-being was at stake during his service. He deferred to her knowledge of the residents' needs when dealing with them.

At the HTC, on the other hand, Maria challenged Elsa's higher status role by requesting to perform a Parelli maneuver of her choice rather than the one Elsa directed her to do. She made the request (poi fai lateral inflection?, Excerpt 2.9, line 3) and then when Elsa did not respond, she refused to perform the move Elsa directed her to do ("no", Excerpt 2.9, line 8), which

surprised Elsa ("no?" Excerpt 2.9, line 9). She did not acquiesce to Maria's request until later in the training session, and even then it was framed as a directive from Elsa for Maria to "do what you want and explain it to them [the other student volunteers] in English" (Excerpt 2.13, lines 1-3). Elsa held on to her position of power in relation to Maria throughout their interactions by not allowing Maria to decide which maneuver to perform on her terms. Nonetheless, it was Maria's insistence that in the end prompted Elsa and Pietro to direct her to do what she wanted. In short, although Elsa did not allow for there to be much negotiation of roles in the context of the interactions at the HTC, Maria interrupted Elsa to ask for further instruction or clarification as well as to request to perform something she wanted to do, exercising her agency to do so. Maria may have felt it was appropriate for her to do so because she had experience as a horse trainer and was closer in ability to Elsa than the other L2 users who were observing, and she claimed the right to perform the move she knew better.

At the Misericordia, Samantha did not challenge or attempt to negotiate her role as the trainee in the interactions. There was a much wider knowledge gap between trainer and trainee and, therefore, a clearer definition of roles than at the HTC for example where Maria had some knowledge of the Parelli technique. However, when Samantha interrupted the CPR training session to ask Francesco a question for her own curiosity (analysis follows in Excerpt 5.1), she was able to take control of the interaction in that moment.

The Italian speakers used only one directive in the interrogative form, which is considered a more indirect way to perform a directive (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989). Pietro used it when asking Maria to explain the Parelli technique to the other students. In institutional settings when someone in a higher status position frames the directive as a question or a request, it is understood to be a directive (Vine, 2004). Also, during the service activities there were few hints

or other indirect forms of directive from Francesco, Susanna or Elsa. The only hints in the interactions were from the resident at the CDR when he was requesting help from Susanna.

Although the three sites were unique, they did have some similarities with regard to directive use: frequent use of the imperative, little mitigation, repetition as reinforcement, and declaratives with the modal "must". The CDR setting closer to what could be considered a typical service-learning context in which there were clear expectations of what the L2 user/volunteer would do to help, opportunity to engage alongside the community partner working towards a common goal and time for casual conversation with the local population served by the agency. Instead, Misericordia interactions and the HTC interactions took place in the context of a training or instructional session. Therefore, this would suggest that directive use would differ from the CDR. On the contrary, there were similar patterns at all locations as mentioned above; high frequency of imperatives, repetition and little mitigation, explanations using the modal "must". One notable difference was the greater use of hypotheticals, passives and impersonal forms at the Misericordia training when Francesco was explaining policies and procedures. Another difference was in the length and complexity of the directives at both the Misericordia and the HTC that were used to describe the maneuvers in greater detail. At the CDR on the other hand the directives were more frequently short phrasal imperatives, formulaic due to the repetitive nature of the tasks, i.e. serving the snack, moving a resident.

The findings related to directive use in this study had similarities and differences when compared to findings from previous studies of directive use in institutional settings. Vine (2004) also found in interactions between managers and their staff that interrogatives occurred infrequently, however, there were more declarative forms than imperatives used, while in this study imperatives were the most frequently used form at all sites. In Vine's study, in the context

of interactions during a business meeting, there was more mitigation used with imperatives than in this study. This may be due to the nature of the context and the fact that there was less urgency to the directives. Also in Vine's study very few directives came from the staff members to their superiors, which aligns with the findings of this study in that the L2 users used few directives aimed at the Italian community partners.

Comparing the findings from my study to those of a similar study can shed light on possible trends related to directive use in the context of service-learning. Perren (2008) in his study of interactions between English language learners and community partners engaged in activities at two volunteer workplaces used Ervin-Tripp's (1976) typology to categorize directive types. He found that the total percentage of community partners' directives in the imperative was only 31% while 43% were in the form of hints. Combining the percentage of hints with imbedded imperatives - another indirect form - approximately 60% of the directives were in ambiguous or indirect forms. This contradicts my findings which show that the imperative was used more frequently - an average of 66% of the time - at all sites. While there were instances of both imbedded imperatives and hints, the majority of directives were in the imperative. The difference could have to do with the fact that in Perren's study there were at times multiple persons were involved in giving instructions, which meant the possibility for greater complexity in language use or "complicated conversation structure" (p.160). In the interactions in my study, however, there was only one person giving instruction to the L2 users (two in the case of HTC - Pietro and Elsa - but Pietro was essentially repeating or rephrasing Elsa's directions). The instructor's directives at each site were aimed at the one (or two) L2 users only and were more straightforward and direct. Perren (2008) also considered complexity of task - based on the amount of language used, types of directives used and the steps needed to complete the task -

when considering directive use typology. Using a similar factor considering directive use at the three sites in my study, the tasks at each location could be considered to vary in complexity. At the CDR, the tasks were somewhat repetitive and the directives formulaic. At the HTC where the tasks were more complex, Elsa was able to use repetition, explanations and gestures along with the directives, to aid in understanding. At the Misericordia, there was perhaps the highest level of complexity in the tasks, but again the instructor could give his full attention to ensure understanding. Therefore, in my study although there was room for ambiguity due to complexity of the tasks, the directives were more explicit and easier to understand coming only from one person.

Nuzzo (2007) found that L2 users of Italian showed a notable increase over time in the use of internal modification in their requests; they used modification with greater frequency and variety of forms. This development brought them closer to native speaker norms for request strategies in her data. While I did not measure development over time for this study, a snapshot of the request strategies of the L2 users in my data shows that, similar to Nuzzo's findings, they did not use internal modification in their requests. Internal modification to the head act of a request is defined as language that is "not essential for the utterance to be potentially understood as a request" (Blum-Kulka, et al, 1989, p. 19) and could be used to either mitigate or intensify a request. In the few examples of requests of the L2 users in this study, there was no internal modification to their requests. Brad's request to leave the CDR at the end of the day was a needs statement in the form of a declarative ("um I need to leave" (Extract 4.1, line 1). There was no language used to mitigate of soften the request, such as putting it in a question form, asking permission such as, "Do you mind if I leave now?" or "Would it be ok if I left now?" In that way, it would have acknowledged Susanna's supervisory position and been more attentive to her face

needs. Maria's request at the HTC to perform a different move from Elsa's command was also performed in an unmodified and direct form of the request: "then you do lateral flection" (Excerpt 2.9, line 3), which took Elsa by surprise as discussed in chapter four. Elsa did not use And Samantha used requests primarily to ask for the definition of a word or further explanation of how a maneuver should be performed. Her requests often consisted of repeating the unknown word with rising intonation. On one occasion when she wanted to ask a question during the CPR training, she announced she had a question rather than use a request with internal modification to interrupt Francesco. Overall, the L2 users in this study did not use internal modification in their requests. However, the Italian local speakers did not use modification either which would suggest that in this context it was not necessary or appropriate to mitigate directives.

Misunderstanding. Misunderstanding at each of the sites manifested itself in a breakdown in the flow of the interaction or an interruption of the activity. It was most frequently related to linguistic non-understanding between interactants, but there were also instances of pragmatic failure in which the utterance of the L2 user or the Italian speaker was unexpected and caused confusion.

All three of the participants had instances in which they had difficulty understanding the meaning of word or phrase spoken by the Italian community partner. The L2 users employed linguistic strategies for understanding such as repeating the word with rising intonation, asking for the speaker to repeat the word, or use of a question token such as "huh?". Repair usually followed in the next turn, however, this was not always the case. At the CDR, for example, there were several times when Brad had difficulty understanding the language of a resident and they were not explain it to him, possibly due to cognitive or hearing impairment. At the HTC, on at least one occasion, Elsa dismissed Maria's question regarding the meaning of a word. This is

similar to the incidents of "avoidance" that Perren (2008) found with the community partners at the volunteer workplaces with the English language users. This occurred when the native English speaker made a choice not to respond to or interact with the L2 user. Francesco at the Misericordia, on the other hand, responded to Samantha's questions regarding the meaning of words in Italian in subsequent turns; either with an explanation of the word in Italian or the translation in English. Perren (2008) found that a significant factor related to breakdowns in understanding was due to "conversational delivery", specifically factors such as speed and clarity. These factors were present also at the CDR in Brad's conversations with the residents. Brad mentioned in the post-interview that it was the way they spoke rather than the language they used that made it difficult to understand their language. However, this did not seem to be a problem at the HTC or the Misericordia. At those locations the most common problems in understanding for the L2 users were linguistic.

