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ABSTRACT

This study is an exploration of spoken communication in a cross-cultural context, with Japanese learners of English specifically in mind. It has two main purposes. The first is to examine the theoretical background to the field in order to formulate a descriptive model for the study, which will then be applied to empirical data. At the same time it is hoped that the process of the enquiry itself will have direct implications for pedagogy. That is, it is planned that the research will provide a model for a consciousness-raising methodology. This is the second purpose.

The study consists of three parts. The first part, Chapters 1-5, investigates the theoretical background to the present study, covering such areas as theories of communication (Chapter 2) and culture (Chapter 3). Chapter 4 explores a descriptive model for the present study. Chapter 5 consolidates the first part and presents a general framework for learner needs in communication. The second part, Chapters 6-8, is mainly descriptive. It aims to apply the theory of communication to an empirical study. Chapter 6 concentrates on the description of the research design, including the design of the questionnaires and the recorded data. Chapter 7 discusses the results of the questionnaires. Chapter 8 concentrates on the analysis of the recorded data, focusing specifically on certain features of conversational style such as pause/silence, overlapping, interruption and repetition. Each feature will also be discussed from the perspective of the sociocultural values attached to its use. The last part, Chapter 9, deals with pedagogy. It aims to combine theory with practice and to provide a model for a consciousness-raising methodology through the preceding discussion of the theories and the data.
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PREFACE

In the street where I used to live in London, I would often hear an elderly man's voice asking,

'Miss, have you got the time, please?'
'Miss, do you have the time, please?'

A woman's voice would follow, 'Ten-thirty'.
'Thank you', the old man would acknowledge.

Thirty seconds later, you would hear the same voice again,

'Mr, what's the time now, please?'

(Oh-oh again?)

'Ten-thirty', a young man's voice would answer.

Fifteen seconds later, you would again hear,

'Miss, have you got the time, please?'

(Not, again?!)  

By now, you might have noticed that something is wrong with the above exchanges. What would you think is happening here? This is surely not a realisation of the language function 'asking for information, or specifically, how to ask the time', similar though it may sound to an example of classroom discourse, a teacher asking a question (Initiation), followed by an answer (Response) and a feedback (Feedback): a typical IRF type exchange.

At first, I just thought that somebody was literally asking for the information. Then, I thought that perhaps this elderly man was suffering from forgetfulness. But when I noticed that these exchanges took place repeatedly, sometimes twice a day but usually a few times per week, sometimes during the day, but usually at night or even after midnight, the strangeness of the occurrence attracted my attention. Gradually, a slightly more detailed pattern revealed itself. It turned out that there was usually a preliminary action before these exchanges
took place; that is, you would hear somebody walking in the street and then the sound of the window being opened. After that the usual exchange would start with some variations. Thus, it emerged that these exchanges were not taking place in the street, but actually the elderly man's voice came from next door and the other interactants were passers-by.

It took some time for me to understand the situation. In the end, I came to a conclusion that this elderly man lived on his own next door and that whenever he needed to talk to somebody, though not necessarily wanting the information, he would often initiate this exchange.

It appears to be a typical example of what Malinowski (1923) calls 'phatic communion'. He was not wanting any specific information, although at a superficial level, it looked like a typical example of 'transactional' exchange. What he really wanted was to establish 'rapport' (Aston 1988) with somebody else. Living on his own and spending most of the time talking to nobody, what was most important for him was just to talk with somebody on whatever subject. Thus, the information he got as a consequence of the exchange was not of the slightest significance to him.

This example may be an extreme case. However, it shows clearly the importance of the role of communication in our everyday life. Communication seems to be far more sophisticated than only transmitting information, and interpreting human interaction seems to include also the interpretation of interactants' intentions, attitudes and feelings as they are conveyed in actual exchanges. This is a study of communication in cross-cultural context.
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This study has emerged from an increasing concern with cross-cultural communication, particularly with Japanese learners of English in mind. With ever-expanding opportunities for people to communicate with speakers of English—either with native or non-native speakers—in various international settings on business, academic or personal levels, the need to equip learners of English for actual communicative situations is also increasing. When talking about actual communication between people from different backgrounds, it is inevitable that one also has to consider sociocultural 'appropriateness' (Hymes 1972). However, traditionally, this has not been a practice of language teaching in Japan. The gap between social demands and the actual capacity of Japanese learners of English to speak is widening. It is primarily with this in mind that the necessity for such research has emerged.

This study, therefore, concentrates on the role of English as a means of communication. In so doing, specific focus will be placed on the study of spoken discourse. Thus, first of all the nature of communication will be explored in order to clarify what it is that constitutes the needs of learners and the objectives of the course. In particular, the notions of communicative and pragmatic competence will receive special attention.

The study of spoken English as a means of communication inevitably requires a cultural perspective as well. When people from different cultural backgrounds communicate with each other, they usually reveal
their own culture-bound communicative patterns even if they are ostensibly communicating in the same language. Moreover, these patterns often emerge subconsciously. Conversational interactants on both sides are usually unaware that the specific conversational style of their partners derives from different cultural dispositions. This sometimes results in misunderstanding, for example, of the personality of their conversational partners or worse: when the encounters involve serious social settings such as job interviews or courtroom hearings, lack of awareness could cause serious disadvantages on the side of less powerful interactant. It is essential that the study of spoken English as a means of communication include a cross-cultural perspective. It, therefore, inevitably combines the study of language and culture.