The L2 users at times had difficulty expressing themselves or their requests to the community partners, which caused misunderstanding. At the CDR Brad's inability to rephrase or explain the topic of conversation to a resident often caused the conversation to end abruptly. He had limited repair strategies when the resident did not understand him; repetition was most commonly used. This meant his conversations with residents were usually brief and changed topics often. Brad's limited Italian proficiency level coupled with the hearing and cognitive impairment of many of the residents was a constraint on their ability to carry on extended casual conversations. At the HTC, Maria had difficulty requesting to Elsa that she perform a different maneuver. As discussed in Chapter four, Maria's attempt to request to do "lateral inflection" - contrary to Elsa's directive - caused confusion to Elsa. Her non-understanding was either due to the minor syntactic error of Maria's request or more likely because Elsa did not expect Maria to

make a request due to Elsa's higher status role as trainer. Samantha's misunderstandings during the Misericordia training session were mainly linguistic; not knowing the meaning of a word in Italian or a technical term. However, on one occasion she interrupted the CPR training to ask a question that she was curious about related to CPR in general rather than about the training she was engaged in at that moment. She first announced that she had a question, in order to interrupt the session, and then proceeded to ask her question in English:

Extract 5.1 - MIS-SL, 1421-1426

1	SAM:	oh ok **ho una domanda**	1	SAM:	oh ok I **have a**
2		quando	2		**question** when
3	FRA:	apri molto la bocca	3	FRA:	open your mouth wide *open*
4		open wide your mouth	4		*wide your mouth*
5	SAM:	si um **in inglese** you	5	SAM:	yes um **in English** *you breath*
6		breathe oxygen in when	6		*breathe oxygen in when*
7		you're breathing out you're	7		*you're breathing out you're*
8		breathing out carbon dioxide	8		*breathing out carbon dioxide*
9	FRA:	yes	9	FRA:	*yes*
10	SAM:	ok	10	SAM:	*ok*
11	FRA:	both of them	11	FRA:	*both of them*
12	SAM:	ok I'm just	12	SAM:	*ok I'm just*
13	FRA:	you have a lower percentage	13	FRA:	*you have a lower percentage*
14		of oxygen rather than the	14		*of oxygen rather than the*
15		external air but it's still more	15		*external air but it's still more*
16		than nothing	16		*than nothing*
17	SAM:	ok so ok cause I was like this	17	SAM:	*ok so ok cause I was like this*
18		is he's just breathing carbon	18		*is he's just breathing carbon*
19		dioxide but there's oxygen	19		*dioxide but there's oxygen*
20	FRA:	you have more carbon	20	FRA:	*you have more carbon*
21		dioxigen dioxide than normal	21		*dioxigen dioxide than normal*
22		air but there is still some oxygen	22		*air but is still some oxygen*
23	SAM:	ok	23	SAM:	ok
24	FRA:	imagine that you have you	24	FRA:	*imagine that you have you*
25		start from 21%	25		*start from 21%*
26	SAM:	ok	26	SAM:	ok
27	FRA:	and your exhausted air may	27	FRA:	*and your exhausted air may*
28		have I don't know 18% 19%	28		*have I don't know 18% 19%*
29		oxygen	29		*oxygen*
30	SAM:	ok	30	SAM:	ok
31	FRA:	or even 15 it's nothing	31	FRA:	*or even 15 it's nothing*
32	SAM:	**ok thank you si ok**	32	SAM:	***ok thank you* yes ok**

Samantha interrupted Francesco (line 1) who instead of acknowledging her question was still continuing an explanation from the previous turn. Samantha then persisted, announcing she would ask the question in English (line 5). The rest of the exchange continued in English as Francesco gave an explanation for Samantha's rather complex question. At the end of the exchange Samantha thanked Francesco for responding to her request. In short, Samantha needed to first announce that she had a question and then ask it in English in order to make herself understood. Once he knew she had a question, Francesco took the time to explain the response to Samantha, in English as a supportive move. Overall, the L2 users in this study did not use internal modification in their requests. However, the Italian local speakers did not use modification either which would suggest that in this context it was not necessary or appropriate to mitigate directives.

Relational work. By examining the discursive norms in the interactions related to facework and politeness, it was possible to see the way relational work was employed in these contexts. The data revealed that issues of politeness and face were not as important as execution of the tasks expressed through transactional talk during service-learning at the three sites. Relational work and interpersonal talk between Brad and the residents was prevalent and part of service activity at the CDR. During those challenging conversations with frequent misunderstandings, Brad was still able to build rapport with the residents by initiating conversations, using laughter, smiling and complimenting the residents. Brad and Susanna's language was focused mainly on the residents' needs. The only opportunity for social talk was when they were on few occasions they rode the elevator together on the way to retrieve a patient. The main focus of their interactions was on attending to the residents' needs. Similarly, at the HTC, the objective of the interactions was for Maria to perform and demonstrate the Parelli

technique. There was little time during the training session for social talk or talk not related to Elsa's critique of Maria's performance in the ring. Pietro was more attentive to the L2 users by suggesting that Maria perform the move that she wanted to. He had a different priority than Elsa and was more concerned with the L2 users on an interpersonal level, perhaps in part because he wanted them to return as volunteers in the future and to build a rapport with the Institute as well. His directive to Maria about giving an explanation about Parelli to the other L2 users was framed as a request, for example, rather than a command. He also encouraged Maria to perform the maneuver that she wanted while in the ring. At the Misericordia, while Francesco was also concerned about the volunteers returning in the future, the focus of Francesco's language was on instructing us on the procedures and maneuvers that were essential to know for volunteering at that site. There was little time for social talk during the session. His priority, similar to Elsa's, was to convey the instructional information as clearly and concisely as possible. His directives were primarily therefore, direct with little mitigation in order to be easily understood. Francesco needed to be critical of us if we performed the maneuvers in the wrong way, at the cost of being conventionally polite. However, Locher's (2010) framework of relational work states that the norms of interaction determine what can be considered polite in a particular context. At all of the sites, the supervisor/ trainer used primarily transactional language related to accomplishing their goals, at times at the cost of the building a rapport with the L2 user. Their responses to this type of interaction, as revealed in post-interviews and in the interactions show they had different reactions. Brad admitted having difficulty understanding and therefore creating relationships with the residents, yet he enjoyed his time there and returned on several occasions during the term. His priority was on spending time with the residents and therefore he did not view the lack of social talk with Susana as a negative factor in his experience volunteering there. Maria also

enjoyed her volunteer experience despite her view of Elsa's manner as being abrupt and critical with her. She looked forward to returning again if the possibility presented itself. Samantha, on the other hand, did not have a positive experience with the training session and decided not to return to the Misericordia to volunteer that summer. She admitted being anxious and worried about not being able to remember everything she had learned. Furthermore, in the post interview she clearly stated her view of Francesco as being "scary" and overly critical during the training session, which was one of the reasons she did not return. It is likely, therefore, that attitudinal factors as well as the experience itself played a role in the L2 users perspective of their experience even more so than language use. At each of the sites direct forms such as the imperative were the most commonly used with little mitigation, in the interest of clarity and comprehensibility. Yet, the L2 users internalized their experiences in different ways based on various personal viewpoints.

Study abroad researchers have shown that meaningful interaction with local speakers of the L2 can enhance language learning (Kinginger, 2008). Service-learning has been identified as context that offers this type of opportunity to L2 users during study abroad. While the focus of this study is not on measuring language learning of the L2 users over time, considering the nature of the interactions and language use in this study can shed light on the potential language learning opportunities at each site.

At the CDR, Brad faced several challenges related to the context in which he was not able carry on extended or even at times coherent conversations with the residents. There was much confusion on his part and the residents were not always able to understand him either. His interactions with Susanna included concise, imperative directives for similar types of simple actions. Susanna often used imperatives, at times in the elliptical forms and with indexicals to

indicate her directives to Brad. She often used repetition to reinforce her directives. Brad rarely asked Susanna a confirmation question regarding the meaning of a word or phrase, which means he did not have difficulty understanding her direction. Therefore, Brad had limited exposure to language beyond the formulaic commands of Susanna. His attempts to understand and communicate with the residents would often prove to be unfruitful, although he did find them enjoyable. He often used simple language ("tu sei bella"/ you are beautiful) and was not able to have more complex conversations with the residents. Susanna was too involved with taking care of the residents to have time for casual conversation with Brad.