Thus, this research aims to combine the study of spoken English with that of culture. This perspective has been chosen with special reference to Japanese speakers of English.

Notwithstanding the fact that the study of English as a means of communication is receiving more and more attention these days, specific studies of Japanese speakers of English in this area still seem to be limited. Moreover, although there is a general recognition that the teaching should be directed towards spoken communication, there does not yet seem to be a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of English as a means of communication which is based on firm theoretical considerations.

To create an effective language teaching and learning environment which takes into consideration learner needs and differing social contexts, a
sound theory which underlies and supports teaching methods and materials is essential. In this sense, this study can also be said to be a process of enquiry, which attempts to combine a theoretical study of language as a means of communication and practical pedagogic concerns based on a discussion of the theory. The enquiry then has three purposes. The first is to investigate the theories of communication and formulate a descriptive model based on the discussion. The second purpose is to apply the descriptive model to empirical data with a view to turning the findings to pedagogic advantage. Thirdly, the process of enquiry itself is meant to have a direct bearing on pedagogy in that it is intended to provide a model for a consciousness-raising methodology which can be made relevant to actual classrooms.

The study consists of three parts. The first part, Chapters 1 to 5, examines the theoretical background to the study of cross-cultural communication, with reference to various disciplines. It deals with the notions of communicative and pragmatic competence (Chapter 2), the concept of culture and its relationship with language and communication (Chapter 3), and considers three different approaches to analysis: Contrastive Analysis, Discourse Analysis, and Conversational Analysis (Chapter 4), examining their relationship to each other. Finally, a general framework for learner needs is formulated (Chapter 5).

The second part, which includes Chapters 6 to 8, is mostly concerned with empirical research. It aims to apply the theory to the data of cross-cultural communication and to assess its applicability. Chapter 6 concentrates on introducing a research design, including the design
Chapter 7 discusses the results of the questionnaires. Chapter 8 deals with an analysis of the major study of face-to-face conversational interactions. The analysis specifically focusses attention on certain features of conversational style which are salient at topic boundaries of the recorded data. They are the phenomena of pause/silence, overlapping, interruption, and repetition.

The use of these features will also be discussed from the perspective of value differences imposed on them. In particular, how the notions of the 'cooperative' and the 'territorial imperative' (Widdowson 1983) or 'solidarity' and 'deference' (Scollon & Scollon 1983) are related to the frequent use of a certain type of feature will be discussed. This is because when language is examined from the perspective of its use as a means of communication, taking into consideration a cross-cultural perspective, it is inevitable that differing cultural values which are attached to certain cultural patterns are brought into play.

Thus, the cross-cultural study of language as a means of communication needs to investigate not only linguistic and cultural conventions characteristic to a specific situation but also the specific values attached to them, otherwise successful communication will be hindered. Chapter 8 attempts to achieve these aims.

The final part, Chapter 9, on the basis of the preceding discussion, attempts to relate theory to practice. It suggests that the theoretical and research framework presented in this study be introduced and combined in a classroom situation where teachers conduct
their own research on the basis of theoretical considerations and where learners are actively involved in problem-solving tasks. That is to say, the enquiry seems to combine what Widdowson (1990) calls 'the instructional activity', in which 'techniques are devised with regard to their practical effectiveness in the promotion of learning' (1990:3), and the 'experimental activity', in which 'techniques are related to principles with a view to enquiring into the relationship between the two' (Widdowson 1990:3). Thus, it is hoped that both learners and teachers as researchers benefit directly or indirectly from the enquiry process.
CHAPTER 2 THEORIES OF COMMUNICATION
(From Communicative Competence to Communicative Capacity)

2.1 COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Since my concern is communication, my first task is to consider how it has been defined and how such definitions can provide a basis for deciding on what needs to be taught. In this section, I shall first examine the background to the emergence of the notion of communicative competence and then explain how it has been expanded to provide a general framework for learner needs in communication.

2.1.1 From Grammatical Competence to Communicative Competence

Language learning is obviously a matter of developing competence in the language. But what does it entail? 'Grammatical competence' has been, and still is a primary concern of both learners and teachers. 'Grammatical competence' in the Chomskyan sense means only knowledge of grammar, or to be more precise, 'grammatical knowledge as a deep-seated mental state below the level of language' (Widdowson 1988:3).

According to Widdowson (1988), Chomsky is only interested in grammar (1988:2). This seems to have coincided for a long time with the interest of language teachers and learners. However, recent years have witnessed various arguments concerning the inadequacy of providing learners with only grammatical competence (although to be more precise again in the Chomskyan sense, the term 'providing' might not be appropriate since grammatical competence, as mentioned above, is 'a deep-seated mental state' and not something teachers can provide for.
learners). Consequently, various scholars have explored, reinterpreted or expanded this concept of competence according to their own research interests. Amongst these, Hymes has played the most influential role.