At the HTC, Maria had more opportunity to speak Italian but at the request of Elsa or Pietro rather than through her own agency. For example, Elsa and Pietro both asked her to explain the Parelli technique, even though she did not want to at first. Maria's language was at times even dictated to her by Elsa - when she was asked Maria to translate her explanation of how to perform a certain maneuver. Maria did take the initiative on occasion to make a request of Elsa or express her non-understanding. During the Misericordia training session, the majority of Samantha's talk consisted of backchannels and requests for information, definition of a word or confirmation of understanding for example. There was little time for social talk during the training session.

Overall, language use by the L2 users and the local Italian speakers at each of the three sites was conditioned by certain constraints such as the type of activities they were engaged in, the power dynamic among the interactants, and their linguistic ability and attitudes. At the HTC and the Misericordia, the setting of the volunteer activity was a training session with one or two local Italian speakers in a position of having expert knowledge and the L2 user in the position of trainee or learner. At both sites there were opportunities for the L2 users to ask clarifying

questions related to the language or the activity but rarely did they have the chance to initiate a conversation or introduce a new topic. The language of the local Italian speakers was most often instructional or procedural with little need for response other than backchannels or questions related to understanding the command. At both sites the language Maria and Samantha were exposed to was from someone of a higher status position and there was little opportunity for them to have peer-to-peer interactions with a local Italian speaker. The activities were collaborative in that the L2 users were involved in the activities with the Italian speakers, but their roles were hierarchical and they were not engaged in the activities as peers. This means that the language use of the L2 users was limited due to the less collaborative nature of the activities and their subordinate position in the context of the interactions.

At the HTC, although the power dynamic was more ambiguous because Maria had a level of knowledge about the Parelli method, Elsa claimed the role of trainer and positioned Maria as trainee or student as reflected in the interactions. Elsa initiated the directives and dominated the overall interaction. Maria accepted that role for the most part, and when she attempted to challenge it by interrupting Elsa, her limited linguistic ability made it difficult for her to express her desires so she continued to follow Elsa's directives.

Brad had more of an opportunity for casual conversation with local Italian speakers at the CDR, who while not exactly peers were at least were not in a supervisory position related to Brad. Their conversations were limited, however, to short exchanges that often ended in misunderstanding, by the residents' cognitive and hearing impairment and by Brad's linguistic ability. Therefore, each site offered a unique set of circumstances that offered both opportunities and constraints on the interactions.

Overall, at the three service-learning sites that were part of this study, there appeared to be limited opportunities for the L2 users to be involved in interactions with Italian speaking peers. The L2 users did not use requests or directives frequently during their service, and the majority of the directives they heard from the Italian speakers were in the imperative form. In the interest of clarity and safety, unmitigated forms of the imperative were most commonly used and the L2 users, therefore, were exposed to a limited variety of directive forms. The L2 users language was most often short backchannels to confirm understanding and there was little opportunity for extended conversation. Even at the CDR where casual conversation was intrinsic to the service itself the conversations were brief, often cut short due to misunderstanding on the part of one or both interlocutors. Relational work was evident in the interactions, however, the emphasis was on successful task completion rather than rapport building. This may be due to the temporary nature of the L2 users involvement at the agencies but also the nature of the activities which understanding the directives was the priority.

Despite the challenges and constraints on the language use of the L2 users, they were exposed to and participated in interaction norms at each of the sites and therefore, service-learning provides a unique opportunity for language learners to use and experience situated language outside the classroom use during a study abroad program. The L2 users were able to use several strategies for understanding (repetition, clarification questions), make simple requests, and begin to build relationships in Italian. Brad was able to connect with and enjoy the company of the Italian residents at the CDR. Maria in the end was successful in performing the maneuver she wanted, and she admitted being enthusiastic about the experience. Samantha was able to complete the training session successfully despite her anxiety. She was able to ask questions when she was unsure about a maneuver and to interrupt Francesco when she had a question.

Even though she decided not to return for service, she was exposed to a great deal of new vocabulary and learned about the tradition of the Misericordia in Italy. In addition to participating in authentic interactions in real time, the L2 users were also exposed to the inner workings of social service agencies in Italy. Each service-learning context therefore, offered opportunities for learning regarding authentic language use outside the classroom as well as Italian society and culture.

Conclusion

This study provides a rich description of situated, authentic language use of three L2 users of Italian and four Italian local speakers during service-learning on a study abroad program in Italy. It shows how L2 users interact with local speakers in service-learning environments outside the classroom; their challenges and limitations as well as the linguistic resources they employ. The close discourse analysis considering language use related to directives, mis)understanding and relational work from a socio-pragmatic perspective reveals previously unknown norms of interaction in this context. The analysis illustrates ways in which language use can lead to linguistic and pragmatic misunderstanding and that breakdowns in communication can interfere with rapport development and accomplishing goals.

Attitudes of the L2 users towards their service experience were influenced in part by their perceptions of the local Italian speakers. For example, Samantha decided not to return to the Misericordia because she felt overwhelmed by the training session and felt overly criticized by Francesco, which caused her to decide not to return for service. Maria, on the other hand, also felt judged harshly by Elsa, but her overall experience was positive and she was enthusiastic about returning. Brad was also motivated to return to the CDR despite major challenges in his interactions with the residents. In short, in the context of this study attitude of the individual L2

user played an important role in determining whether or not they returned to the site for service. A closer look at Samantha's reasons for not returning - anxiety over not being able to remember all the information, fear of being assigned to a task where she would be working with an Italian who did not speak English, and the critical tone of the trainer - can provide guiding principles for pre-service preparation for L2 users and community partners for a more positive and fruitful experience.

Findings from this study can be used by language teachers to inform classroom pedagogy, service-learning and study abroad program planners, as well as community partners to prepare them for interaction with L2 users during service-learning. These implications will be discussed in the following sections along with directions for future research in the areas of second language teaching and learning, service-learning and study abroad.

Implications of the research for second language learning

The findings from this study can inform pedagogical practice in the foreign language classroom and more specifically contribute in various ways to teaching pragmatics. Pragmatic competence goes beyond knowledge of the grammar, syntax and lexicon of a foreign language to include the ability to assess the context and determine the appropriate language for that context. That is, "it entails knowledge of forms as well as their functional possibilities" (Taguchi, 2011, p. 290). There are well known challenges to teaching pragmatics in the classroom. Interactants - students and teachers - have clearly defined and static roles and therefore it is difficult to replicate the range of and type of authentic interactions L2 learners might encounter outside the classroom (Kasper, 1997). Materials used to teach pragmatics are often more form-focused and do not require the learners to consider the appropriate context in which the forms are used. Researchers have suggested pedagogical methods to be used in the classroom that would

enhance pragmatic competence; by a) raising learners' awareness of the way speech acts are used in various situations, b) examining authentic language in context, and c) working together on collaborative tasks, interpersonal as well as transactional, in order to start using the language in meaningful and consequential ways (Kasper, 1997). Participating in service-learning integrated into a foreign or second language learning program can offer the learner the chance to experience all three outside the classroom. The experiences of the L2 users in this study bring to light ways in which classroom preparation could prepare learners not only for the linguistic forms they are likely to encounter in this context, but also the norms of interaction. More specifically, a close examination of the language used by the interactants can serve as a model for understanding challenges learners may face in authentic interactions as well as strategies for successful communication.

The transcripts of the interactions in this study provide practical information about linguistic features that are common in each context ranging from specialized vocabulary related to the context as well as information about pragmalinguistic norms - appropriate forms for speech acts such as requests and directives. At each of the sites the L2 users had difficulty or questions about terminology unique to that context. These terms could be integrated into the language classroom as a way to prepare learners how to use them ahead of time. The majority of Samantha's questions during the Misericordia training session, for example, were vocabulary questions for terms such as "stretcher", "hook", "inside-out", among others. Prior knowledge of the terminology Francesco would use may have alleviated some of Samantha's feelings of anxiety about not being able to remember the vast amount of information she was learning in such a short time. Maria also had difficulties with specialized vocabulary during the Parelli training. Not knowing the meaning of the word "backwards", for example, created a tense

situation with Elsa in which she believed Maria did not know how to perform a maneuver. Instead, she simply did not know the meaning of the word Elsa was using in the command. In the end the misunderstanding resulted in Maria's somewhat negative perspective of Elsa. Learning the vocabulary beforehand can also foster a sense of the L2 user being more of insider at the organization and possibly encourage more dialogue with other volunteers. This could be especially salient during the summer term when there is a shorter amount of time to become familiar with the language used at a particular site. Samantha seemed annoyed that at times she had to use English to ask questions.