2.1.1.1 Hymes' Model

Hymes, with his anthropological background, finds the Chomskyan notion of linguistic competence too idealised and inadequate. He argues that according to Chomskyan linguistic theory, 'judgements' made are only of two kinds: 'grammaticality' and 'acceptability'; this, he thinks, is not adequate. He suggests that:

If an adequate theory of language users and language use is to be developed, it seems that judgements must be recognized to be in fact not of two kinds but of four. And if linguistic theory is to be integrated with theory of communication and culture, this fourfold distiction must be stated in a sufficiently generalized way. (1972:281)

This 'fourfold distinction' comprises Hymes' much quoted model of communicative competence, which consists of four parameters: what is 'formally possible' (grammaticality), 'feasible' (psycholinguistic factors), 'appropriate' (sociocultural factors) and 'in fact done' (probabilities of occurrence) (Hymes 1972:281, 284-286, also see summaries and interpretations by Munby 1978, Canale & Swain 1980 and Widdowson 1983, 1988). Thus, Hymes has extended Chomsky's original two parameters of competence to four, adding three new domains of 'feasibility', 'appropriateness' and 'actual occurrence', all of which fall into the category of 'acceptability in Chomsky's model.
In addition to extending the parameters of competence, Hymes also expands the components of competence from Chomsky's one: 'knowledge', to two: 'knowledge' and 'ability for use'. More importantly, he states that each of the four parameters consists of both 'knowledge' and 'ability for use'. Widdowson (1988), observing this point, identifies that Hymes' model of competence has eight elements whereas Chomsky only has two (1988: 4). Thus, while the focus of Chomsky's competence is only on knowledge of grammar, Hymes' model of competence has far wider coverage. This might be illustrated as follows:

Another remark to be made concerning Hymes' model of competence is that, of Hymes' four parameters, the last of the four, 'what is actually done', seems to have a slightly different status compared to the others; it could in fact be seen as a result of the interplay of the three other parameters; as Hymes puts it:

In sum, the goal of a broad theory of competence can be said to be to show the ways in which the systemically possible, the feasible, and the appropriate are linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behavior. (Hymes 1972: 286)

It may therefore be said that to satisfy this parameter of
'attestedness' (Widdowson 1988), a continuous evaluation and interaction process is called upon, through which the judgement of occurrence and non-occurrence is made based on the knowledge of 'attestedness'. The following illustration might be useful to clarify the situation:

![Diagram showing the relationship between possibility, ability, knowledge, performance, feasibility, appropriateness, and occurrence/non-occurrence.]

Figure 2.2 Hymes' Fourth Parameter

To summarise, the main differences between Hymes' and Chomsky's models are the inclusion of 'ability for use' within the framework of competence by Hymes, and his extension of the parameters of competence from Chomsky's two to four. For the purpose of the present research, Hymes' expansion of the parameters of competence is very significant, particularly the inclusion of the parameter of social 'appropriateness' together with that of 'attestedness'. These two features, therefore, will receive particular attention.

Thus, Hymes' model of competence is generally considered to be more comprehensive in explaining communicative behaviours and his model has influenced various scholars. However, although it explains what kind of knowledge learners require more comprehensively than Chomsky's
idealised competence model, it does not inform us how this knowledge is put into use in actual communicative situations. We shall now need to move towards the activation of this knowledge. In so doing, I shall firstly examine Canale & Swain's model of communicative competence, which, while basically following Hymes' original model, extends it to include the notion of 'strategic competence', which could be said to be a clue as to the activation of knowledge.

2.1.1.2 Canale and Swain's Model

Canale & Swain (1980), after examining various theories of communicative competence, state the necessity of an 'integrative' theory since the existing theories 'do not provide an integration of the different components', paying 'little attention to how individual utterances may be linked at the level of discourse' (1980:20). They state that 'an integrative theory of communicative competence' needs grammatical, sociolinguistic and discourse competencies. Later they add 'strategic competence' to these three components, and place discourse competence in the category of sociolinguistic competence.

The inclusion of strategic competence, which is 'made up of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies' (1980:30), is important in that it handles breakdowns in communication 'to cope in an authentic communicative situation' and 'to keep the communicative channel open' (Canale and Swain 1980:25). In this sense, 'strategic competence' has a direct relevance to the present research.

In addition to the above three components of communicative competence,
Canale & Swain (1980) add another factor, 'probability rules of occurrence', which also constitute one of the four parameters of communicative competence in Hymes's (1972) framework. However, they include this as a subcomponent of each of the three categories and explain that 'probability rules of occurrence attempt to characterize':

the knowledge of relative frequencies of occurrence that a native speaker has with respect to grammatical competence (e.g. the probable sequences of words in an utterance), sociolinguistic competence (e.g. the probable sequences of utterances in a discourse), and strategic competence (e.g. commonly used floor-holding strategies).