> "I was like asking questions in English too like I don't know how to say 'carbon dioxide' and 'oxygen' in Italian that's not something I would learn in class."
>
> (Samantha, post-interaction interview, July 22, 2014)

Knowing more about the language used in a service-learning context could also have an effect on the power dynamic by reducing the knowledge gap between the L2 users and the local Italian volunteers and community partners. With more confidence about the language the L2 users may be more willing to engage in more meaningful ways with the local speakers. With a clearer understanding of the context they may also be willing and able to challenge the power dynamic in the organization by being more active participants in the community.

Nevertheless, this study also reveals a number of limitations and constraints of such pre-departure training. While it is possible to predict some aspects of the service-learning environment, unexpected situations for which the student is not prepared. For example, the L2 users who arrived at the HTC the day the recordings took place expected to work with horses, but instead they were asked to sit and observe a training session taking place in the ring. In addition to the vocabulary related to the HTC context, pre-service preparation could include awareness of sociopragmatic norms for making requests regarding the type of activity they are

involved in. This might include a tricky negotiation, however, between the community partner and the L2 user, which may be best coordinated ahead of time with the language institute. In any case, at least an awareness such issues could be communicated to the L2 user before they begin their service.

Transcripts of the interactions can also be used to examine and better understand sociopragmatic norms for each context - the way people in different positions of power use language - as well as the reasons they use such language (Yates, 2010). Consideration of the ways the interactants negotiate politeness and face in the interactions in this study could broaden the L2 learner's awareness and understanding of a variety of situations they may encounter during service-learning. For example, Brad found himself in a situation of engaging in casual conversation at times with a resident who had difficulty responding to his questions, or with a resident who accused him of doing something he did not do (Excerpt 1.5). Discussions in the classroom regarding possible ways to respond to such situations would help better prepare the future volunteer for service at the CDR. Similarly, it is possible if Samantha was familiar with the kind of language Francesco used - primarily transactional and procedural due to the necessity of conveying a large amount of information in a short time - she may have been less intimidated by him during the session. For example, forms such as the imperative and the declarative with the modal "must" can be considered face-threatening but, in fact, they were both common in this study. The interactions revealed that in the interest of clarity and for expediency, politeness conventions were rarely used during the activities. This information would be useful for pre-service programs that are designed to better prepare learners for the kinds of language and norms of interaction they will likely encounter during service-learning, even though there will likely still be surprises that arise.

Role-play scenarios in the classroom offer the chance for students to simulate and practice authentic interactions in various contexts. Giving students the opportunity to take on the role of someone in a different status position can broaden their perspective on the variety of language forms that can be used in various contexts. It can also help the learner understand why a particular form is used as they engage in discussions about language use in the classroom. The authentic interactions from this study can be used to create role-play activities in the classroom. Specialized vocabulary and technical terms used at each site can be highlighted and discussed as well to prepare learners for the kind of language they will encounter outside the classroom in those settings. The transcripts from authentic interactions with local Italian speakers can show the learners ways in which the L2 users were successful in expressing themselves in the interactions. Interactions created for textbooks on the other hand tend to show an idealized view of intercultural interactions in which their language needs to be "perfect" in order to be understood. In addition, the transcripts also reveal moments of communication breakdown among interactants. Language instructors could use excerpts to have students first identify the problematic language and then offer alternatives language that could advance the conversation or repair the rapport between the interactants.

Examining the way L2 users actually interact with local speakers can reveal that they can communicate and build relationships with others even if their language is not native-like. It can also illustrate strategies that L2 users can appropriate for repair in situations where there are breakdowns in communication. For example, Brad's interactions with the residents could be examined closely and the teacher could elicit possible ways to respond to the residents that could move the conversation along. In Excerpt 1.8 when Brad kept repeating the wrong pronunciation of the word for "children" and the resident continued to be confused, the class could discuss

possible ways to respond in that situation to advance the conversation. The interaction between Samantha and Francesco in which she apologized (Excerpt 3.18) could be examined in class to understand how Francesco's language could have been interpreted as critical of Samantha, while for Francesco it was necessary to be strict about the proper way to perform the maneuver. By discussing and reflecting on the appropriate forms for certain situations they are able to "notice" the forms and then be able to acquire them and use them outside the classroom (Schmidt, 1993). Furthermore, the students could become aware of the potentially face-threatening language they may encounter and learn that in this context it is necessary and appropriate. Role-play situations in which one person took on the position of the supervisor or trainer could allow the participants to have a better understanding of the way they use language in this context and what is considered appropriate, even though it may seem impolite or even harsh language to them. This information would be more beneficial than reading about hypothetical scenarios in a textbook because learners would be experiencing and noticing the language and coming up with conclusions themselves in a more student-centered approach.

Based on the findings from this study, student reflections during service-learning could be guided towards asking the L2 users to observe and write about language use they notice during their interactions while engaged in service. Their observations could then be discussed in the classroom in order to better understand the norms of interaction and how they are related to the context. In this way, Samantha could have discussed her concerns about remembering the material she learned in the training session and also her somewhat negative view of Francesco.

Another area that is beyond the scope of this study but could be very useful in the language classroom is to use the audio recordings to examine intonation or prosody in the interactions. Intonation can carry meaning related to attitudes and emotions of the speaker, and

there is a correlation between prosody, intensity and politeness (Fivella & Bazzanella, 2014). Two of the L2 users called the Italian speakers "mean" or "angry" and this could be the result of misunderstanding of the pitch (and volume) of the directives. For example, a direct command spoken in what is perceive as a harsh tone can convey intensity that may seem inappropriate to an L2 user. Listening to and analyzing the audio recordings, therefore, could prove fruitful for a discussion regarding norms of interaction on the level of intonation.

In summary, the findings from this study can shed light not only on the variety of forms of directives use in authentic situations, but also the way the form is used in a particular context, and how factors such as the activity type and the power dynamic influence language use.

Implications of the research for service-learning

The findings from this study provide an in-depth examination of situated language use at three service-learning projects in Italy. This study adds to the growing field of research focused on the nature of intercultural interactions during service-learning and sheds light on the linguistic benefits and challenges of service-learning for L2 users of Italian.

Based on the challenges faced by the L2 users in this study, more pre-service preparation or training related to language use would be beneficial to both the L2 users and the community partners. For example, Brad reported that his experience at the CDR was a positive one, however, he faced unique challenges in his interactions with the residents. Prior training in how to communicate with elderly residents who had cognitive impairment could have given him strategies for interaction or at least prepared him for the kinds of challenges he would face. In Excerpt 1.5 when Brad and Susanna were having difficulty speaking with a resident, Susanna was able to redirect the conversation to the new topic of going home. Awareness of this type of strategy for advancing a conversation could be helpful to the L2 users who volunteer at the CDR.

At the Misericordia, if Samantha had known more about the extent and type of maneuvers she would be doing ahead of time, it might have alleviated some of her anxiety.

This study also reveals that it would be beneficial for the community partners to have more training in working with L2 users. Francesco had the most experience working with English speakers and was more prepared to explain the Italian translations for the terminology. He was also the most proficient English speaker - in my perspective - of the four community partners in the study. Nonetheless, there were still many instances of Samantha's non-understanding during the training session. In addition, it may be useful for the community partners to be aware of the perspectives of the L2 users regarding their language use. Based on my experience of participating in the Misericordia training and on the interview with Francesco, he may be very surprised to hear that Samantha considered him to be intimidating. From my point of view he was very aware of the challenges that the L2 users generally have during the training session; feeling overwhelmed by the amount of information and not knowing the meaning of technical words in Italian. And he made a concerted effort to give explanations and definitions, in English and Italian, frequently during the session. However, he appeared to not be aware of how sensitive Samantha was to his criticism of her performance of certain maneuvers. Perhaps a training session for community partners, especially those who supervise L2 users, could include basic information about intercultural differences related to communication of directives. Framing criticism as positive reinforcement rather than a negative judgment may lead to more a more positive rapport among the interactants.

More communication between the institute and the community partners regarding the L2 users would also beneficial; their language level and the L2 users' expectations for the service.

While it was not their appointed role to be in that position, some were more willing than others to translate, explain or negotiate for meaning when there was misunderstanding on the part of the L2 users. For example, while Susanna was too busy to be involved in Brad's conversations with the residents as a facilitator or even explain their limitations, Pietro at the HTC took the time throughout the day to explain the meaning of certain words and to be sure we understood what Maria was doing. At the Misericordia Francesco was very aware of his role as teacher and mentioned it on several occasions during the interactions. His English was at a higher level and he was able to translate or codeswitch when necessary. However, he preferred to explain in Italian and was more attentive to the fact that service-learning was a language learning opportunity for the L2 users. If the community partners could be educated regarding the needs, challenges and goals of the L2 users it would be beneficial for all.

Along similar lines, it would be fruitful for all participants - L2 users, community partners and the language teachers - to discuss their goals and expectations of service-learning prior to beginning. For example, in each of the three sites there were few opportunities for any kind of extended dialogue. The majority of the interactions were short and mainly reactions to the directives of the supervisors based on the nature of the service-learning. It appears from this study that just as participating in a study abroad program does not guarantee language learning, simply participating in a service-learning program does not guarantee meaningful interaction. A meeting between service-learning program planners at the hosting institute and the community partners could serve to clarify the purpose of the L2 users at each site and what each side hopes to gain from the experience. The findings from this study can serve as a guide or at least an initial point of entry to having such conversations.

Limitations of the study and directions for future research

The purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth description of the way language was used in these contexts to accomplish goals and build and maintain rapport among the interactants. It also addressed the challenges for understanding that occurred and ways those misunderstandings were addressed. Although limited in scope, this study provides several directions for future research in the area of service-learning abroad. In this section I will discuss some of the limitations of the study and how those limitations lead to future directions for research in the areas of pragmatics, study abroad and service-learning.

The research design of the study was conceived to be a multiple case study, small in scale in order to provide a descriptive analysis of language use in a specific context. Only three L2 users were examined in the study. More participants across different levels could shed light on the ways language proficiency of L2 users plays a role in language use in this setting and whether certain service-learning sites are more adapted to learners of a higher proficiency level. For example, would the Misericordia training be less overwhelming to someone who had a higher level of proficiency? More data across a broader spectrum of L2 users could reveal specific challenges related to the L2 users' level of Italian.

There were only three service-learning sites examined in this study. It would add to the richness of the analysis and to the corpora and possibly reveal similarities or trends across sites to examine language use at more service-learning sites. Transcripts of language use at a wider variety of service-learning environments could be used to prepare L2 users for a broader range of volunteer opportunities. Also, he recordings took place over a short-term summer session in which the opportunities for service-learning were limited. For example, the most popular service-learning site during the fall and spring semesters - working with children at the local elementary

schools - was not available during the summer. Therefore, there were a limited number of sites to choose from during the summer session.

The length of the study was limited to a brief timeframe of several weeks. For the purposes of this study (i.e. describing situated language use) it was understood that the data would represent a snapshot of language use in one moment in time. However, conducting research during the longer fall and spring semesters would allow time to examine learning that occurs over time. The function of language use in rapport building over time could add another dimension to the research.

Service at two of the sites - the HTC and the Misericordia - was not typical of the activities students normally engage in at those sites; less collaborative work was performed. While the data from all sites reveal interactional norms and language use in a specific context, future research could focus on more typical service-learning experiences that may be replicated in the future rather than one-time events such as the Parelli demonstration at the HTC. Nevertheless, the study shows that L2 users doing service-learning may find themselves in an unexpected situation - as did the volunteers at the HTC that day - which is part of the experience as well.

The research in this study focused on the speech acts directives and requests. The majority of the requests were in the form of directives performed most frequently by the community partners. Future research could use the transcripts of this study to explore other speech acts shown to be challenging for the L2 users in this study: openings, leave-taking, and apologies. This would provide more information about the norms of interaction in the context of service-learning. In addition, the transcripts, which offer authentic language use in this context could be used in the language classroom as indicated in the previous section.

Future research could include an analysis of student reflective journals, which could provide a more in-depth understanding of students' perspectives of the interactions and of their overall experience of service-learning. It would be helpful to work with the faculty at the ILI to create guiding questions related to their language use - in addition to more open-ended questions - for the students to address in their reflective journals. This could shed light on the L2 users' reasons for using certain forms in specific interactions as well as their overall impressions of their experiences. This could inform language instructors and service-learning program planners of challenges - linguistic and otherwise - that students face and help them design ways to address their needs.

This study included a limited amount of information about the perspective of the community partners regarding their interactions with the L2 user volunteers and their experience working with L2 users. More in-depth interviews and written testimonials from the community partners would provide insight into their perspectives of the interactions with the L2 users and possibly on their choices regarding their language use. This information when compared with the L2 users' perspectives could shed light on incidents of misunderstanding. In addition, the perspectives of the both the L2 users and the community partners on the interactions would mean that the analysis would rely more heavily on their voices rather than primarily on the views and interpretations of the researcher. In addition, using a stimulated recall technique to pinpoint key incidents in the interactions could provide valuable insight into their reasons for choosing to use a particular form in a given situation. This information could then be used to create targeted materials to be used in pre-service training for community partners as well as in the language classroom for the L2 users.

Interviews with community partners could also bring to light their needs and expectations with regard to the L2 user volunteers. For example, retrospective interviews with the community partner regarding ways in which the L2 user volunteer lived up to, exceeded or failed to coincide with their expectations would be valuable information for the institute to have when planning for subsequent service-learning programs. The interviews could give the institute and consequently the L2 users more information that may help them choose the program best suited to their own expectations. In summary, giving the community partners more of a voice, through interviews would

The data in this study were limited to audio recordings. Video recordings would allow for analysis of non-verbal communication and also provide clues about the setting and the context that could be useful in the analysis of certain features of the spoken language such as intonation and prosody.

Overall, more research is needed in the field of service-learning in a study abroad context. This discourse analysis provided important information about the way L2 users and local Italian speakers interact in the context of the three service learning sites. However, there are many questions still unanswered and research is growing in this area. Having information from an Italian language context can add to the growing research in the area of service-learning and TESOL. Conducting replication studies of research on different languages in service-learning could provide a basis for comparison of language use across cultures. There are other unexplored areas that are ripe for research and many questions remain unanswered regarding intercultural interactions during service-learning abroad: How would an intervention or training program before L2 users engage in service-learning abroad effect their ability to interact with community partners? What would be the nature of directive/request strategies be like in more collaborative

activities in which L2 users were working with peers? There are many areas open for future research in the growing area of applied linguistics and service-learning.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. & Lear, D. (2010). The connections goal area in Spanish community service-learning: Possibilities and limitations. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(2), 231-245.

Achiba, M. (2003). *Learning to request in a second language: A study of child interlanguage pragmatics*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

ACTFL Standards for Foreign Language Learning. Retrieved from: http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/StandardsforFLLexecs umm_rev.pdf

Alfonzetti, G. (2013). Compliments. In M. Sbisà & K. Turner (Eds.), *Pragmatics of speech actions* (pp. 555-586). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Allen, H. W. & Dupuy, B. (2012). Study abroad, foreign language use, and the communities standard. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(4), 468-493.

Altman, R. (1990). Giving and taking advice without offense. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.) *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 95-99). New York: Newbury House.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech Acts*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Banca Dati Dell'italiano Parlato (2013). *List of corpora.* Retrieved from http://badip.uni-graz.at/en/list-of-corpora

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *49,* 677– 713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2010). Exploring the pragmatics of interlanguage pragmatics: Definition by design. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across language and cultures* (pp. 219-259). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (2005). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

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

Bataller, R. (2010). Making a request for service in Spanish: Pragmatic development in a study abroad setting. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(1), 160-175.

Bazzanella, C. (1994). *La facce del parlare: Un approccio pragmatico all'italiano parlato,* Firenze: La Nuova Italia Editrice.

Bazzanella, C. (2002). The significance of context in comprehension: The '*we* case'. *Foundations of Science,* 7, 239-254.

Bazzanella, C. & Damiano, R. (1999). The interactional handling of misunderstanding in everyday conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 31, 817-836.

Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Belz, J.A., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review*. *59*(2), 189-214.