(Canale and Swain 1980: 31)

Canale and Swain thus draw our attention to the existence of 'probability rules of occurrence' in each of the three components of communicative competence. Although in Hymes' original framework these rules are presented as one of four parameters, it has been noted in the previous section that Hymes seems to have given this parameter a different status from the others in that its actual occurrence is supposed to take place as a result of the interplay of the other three. Canale and Swain (1980) locate this parameter more clearly on a different level from the other three parameters, which seems to have clarified its status. Their framework can be illustrated as follows:

Figure 2.3 Canale & Swain's (1980) Integrative Theory of Communicative Competence
Canale (1983) slightly modifies the original theoretical framework of the three competencies, 'grammatical', 'sociolinguistic' and 'strategic', to four, separating 'discourse' competence from 'sociolinguistic competence'. On the other hand, the parameter of 'probabilities of occurrence' has somehow lost its status as a subcomponent of each of the competencies of the original framework although Canale does mention them concerning appropriateness of meaning and form within the domain of sociolinguistic competence. He states that this notion is 'of limited value given the unpredictable and creative aspect of communication' (1983:8). This, in a sense, is a regression from the original framework, since 'probability rules of occurrence' seem to be related to each of the other parameters as discussed earlier.

Regarding strategic competence, Canale (1983) emphasises its role as not just related to problems of a grammatical nature but also to those of a sociolinguistic and discourse nature. This is an interesting statement because we can now see through the foregoing discussion of Hymes' framework of communicative competence and Canale and Swain's (1980) original framework that Canale is treating the notion of 'strategic competence' as if it is somewhat similar to 'the probability rules of occurrence' in the Hymesian sense. Thus, although Canale has almost discarded the notion of 'attestedness', we could infer that this notion has been merged into 'strategic competence' in Canale (1983). Another of Canale's contributions is that he clarifies the relationship between communicative competence and 'actual communication', in which
communicative competence plays a part; this had traditionally been
dealt with under the heading of 'performance' in the previous
framework. Actual communication includes, for example, 'other systems
of knowledge and skills, e.g., world knowledge' and 'theory of human
communication, e.g., volition, personality' as well as communicative
competence. But important though these are, Canale does not develop
the discussion much further. In sum, Canale's model of competence
still seems to remain static although there is the potential for
dynamism in his treatment of strategic competence. This situation can
be illustrated as follows:

```
Actual Communication

- communicative competence
  - other rules of communication and skills (e.g. world knowledge)
  - theory of human communication (e.g. volition, personality)
  - strategic competence

Figure 2.4 Canale's (1983) Model of Actual Communication
```

Canale emphasises that his four areas of competence only 'illustrate
what communicative competence (minimally) includes' (1983:12); thus, he
leaves room for additions. At the same time, he emphasises that this
theoretical framework is based on 'a modular view', not 'a global one'.
That is to say, 'communicative competence is analysed as composed of
several separate factors (areas of competence) that interact'
(1983:12). This attitude towards a theoretical framework seems to be
sound, since it is tolerant of the effect of the interaction of other factors. However, in order to serve his original purpose, that is, to clarify the components of competence in order to establish a framework for the assessment of learner achievement, he seems to have proved that it is difficult (if not impossible) to devise comprehensive criteria for the assessment of communicative competence; in other words, the more components and parameters it has, the more complicated it is to produce a framework for assessment.

Another point needs to be made concerning the nature of the components of communicative competence in Canale and Swain's framework. In the latter, communicative competence is understood as 'knowledge' and 'skill'. This interpretation is convenient for assessing learners' acquisition of knowledge and skills, but they do not tell, nor are they interested in, how such knowledge and skills are activated in actual communicative situations. From this standpoint, their model can again be said to be static.

However, their 'strategic competence' is a possible exception in that it, by its very nature, plays a role in negotiation in the course of communication both in compensating for breakdowns and in enhancing 'the effectiveness of communication' (Canale 1983:11). This might help to bridge the gap between 'static' and 'dynamic' models of communication. Canale & Swain (1980), by introducing 'strategic competence', seem to have given a clue as to how to act upon knowledge.
Thus, the inclusion of 'strategic competence' in the framework of competence and the recognition of 'probabilities of occurrence' as a subcomponent of each of the three parameters seem to be two of the contributions of Canale and Swain. However, as to the nature of strategic competence, further refinement is necessary. If communication is to be understood as a dynamic process which takes place between interactants, we need a more comprehensive theory which accounts for the dynamic nature of communication and allows for the negotiation of meaning between the interactants. This leads us to Widdowson's model of communication, which offers movement in this direction.

2.1.2 Widdowson's Model of Communication

Widdowson (1983), having found both the existing model of 'competence' by Chomsky (1965) and that of 'communicative competence' by Hymes (1972) inadequate as frameworks for communication, formulates a new concept called 'capacity', which is:

the ability to create meanings by exploiting the potential inherent in the language for continual modification in response to change. (1983:8)

He states his preference for the term 'capacity' over 'communicative competence' because, firstly, the latter 'seems to imply an analytic, rather than a user, perspective', and secondly, it 'seems to imply conformity, either to code (linguistic competence) or to social convention (communicative competence)' (1983:25).
Thus, Widdowson's (1983) 'communicative capacity' seems deliberately more comprehensive compared to Hymes' 'communicative competence', which still seems insufficient for learners for the purpose of activating their knowledge in actual situations, including the negotiation of meaning, whether it be grammatical or sociocultural. Canale and Swain's model is also insufficient even though it has extended Hymes' original notion of competence by adding discourse' and 'strategic' competencies, since it still remains at the level of knowledge and does not have the explanatory power of dynamic procedures of interaction.