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Biber, D. 2012. Register and discourse analysis. In J.P. Gee and M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of discourse analysis*, (pp 191-208). London: Routledge.

Billig, S.H. (2003). Introduction. Studying service-learning: Challenges and solutions. In S. H. Billig & A.S. Waterman (Eds.), *Studying service-learning: Innovations in education research methodology* (pp. vii-xiv). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Billing, S.H. & Waterman, A.S. (2003). *Studying service-learning: Innovations in education research methodology.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Blasing, M. T. (2010). Second language in second life: Exploring interaction, identity and pedagogical practice in a virtual world. *SEEJ, 54*(1), 96-117.

Block, D. (2007). *Second language identities.* New York: Continuum.

Bloom, M. (2008). From the classroom to the community: Building cultural awareness in first semester Spanish, language, culture and curriculum. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 21*(2), 103-119.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Oshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterances and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8*(2), 165-179.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP), *Applied Linguistics*, *5*(3), 196-213.

Brecht, R.D. and Robinson, J.L. (1995). On the value of formal instruction in study abroad: Student reactions in context. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, (pp. 317-334). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Brecht, R.D., Davidson, D.E., & Ginsberg, R. B. (1995). Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, (pp. 37-66). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Bremer, K. (1996). Causes of understanding problems. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, & P. Broeder (Eds.), *Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters* (pp. 37-64). New York: Longman.

Bringle, R. G., Hatcher, J. A. & Jones, S.G. (2011). *International service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research,* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Thomas Seboek (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253-276). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Butler, C.S. (1988). Politeness and the semantics of modalised directives in English. In J.D. Benson, M.J. Cummings, & W.S. Greaves (Eds.), *Linguistics in a systemic perspective* (pp. 119-153). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Caldwell, W. (2007). Taking Spanish outside the box: A model for integrating service learning in foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*(3), 463-471.

Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, M.B.H., & Richardson, K. (1992). *Researching language: Issues of power and method.* New York: Routledge.

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

Churchill, E. & Dufon, M.A. (2006). *Language learners in study abroad contexts.* Clevedon, Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2013). *Research on service learning, Vol. 2A.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC

Cohen, A. (1996) Speech Acts. In S.L. McKay, & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383 – 420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A.D. & Shively, R.L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *Modern Language Journal, 91,* 189-212.

Cohen, A. D., Paige, R.M., Shively, R. L., Emert, H., & Hoff, J. (2005). *Maximizing study abroad through language and culture strategies. Research on students, study abroad program professionals, and language instructors*. Minneapolis: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisitions, University of Minnesota.

Cole, S. & Anderson, A. (2001). Requests by young Japanese: A longitudinal study. *The Language Teacher.* Retrieved from: http://jaltpublications.org/old_tlt/articles/2001/08/anderson

Cronley, C, Madden, E, & Davis, J.B. (2015). Making service-learning partnerships work: Listening and responding to community partners. *Journal of Community Practice, 23*(2), 274-289.

Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. (2nd. Ed.) Oxford: Blackwell.

DeCock, B. (2011). Why *we* can be *you*: The "we" case forms with hearer reference in English and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43,* 2762-2775.

DeKeyser, R.M. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad, in B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition and the classroom* (pp. 104– 118). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

DeWalt, K.M. & DeWalt, B.R. (2011). *Participant observation.* Plymouth, U.K.: AltaMira Press.

Dewey, T. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier Books.

Dijkstra, K., Bourgeois, M., Allen, R., & Burgio, L. (2004). Conversational coherence: Discourse analysis of older adults with and without dementia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics, 17*, 263-283.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research,* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 1-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ducate, L. (2009). Service learning in Germany: A four-week summer teaching program in Saxony-Anhalf. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 42*(1), 32-40.

Duff, P.A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Dufon, M.A. & Churchill, E. (2006). *Language learners in study abroad contexts*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Ehrlich, S. (2001). Gendering the 'learner': Sexual harassment and second language learning. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender* (pp. 103-128). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ervin-Tripp, S., Guo, J., & Lampert, M. (1990). Politeness and persuasion in children's control acts, *Journal of Pragmatics, 14,* 307-331.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives, *Language in Society, 5,* 25-66.

Eyler, J, & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. New York: Longman.

Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2015). *The language of service encounters.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). Interlanguage refusals: Linguistic politeness and length of residence in the target community. *Language Learning, 54*(4), 587-653.

Fivella, B.G. & Bazzanella, C. (2014). The relevance of prosody and context to the interplay between intensity and politeness: An exploratory study on Italian. *Journal of Politeness Research, 10*(1), 97-126.

Freed, B.F. (2008). Second language learning in a study abroad context. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl and N. H. Hornberger (Eds), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, *2nd Edition* (Vol. 4*,* pp. 113–125) New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media LLC.

Freed, B.F. (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Freed, B.F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D.P. (2004). Context of learning and second language fluency in French: Comparing regular classroom, study abroad, and intensive domestic immersion programs, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*, 275–301.

Furco, A. (2003). Issues of definition and program diversity in the study of service-learning. In S.H. Billig & A.S. Waterman (Eds.), *Studying service-learning: Innovations in education research methodology* (pp. 13-34). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *Introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Golato, A. (2003). Studying compliment responses: A comparison of DCTs and recordings of naturally occurring talk. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 90-121.

Goodwin, C. & Duranti, A. (1992). Rethinking context: An introduction. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 1-42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, M.H. (1980). Directive-response speech sequences in girls' and boys' task activities. In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker, & N. Furman (Eds.), *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 157-173). New York: Praeger.

Grim, F. (2010). Giving authentic opportunities to second language learners: A look at a French service-learning project. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(4), 605-623.

Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 237-257.

Guest, G., Namey, E., & Mitchell, M. (2013). Participant observation. In G. Guest, E. Namey, & M. Mitchell (Eds.), *Collecting qualitative data: A field manual for applied research* (pp. 75-112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Language and social identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, A. (1999). Service-learning and Spanish: A missing link. In J. Hellenbrandt and L. Varona (Eds.), *Constuyendo puentes (Building bridges): Concepts for models of service-learning in Spanish* (pp. 9-31). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Hassall, T. (2006). Learning to take leave in social conversations: A diary study. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 31-58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hassall, T. (2013). Pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: The case of address terms in Indonesian. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 55, 1-17.

Haugh, M. (2010). Intercultural (im)politeness and the micro-macro issue. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across language and cultures* (pp. 139-166). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hellenbrandt, J. & Varona, L. (1999). *Constuyendo puentes (Building bridges): Concepts for models of service-learning in Spanish.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Heller, M. (2003). Discourse and interaction. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis.* (pp. 250-264). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Helmbrecht, J. (2002). Grammar and function of *we*. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Us and others: Social identities across languages, discourses and cultures* (pp. 31-49). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Holmes, J. (1983). The structure of teachers' directives. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 89-115). London: Longman.

Holmes, J. & Marra, M. (2004). Relational practice in the workplace: Women's talk or gendered discourse? *Language in Society, 33*(3), 377-398.

Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work.* London: Pearson Education Ltd.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. In W. Lörscher & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance. Festschrift for Werner Hüllen* (pp. 1250-1288). Tübingen: Narr.

House, J., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (2003). *Misunderstanding in social life: Discourse approaches to problematic talk*. New York: Routledge.

Howard, J. (2003). Service-learning research: Foundational issues. In S.H. Billig & A.S. Waterman (Eds.), *Studying service-learning,* (pp. 1-12). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Huebner, T. (1995). The effects of overseas language programs: Report on a case study of an intensive Japanese course. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 171–94). Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes, (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Education.

Iino, M. (2006). Norms of interaction in a Japanese homestay setting: Toward a two-way flow of linguistic and cultural resources. In M.A. Dufon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 151-173). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Institute of International Education (2012). *Open doors report on international Educational exchange: Duration of U.S. study abroad*. Retrieved from: http://www.iie.org/opendoors

Isabelli-Garcia, C. (2006). Study abroad social networks, motivation and attitudes: Implications for second language acquisition. In M.A. Dufon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts* (pp. 231-258). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (2007). *The discourse reader* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*. (pp. 79-96). New York: Irvington.

Jones, K. (1992). A question of context: Directive use at a morris team meeting. *Language in Society, 21,* 427-445.

Kádár, D. & Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2011). Introduction: Politeness theories in and across cultures. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini & D. Kádár (Eds.), *Politeness across cultures* (pp. 1-15). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved from: http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking* (pp. 316-341). London & New York: Continuum.