Widdowson's (1983) 'communicative capacity' appears to be satisfactorily formulated in that it also considers the user's standpoint, enabling 'the user to make sense of expressions of varying possibility, feasibility, and so on' (1983:25). Moreover, it seems to encompass what Canale & Swain (1980) call 'strategic competence' since 'capacity' as 'procedural ability' (1983:41) is 'used to match up and adjust schemata in the discourse process' (1983:40) and because procedures:

are the interactive negotiating activities which interpret the directions provided and enable us to alter our expectations in the light of new evidence as the discourse proceeds. (1983:40-41)

Thus, if we interpret 'communicative capacity' in a broader sense, it seems to include the elements which Canale & Swain (1980) define as 'strategic competence'. Here, the question arises that if 'communicative capacity' enables the learners to negotiate meaning and modify existing schemata, then it might be the case that possessing 'communicative capacity' prevents breakdowns. It can therefore be said
that if one has 'communicative capacity', one does not need 'strategic competence'. But here we have to remember that 'strategic competence' is not confined to repair but also 'enhances the effectiveness of communication' (Canale 1983:11). Therefore, we could conclude that strategic competence is a component of 'communicative capacity'.

2.1.3 Gumperz's Definition

Gumperz, in his attempt to define 'communicative competence', adds another dimension to frameworks of competence, particularly, to the notion of 'strategic competence'. That is, he has partly demonstrated the way in which knowledge is accessed in negotiating procedures. According to Gumperz, communicative competence is:

\[
\text{the knowledge of linguistic and related communicative conventions that speakers must have to initiate and sustain conversational involvement. (1982b: 325)}
\]

He points out (1982b: 327-328) the importance of 'contextualization cues', which are related to conversational 'sequencing or turn-taking processes'. This refers to Sacks et al's work on conversational analysis, especially on turn-taking mechanisms, which 'are organized about transition relevance places'. Gumperz, however, states that Sacks et al (1974) 'give no data on how such transition relevance places are signalled'. He points out that 'chunking or phrasing of speech' plays an important role. According to him:

\[
\text{Chunking is an act of interpretation involving simultaneous processing of signs at several levels of signalling: prosodic, phonological, syntactic, lexical and rhythmic-----.(1982b: 327)}
\]

For example, he stresses the importance of 'rhythmicity' in maintaining
'conversational involvement', quoting Erickson and Shultz (1982); and emphasizes 'the role of tempo and pausing in segmentation' (1982b:327), which has been pointed out by Chafe (1980b). In this sense, contextualization cues are understood as signals for conversational management. Gumperz (1984) later redefines 'communicative competence' as:

The knowledge of discourse processing conventions and related communicative norms that participants must control as a precondition to being able to enlist and sustain conversational cooperation. (1984:280)

This knowledge of 'discourse processing conventions' might be more appropriately called a component of 'strategic competence' in that it is the knowledge required in an ongoing process, that of interaction, and of negotiation of meaning. Gumperz emphasises this knowledge of 'discourse processing conventions' as well as linguistic competence are two of the important components of the framework of communicative competence. What Gumperz (1984) refers to as the knowledge of 'discourse processing conventions' and 'communicative norms' here appears to be related to what Widdowson (1983) calls 'schematic competence'. We might as well call the actual capability to utilise these competencies 'strategic capacity', using 'capacity' in the Widdowsonian sense.

2.1.4 'Communicative Language Ability' --- Bachman's Model

Bachman (1990) attempts to define a framework of 'communicative language ability' as a 'basis for language testing' (1990) drawing on earlier theories of communicative competence (e.g. Hymes 1972, 1973;
Canale & Swain 1980; Savignon 1983; Canale 1983). He states that his framework of 'Communicative Language Ability (CLA)' consists of 'both knowledge or competence, and the capacity for implementing, or executing that competence in appropriate, contextualized communicative language use' (1990:5) and includes the following three components:

1. language competence
2. strategic competence
3. psychophysiological mechanisms (1990:84)

Of the above three components, his emphasis seems to lie on the second, 'strategic competence'. He defines 'strategic competence' as the mental capacity for 'implementing the components of language competence in contextualized communicative language use'(1990:84). His idea of 'strategic competence' basically develops from Faerch & Kasper's (1983) model of communication strategies. However, Bachman develops their model, which, according to him, 'is intended only to explain the use of communicative strategies in interlanguage communication' (1990:100) and views 'strategic competence' as 'an important part of all communicative language use, not just that in which language abilities are deficient and must be compensated for by other means' (1990.100). He further states that the function of strategic competence is:

to match the new information to be processed with relevant information that is available (including presuppositional and real world knowledge) and map this onto the maximally efficient use of existing language abilities. (1990:102)

Thus, what characterises Bachman's model of CLA seems to be this recognition of 'strategic competence' as a part of a dynamic process. However, his use of 'strategic competence' is misleading because
'competence' here is expanded beyond the limit of a level of knowledge as he defines it originally, to include the ability to use that knowledge. It might, therefore, be more appropriate to use the term 'strategic capacity' which describes procedural ability to negotiate meaning in ongoing interaction.

Bachman then presents his own model of 'strategic competence' as 'consisting of three components' of 'assessment, planning and execution' (1990:100) and further explains how these components interact with each other in order to achieve a particular communicative goal (1990:100-104). He emphasises the status of strategic competence, or 'strategic capacity', as an independent entity which plays a necessary role in a dynamic process to achieve communicative goals but which is separate from language competence; this he divides into two competencies: organizational and pragmatic.

One of the characteristics of Bachman's 'language competence', as mentioned above, is the distinction between 'organizational competence', which consists of 'grammatical' and 'textual' competence and 'pragmatic competence', which includes 'illocutionary' and 'sociolinguistic' competence. Here, what Bachman calls 'textual competence' appears to be what Canale (1983) terms 'discourse competence' and also what Widdowson (1983) refers to as 'interpersonal schemata' (1983:55), thus, it is a component of 'schematic competence'. Textual competence also includes such aspects as conversational maxims, which normally comprise an aspect of pragmatic competence, since conversational conventions, according to Bachman:
appear to be ways in which interlocutors organize and perform the turns in conversational discourse, and may be analogous to the rhetorical patterns that have been observed in written discourse. (1990: 88)

Textual competence, therefore, includes what Gumperz calls 'discourse processing conventions' and thus, 'schematic competence' (Widdowson 1983).

At this point it is worth referring to Levinson (1983), who places conversational structure in the domain of pragmatics. Bachman's 'pragmatic competence' consists of two competencies; that of 'illocution', which is 'the knowledge of language functions' represented by Speech Act Theory, and that of 'sociolinguistics', which is 'the knowledge of social conventions' and which seems very similar to the definition of 'sociolinguistic competence' in the Hymesian sense (1972). 'Illocutionary competence', however, is very specific to Bachman, being limited only to language functions. This, in the Widdowsonian definition, is categorised as 'rhetorical routines' of schematic competence.

Bachman has made a very useful attempt to subdivide 'language competence' into two competencies of 'organization' and 'pragmatics' for practical assessment purposes. This makes it easier to measure different competencies. However, since the actual scope of pragmatic competence seems to be wider than Bachman's definitions, this may cause further confusion as pragmatic phenomena are also covered in 'textual competence' and 'grammatical competence' under his classification.
Another possible confusion in Bachman's framework of language competence is the seemingly interchangeable use of terms 'knowledge' and 'ability'. He states in the notes that he will use 'knowledge' and 'competence' more or less synonymously, and further explains that:

the term ability includes both knowledge or competence and the capability for implementing that competence in language use (1990:108)

Here, ability is inclusive of knowledge, but the reverse is not the case. Notwithstanding this statement of the difference, Bachman uses knowledge and ability synonymously when explaining language competencies, which could lead to a certain confusion. A somewhat similar confusion between 'competence' and 'ability' in Chomsky's (1980) framework has also been pointed out by Widdowson (1988).

### 2.1.5 Communicative Competence and Pragmatic Competence

Recently, Widdowson (1988) stated that Hymes' model of 'communicative competence' could be 'reformulated as grammatical competence (the parameter of possibility) on the one hand, and pragmatic competence (all other parameters) on the other' (1988:8). Here, Widdowson's interpretation superficially appears similar to Chomsky's (1980) recent attempt to divide 'knowing a language' into two categories of grammatical and pragmatic competence. However, although the terms used are the same, the scope they entail is different since Chomsky's competence does not in principle include 'ability for use'; whereas Hymes' competence covers both knowledge and ability. Also it is not very clear in Chomsky's framework of knowledge what 'pragmatic knowledge' includes apart from very general and vague definitions such
as:

a cognitive system distinct and differently structured from grammatical competence (1980: 90)

and,

the knowledge of conditions and manners of appropriate use (1980: 224)

In the above sense, Chomsky's 'pragmatic competence' seems to be similar to Hymes' knowledge component of 'sociolinguistic competence'; moreover, it is even nearer to Canale and Swain's (1980) 'sociolinguistic competence' in terms of its scope; as Taylor (1988) also points out, the scope of the latter is narrower than that of the former. Thus, Chomsky's pragmatic competence is more limited in its range than what Widdowson calls Hymes' 'pragmatic competence', which consists of knowledge of 'feasibility', 'appropriateness' and 'performance' as well as 'ability for use' for each kind of knowledge mentioned above.

Hymes' model, however, is not without problems. Widdowson points out that Hymes says little about 'the relationship between knowledge and ability' (1988: 5) so that, for example, it is difficult to tell:

what constitutes knowledge of appropriateness convention, as distinct from an ability to be appropriate. (1988: 4)

He sets out to explore this relationship and tries to characterise 'knowledge' in terms of 'analysability' and 'ability' in terms of 'accessibility'. This refers to Bialystok's (1982) attempt to describe
a model of language proficiency, in which she distinguishes learners' analysed knowledge from unanalysed knowledge for a functional purpose.