Kasper, G. (2006). Speech acts in interaction: Towards discursive pragmatics. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Félix-Brasdefer, & A.S. Omar (Eds.) ,*Pragmatics and language learning, Vol. 11*. (pp. 281-314). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Kasper, G. (2010). Introduction. In G. Kasper, H. t. Nguyen, D.R. Yoshimi, & J.K. Yoshioka, (Eds.), *Pragmatics & language learning, Vol. 12*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G. & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(2), 215-247.

Kasper, G. & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317-334). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language teaching* (pp.1-12). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, G. & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language.* Blackwell, Oxford.

Kerekes, J. (2005). Before, during and after the event: Getting the job (or not) in an employment interview. In K. Bardovi-Harlig and B. Hartford (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk* (pp. 99-132). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Kinginger, C. (2013). Identity and language learning in study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*(3), 339-358.

Kinginger, C. (2011). Enhancing language learning in study abroad. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 58-73.

Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kinginger, C. & Farrell, K. (2004). Assessing development of meta-pragmatic awareness in study abroad. *Frontiers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10,* 19-42.

Kitao, K. (1990). A study of Japanese and American perceptions of politeness in requests. *Doshida Studies in English, 50,* 178-210.

Knight, S.N. & Schmidt-Rinehart, B.C. (2010). Exploring conditions to enhance student/host family interaction abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(1), 64-79.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *Modern Language Journal, 70,* 366-372.

Kruse, J. & Brubaker, C. (2007). Successful study abroad: Tips for student preparation, immersion, and postprocessing. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 40*, 147–52.

Labov, William (1972). *Sociolingustic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Lafford, B.A. (2004). The effect of the context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 201–225.

Lafford, B. A. (2006). The effects of study abroad vs. classroom contexts on Spanish SLA: Old assumptions, new insights and future research directions. *Selected proceedings from the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages, ed. Carol A. Klee and Timothy L. Face,* (pp. 1-25). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Lantolf, J. & Frawley, W. (1985). Oral proficiency testing: A critical analysis. *Modern Language Journal, 69*, 337-345.

Lapkin, S., Hart, D. & Swain, M. (1995). A Canadian interprovincial exchange: Evaluating the linguistic impact of a three-month stay in Quebec. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 67–94). Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Locher, M.A. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Locher, M. A. (2006). Polite behavior within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness. *Multilingua, 25*, 249-267.

Locher, M.A. & Langlotz, A. (2008). Relational work: At the intersection of cognition, interaction and emotion. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquèe (VALS-ASLA), 88,* 165-191.

Locher, M. A. & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research, 1*, 9-33.

Mackey, A. & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Magnan, S. (1986). Assessing speaking proficiency in the undergraduate curriculum: Data from French, *Foreign Language Annals, 19*(5), 429–438.

Magnan, S. & Back, M. (2007). Social interaction and linguistic gain during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*, 43–61.

Marmolejo, F. (2011). The future of higher education internationalization. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Retrieved from: http://chronicle.com.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/blogs/worldwise/defining-internationalization/28615.

Matsumura, S. (2007). Exploring the aftereffects of study abroad on interlanguage pragmatic development. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *4,* 167-192.

McAlpine, D. (2000). Is there a place for the National Foreign Language Standards in higher education? *ADFL Bulletin, 31*(2), 75-79.

Mendelson, V. G. (2004). Hindsight is 20/20: Student perceptions of language learning and the study abroad experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10,* 43-63.

Messick, S. (1994). The interplay of evidence and consequences in the validation of perfomance assessments. *Educational Researcher, 23,* 13-23.

Moore, L. (2008). Language socialization and second/foreign language and multilingual education in non-western settings. In P. A. Duff and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education,* (2nd Ed.). (pp. 175–185). Paris: Springer Science + Business Media, LLC.

Murcia-Bielsa, S. (2000). The choice of directive expressions in Spanish and English instructions: A semantic network. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Discourse and community: Doing functional linguistics* (117- 146). Tubingen: Gunter Narr Verlog.

Norton, B. (1995) Social identity, investment and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 9-31.

Nuzzo, E. (2012). Lo sviluppo delle competenze pragmatiche. In E. Nuzzo & P. Gauci (Eds.), *Insegnare la pragmatica in italiano L2: Recenti richerche nella prospettiva della teoria degli atti linguistici* (pp. 23-43). Roma, IT: Carocci Editore.

Nuzzo, E. (2007). *Imparare a fare le cose con le parole: Richieste, proteste, scuse in italiano lingua seconda.* Perugia, IT: Guerra Edizioni.

Overfield, D. (2007). Conceptualizing service-learning. In A. Wurr & J Hellenbrandt (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Service-learning in applied linguistics*, (pp. 58-81). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Overfield, D. (1997). From the margins to the mainstream: Foreign language education and community based learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(4), 485-491.

Pearson, B. (1989). "Role-ing out control" at church business meetings: Directing and disagreeing. *Language Sciences, 11*(3), 289-304.

Pellegrino, V. (1998). Student perspectives on language learning in a study abroad context, *Frontiers 4*, 91–120.

Pelligrino Aveni, V. (2005). *Study abroad and second language use: Constructing the self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perren, J. (2008). *Intercultural language socialization through volunteering: A qualitative study of directive use in nonprofit organizations.* (Doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Perren, J. (2007). International service-learning in the Philippines. In A. Wurr & J. Hellenbrandt (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Service-learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 263-292). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

Polansky, S, Andrianoff, T., Bernanrd, J.B., Flores, A., Gardocki, I.A., Handerhan, R.J., Park, J, & Young, L. (2010). Tales of tutors: The role of narrative in language learning and service-learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(2), 304-323.

Polio, C., Gass, S. & Chapin, L. (2006). Using stimulated recall to investigate native speaker perceptions in native-nonnative speaker interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 237-267.

Raschio, R. (2004). Adams Spanish immersion and the ascension parish project: Two service-learning projects, two levels of success. *Hispania*, *87*(1), p. 122-127.

Roberts, C. (1996). A social perspective on understanding. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, & P. Broeder (Eds.), *Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters*. (pp. 9 - 36). London: Longman Group, Ltd.

Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Somerset, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sbisà, M. (2001). Illocutionary force and degrees of strength in language use. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*(12), 1791-1814.

Schauer, G. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context.* London, UK: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12*, 55-62.

Schiefflin, B. & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 15,* 163-191.

Schiffrin, D. (1994) *Approaches to discourse*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Schneider, K. P. (2008). Small talk in England, Ireland, and the U.S.A. In K.P. Schneider and A Barron (Eds.), *Variational pragmatics: A focus on regional varieties in pluricentric languages* (pp. 99-140). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schneider, S. (2010). Mitigation. In Locher, M.A. & Graham, S. (Eds.), *Interpersonal pragmatics,* (pp. 253 - 269). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (2003). Discourse and intercultural communication. In In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 538-547). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1995). *Intercultural communication*: *A discourse approach.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (1983). Face in interethnic communication. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication,* (pp. 156-191). New York: Longman.

Searle, J.R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5,* 1-23.

Searle, J.R., Kiefer, F. & Bierwisch, M. (1980). Introduction. In J.R. Searle, F. Kiefer, & M. Bierwisch (Eds.), *Speech act theory and pragmatics* (pp. vii-xii). Dordrecht: Reidel.

Segalowitz, N. & Freed, B. (2004). Context, contact, cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 26, 173–99.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(3), 209-225.

Shardakova, M. (2005). Interlanguage pragmatics in the speech of American second language learners of Russian: Apologies offered by Americans in Russian. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I.

Shively, R. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43,* 1818-1835.

Siegal, M. (1995). Individual differences and study abroad: Women learning Japanese in Japan, in B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 225-243). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sinclair, J. (1994). *Corpus, concordance and collocation,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spencer- Oatey, H. (1993). Conceptions of social relations and pragmatic research. *Journal of Pragmatics, 20*(1), 27-47.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spradley, J.P. (1980). *The ethnographic interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Steinke, P. & Fitch, P. (2007). Assessing service-learning. *Research and Practice in Assessment, 1*(2), 1-8.

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language,* Oxford, Blackwell.

Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (31)*. 289-310.

Talburt, S. & Stewart, M. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad: Race, gender and "living culture". *Modern Language Journal, 83*(2), 163-175.

Tanaka, K. & Ellis, R. (2003). Study-abroad, language proficiency, and learner beliefs about language learning. *JALT Journal, 25*, 63–85.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communications strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning, 30*(2), 417-428.