Bialystok, later with Sharwood-Smith (1985), distinguishes between 'linguistic knowledge and the learners's control of that knowledge in real-time processing utterance' (1985:101); on the basis of Chomsky's (1980) distinction between 'grammatical competence' and 'pragmatic competence', they regard linguistic knowledge as consisting of 'grammatical knowledge' and 'pragmatic knowledge'. Language ability, according to them involves these 'knowledge systems and control of those systems' and they illustrate the relationship between the two as follows:

![Figure 2.5 Relationship between control procedures and two aspects of linguistic knowledge (Bialystok and Sharwood-Smith 1985:106)](image)

Thus, as Widdowson (1988) points out, for Bialystok and Sharwood-Smith ability is comprised of knowledge and control, which is 'the ability to apply the learner's formal knowledge of aspects of the language in various contexts (1985:111). This is an improvement on Chomsky's model of grammatical and pragmatic competence, which consists only of knowledge.
This definition is somewhat similar to Hymes' model of 'communicative competence' as interpreted by Widdowson (1988), although again, as in Chomsky's model of pragmatic competence, it is not clear what Bialystok and Sharwood-Smith's pragmatic knowledge actually involves. However, by involving control procedures, which might be called 'strategic capacity'—this is similar to Bachman's 'strategic competence'—they have shed light on the way in which this linguistic knowledge is activated.

In sum, Bialystok and Sharwood-Smith can be said to have succeeded in clarifying the concepts of knowledge and ability in the framework for communication. By introducing control procedures, they also give clues as to how to activate linguistic and pragmatic knowledge together with strategies in communicative situations.

2.1.6 Framework for Learner Needs in Communication

Having reviewed different models of communication, now we need to establish a framework for communicative objectives on the basis of the foregoing discussion.

First of all, to be a good communicator in a language, learners need to possess 'the knowledge of language' as a foundation. This consists of two levels. At one level, there is linguistic competence, which includes knowledge of syntax, semantics and phonology. At the other level, there is knowledge of appropriate use; that is, 'whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated' as in the
Hymes, sociolinguistic competence (Hymes 1972:281). Also at this level we might add what Widdowson calls 'schematic competence' which is divided into two main schema types: 'frames of reference' for 'propositional content' and 'rhetorical routines' for illocutionary intent (Widdowson 1983:41); what Gumperz calls 'discourse processing conventions' could also be included here, although this might be more appropriately included in 'strategic competence' (see 2.1.4).

Apart from knowledge of language and knowledge of language use, learners need to have a certain ability to activate this knowledge in actual communicative situations. For this, I would like to use the term 'strategic capacity'. This capacity, being a 'procedural ability to match up and adjust schemata in the discourse process' (Widdowson 1983:40), includes what Canale & Swain (1980) call 'strategic competence': the knowledge of strategies for repair in case of communication breakdowns; and at the same time it enhances 'the effectiveness of communication'; it is also very similar to Bachman's 'strategic competence'. Strategic capacity is related to each of the competencies involved. By introducing an extra component here, we risk confusing the concepts of capacity and competence. However, since the ability to cope with the breakdowns in ongoing conversation and also to maintain and enhance conversation is beyond the level of 'knowledge', with which 'competence' is usually associated, we might as well call it 'strategic capacity'. We can then place 'communicative capacity' as a superordinate to strategic capacity and other previously mentioned competencies.
The reason I introduce 'strategic capacity' in addition to the notion of 'communicative capacity' is because communication also breaks down with the lack of 'capacity' if 'capacity' is a relative concept. Communication may break down when learners fail to 'realize and modify existing schema' (Widdowson 1983:50), as well as when they lack knowledge of language and knowledge of the use of language. Accordingly, when learners have not fully developed any of their competencies, they need more 'strategic capacity' to compensate for their failure if they are to achieve the same level of successful communication as more advanced learners. This can be illustrated as follows:

![Figure 2.6 The Relationship between Strategic Capacity and Competencies in the Framework of Communicative Capacity](image)

Although in theory it is true that those who have not fully developed their competence need more 'strategic capacity' in order to make up for the shortfall, in practice it does not seem that learners develop both competence and 'strategic capacity' simultaneously. However, 'strategic capacity' may be universal since people often experience communication breakdowns even when conversing in their own mother tongue. It can therefore be said that even beginners have the potential for strategic capacity, and accordingly, it will be less difficult for learners to acquire foreign languages if they are made aware of the fact that they can utilise certain strategies common to
their mother tongue to compensate for their lack of competence in their target language. It would therefore be useful for learners to be familiarised with a knowledge of various communicative strategies and also with ways in which to activate that knowledge to facilitate the development of 'communicative capacity' from the very beginning of their learning experience.

Lastly, the relationship between 'competencies' and 'strategic capacity' needs to be balanced in communicative situations for successful communication to take place. Even if a person's 'competencies' have not been developed well enough, and communication breakdowns quite often take place, if s/he has strategic capacity it will enable him/her to repair the breakdowns, or even before breakdowns take place learners will be enabled to negotiate meaning.