Taylor, J. B. (2007). What the service in service-learning? In A. Wurr & J. Hellenbrandt (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Service-learning in applied linguistics,* (pp. 5-31). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis.* Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/10.4135/9781849208895

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*, 91-112.

Thompson, G. (2012). *Intersection of service and learning: Research and practice in the second language classroom.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Tilley-Lubbs, G. (2004). Crossing the border through service-learning. *Hispania, 87*(1), 135-136.

Tommaselli, M.V. & Gatt, A. (2105). Italian tag questions and their conversational functions. *Journal of Pragmatics, (84)*, 54-82.

Tonkin, H. & Quiroga, D. (2004). A qualitative approach to the assessment of international service learning. *Frontiers, 10,* 131-150.

Torrens, V. & Escobar, L. (2006). *The acquisition of syntax in romance languages.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints and apologies.* Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co.

Varner, I. & Beamer, L. (1995). *Intercultural communication in the global workplace.* Chicago, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Vedder, I. (2008). Competenza pragmatica e complessità sintattica in italiano L2: L'uso dei modificatori nelle richieste. *Linguistica e Filologia, 25*(1), 99-123.

Ventola, E. (1979). The structure of casual conversation in English. *Journal of Pragmatics (3)*, 267-298.

Vine, B. (2004). *Getting things done at work: The discourse of power in workplace interaction.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Vine, B. (2010). Interpersonal issues in the workplace. In Locher, M.A. & Graham, S. (Eds.), *Interpersonal Pragmatics,* (pp. 329 - 351). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Warga, M. and Scholmberger, U. (2007). The acquisition of French apologetic behaviour in a study abroad context. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 4,* 221-251.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watts, R.J. (1992). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behavior: Reconsidering claims for universality. In R.J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language* (pp. 43-69). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9*, 145-178.

Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs, *Foreign Language Annals, 31*, 23–39.

Wolfson, N. (1983). Rules of speaking. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication*. London: Longman.

Yates, L. (2010). Pragmatic challenges for second language learners. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures* (pp. 287-308). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Yorio, P.A. & Ye, F. (2012). A Meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on social, personal and cognitive outcomes of learning. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *Vol. 11*(1), 9-27.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A new model of excellence. In E. Zlotkowski (Ed.), *Successful service-learning programs: New models of excellence in higher education* (pp. 1-14). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

APPENDIX A - Interview protocols

L2 user retrospective interviews

I interviewed the participants as soon after the service as possible, often on the way home that same day. The purpose of the interviews was to elicit information about their perspectives of the interactions with local Italian speakers. The initial questions were purposely open-ended in order to allow the L2 users to identify any incidents or behavior that was salient to them.

Sample retrospective interview questions for L2 users:

1) How did the service go today?

2) Were there any challenges related to the language or anything else?

3) What was your impression of the people you worked with?

4) Did you have difficulty understanding anything they asked you to do? If so, did you eventually understand? If so, what strategies did you use to figure it out?

5) Did you notice any behavior that you would consider inappropriate or rude?

6) Anything else that you want to mention about the service today?

Additional more focused questions would be asked related to any specific incidents that I noticed. For example:

1) Remember when X happened?

2) Can you explain what happened?

3) What did you think about that? Did you think the language/behavior was appropriate?

Italian speaker interviews

I was able to conduct a formal interview regarding the interactions with only one of the Italian speakers, Francesco of the Misericordia. The other Italian speakers I gleaned their perspectives of the interactions either before or during service. The focus of the questions was a bit different from the L2 user interviews. Rather than focusing on their impressions of specific individuals' language and behavior, the interviews ended up being more about their impressions of working with American study abroad students. The interviews with the local Italian speakers, formal and as part of casual conversation were all conducted in Italian. Here are sample questions from the interviews with the local Italian speakers (translated to English):

1) Have there been in your experience any difficulties with the language or understanding each other during service with the American volunteers?

2) Can you think of an example of a misunderstanding that has occurred between your staff or Italian volunteers and American volunteers?

3) What is your impression of the American student volunteers?

APPENDIX B - Transcription Conventions

:	Colon indicates an elongated sound or syllable. Multiple colons are used to indicate a prolonged elongation.
( )	Items enclosed in single parentheses indicate researcher doubt.
(---)	Three dashes enclosed in parentheses indicate researcher's inability to understand the utterance.
(#)	Pauses of longer than 1 second are indicated by enclosed parentheses with the approximate length of the pause noted in seconds and minutes. For example, (1.5) means one minute and five seconds.
[	Left bracket indicates the beginning of an overlapping utterance.
]	Right bracket indicates the ending of an overlapping utterance.
[[ ]]	Double bracket indicates researcher explanation
=	Equal sign indicates latching.
?	Question mark indicates a rising intonation.
Underline	Underline indicates emphatic stress
CAPS	Capital letters indicate the utterance was much louder than the surrounding talk
(( ))	Paralinguistic features or enclosed in double parentheses
-	A dash indicates a sudden cut-off

All line numbers in the excerpts provided refer to the line numbers in the transcript from which they were taken. At the beginning of each excerpt the transcript name and line number(s) are noted, e.g., [Excerpt 1.0 - HTC-SL, 12-15]. Excerpt 1.0 was taken from the Horse Therapy Center (HTC) during service-learning (SL) and refers to lines 12 - 15 in the audio transcript. This information reveals the relative time at which the interaction occurred in the recording; i.e. lines 12-15 occurred early on in the recordings, which may have implications for the analysis.

Transcription abbreviations

Abbreviation in transcript	Name of participant	Community partner (CP) or L2 user	Location
BRA	Brad	L2 user	Casa di riposo (CDR)
ELS	Elsa	CP	Horse therapy center (HTC)
FRA	Francesco	CP	Misericordia
MAR	Maria	L2 user	HTC
PIE	Pietro	CP	HTC
RES	Resident	CP	CDR
RSR	Researcher	L2 user / Researcher	All
SUS	Susanna	CP	CDR

APPENDIX C- Audio Recordings

Transcript Code	**Service-learning or interview**	**Length of recording**	**Location / Date**	**Participants**
MIS- SL	Service-learning	1:31:00	Misericordia 06/05/14	Samantha, Francesco, Researcher
MIS-INT	Interview	47:09	Misericordia 07/17/14	Francesco, Researcher
HTC-SL	Service-learning	1:53:14	Horse therapy center 6/24/14	Maria, Pietro, Researcher
HTC- INT	Interview	10:46	Horse therapy center 6/25/14	Maria, Researcher
CDR-SL	Service-learning	24:57	Casa di riposo: Nursing home 6/24/14	Brad, Susanna, Researcher
CDR-INT	Interview	5:28	Casa di riposo: Nursing home 6/24/14	Brad, Susanna, Researcher
CDR-SL	Service-learning	1:22:41	Casa di riposo: Nursing home 7/22/14	Brad, Susanna, Researcher

APPENDIX D - Institutional Review Board letter of approval

USF
UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH FLORIDA

RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND COMPLIANCE
Institutional Review Boards, FWA No. 00001669
12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., MDC035 • Tampa, FL 33612-4799
(813) 974-5638 • FAX (813) 974-7091

February 18, 2014

Kristy Cardellio
World Languages
Sarasota, FL 34236

RE: **Expedited Approval for Initial Review**
IRB#: Pro00015871
Title: Interlanguage pragmatics in study abroad service-learning interactions: Request strategies in Italian

Study Approval Period: 2/18/2014 to 2/18/2015

Dear Ms. Cardellio:

On 2/18/2014, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and **APPROVED** the above application and all documents outlined below.

Approved Item(s):
Protocol Document(s):

irb study protocol.docx

Consent/Assent Document(s)*:

Informed Consent .pdf

*Please use only the official IRB stamped informed consent/assent document(s) found under the "Attachments" tab. Please note, these consent/assent document(s) are only valid during the approval period indicated at the top of the form(s).

It was the determination of the IRB that your study qualified for expedited review which includes activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures listed in one or more of the categories outlined below. The IRB may review research through the expedited review procedure authorized by 45CFR46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. The research proposed in this study is categorized under the following expedited review

category:

(5) Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis).

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

As the principal investigator of this study, it is your responsibility to conduct this study in accordance with IRB policies and procedures and as approved by the IRB. Any changes to the approved research must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval by an amendment.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Sincerely,

John A Schinka, Ph.D.

John Schinka, Ph.D., Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board