In this section I have concentrated on a review of frameworks of competence, focussing on how Chomsky's original framework has been extended by those of Hymes and his followers. Hymes' expansion of the notion of communicative competence - especially the parameters of 'appropriateness' and 'attestedness' - has a direct bearing on the present research. On the other hand, through this exploration, it has been indicated that even Hymes' extended framework for competence remains at the level of knowledge. A clue as to the activation of this knowledge lies in 'strategic capacity', which was originally introduced as 'strategic competence' by Canale and Swain (1980); it was later extended and elaborated in Bialystok and Sharwood-Smith (1985) as 'control procedures' and in Bachman (1990), who also highlights the
execution of linguistic knowledge. Thus, when we discuss the actual use of language, i.e. pragmatics, strategic capacity plays an important role. In the following section, I shall discuss how pragmatic competence plays an important role along with strategic capacity, in the study of communication.

2.2 THE DEFINITION OF PRAGMATICS

In the previous section, I examined some of the existing frameworks for communicative competence. While studying various models, 'pragmatic competence' was referred to several times. In this section I shall concentrate on exploring the domain of pragmatics and its relationship to the study of communication. Here, Levinson's approach to pragmatics provides a convenient starting point.

2.2.1 Levinson's Approach to Pragmatics

Not being satisfied with the traditional definition of pragmatics as being 'the study of language usage' (1983:5), Levinson (1983) launches into an attempt to define it. He works his way through several definitions of pragmatics (see 1983:7,9,12,21,24,27) and comes to the conclusion that pragmatics as 'meaning minus semantics' is most promising; this, he understands as:

a theory of language understanding that takes context into account, in order to complement the contribution that semantics makes to meaning. (1983:32)

Therefore, pragmatics deals with areas where semantics alone cannot
give a satisfactory explanation. That is, pragmatics can be defined as the study of meaning in context. Pragmatics, then, according to Levinson's definition, can be illustrated by the following figure.

Thus, Levinson (1983) takes a broader scope for pragmatics. He is centrally concerned with such phenomena as:

presuppositions, speech acts and other context-dependent implications, together with troublesome phenomena like honorifics and discourse particles (1983: 37),

and tries to bridge the gap 'between a semantic theory (together with a syntactic and phonological theory) and complete theory of linguistic communication' (1983: 38). Another remark to be made and one which is characteristic of Levinson's approach to pragmatics is that he places great stress on conversation or 'the systematics of face-to-face interaction' (1983: 44) because of its capability to give 'functional explanations of linguistic phenomena' (1983: 44).
He lists two approaches to the study of interaction: 'straightforward empirical analysis, and analysis-by-synthesis' (1983:44). As an example of the former approach, Levinson lists 'the nature of conversational interaction' as promising, since it 'has an elaborate and detailed structure of which we have very little conscious awareness' (1983:46-7). One of the characteristics of Levinson's (1983) approach to pragmatics is this recognition of the importance of insights from conversational analysis to the concepts of pragmatics. It is this study of conversational structure, which gives us a great insight into the nature of human interaction, covering such areas as turn-taking and topical organization, to which I shall return for further investigation in Chapter 4. As an example of the latter approach, Levinson introduces Goffman's (1976) 'distinction between system constraints and ritual constraints' (1983:44), which has a great deal to offer in the study of interactive processes. Levinson points out that if 'all the essential concepts for the analysis of pragmatic phenomena' are 'traceable to the fundamentals of interaction' (1983:45), this is the most direct and powerful way to study human interaction. Since the interest of the present study research lies in conversational interaction, I shall now pursue this approach to pragmatics.

2.2.2 System and Ritual Constraints — Goffman's Approach to Pragmatics

Goffman's (1976) distinction between 'system constraints' and 'ritual constraints' plays an important role in the study of conversational interaction. According to him, 'system constraints' are concerned with
a 'basic framework for face-to-face talk', covering also what Sacks et al (1974) call 'turn-taking' systems. They might be, as Goffman also points out, more 'pancultural' (1976:267), whereas 'ritual constraints' are more culture dependent and 'can be expected to vary quite markedly from society to society' (1976:267). The latter are more concerned with 'various forms of territoriality' (1976:266) of conversational participants, that is, with 'acceptability' (Widdowson 1983), while 'system constraints' are more to do with 'accessibility' (Widdowson 1983) of information.

'Ritual constraints' deal with various interactional features which tend to be culture specific. According to Goffman, 'ritual constraints' give us:

a means of attending to what it is about different social situations that makes them relevantly different from the management of talk. (1976:268)

Thus, Goffman's notion of 'ritual constraints' conveys a significant implication for the present study, which employs a cross-cultural perspective. However, what Goffman stresses is not only the importance of 'ritual-constraints' but also 'system-constraints', or rather, the combination of both.

Levinson, interpreting Goffman's remark, states that system constraints are 'the ingredients essential to sustaining any kind of systematic interweaving of actions by more than one party' (1983:44). He goes on to say that with this approach:
phenomena would be traceable to the fundamentals of interaction. (1983:45)

At the same time, he points out the necessity of 'the study of ritual constraints, the social and cultural constraints on interaction', to complement the above approach, especially at the outset, since the approach based on system-constraints is still 'too abstract to provide systematic functional accounts of the minutae of linguistic structures' (1983:45).

For a sound theory of communication, both system and ritual constraints (or 'accessibility' and 'acceptability' (Widdowson 1983)) need to receive equal attention. However, not all scholars stress the importance of both notions equally: some are more interested in 'acceptability', while others put more emphasis on 'accessibility'. I shall now explore some of the approaches of these scholars, starting with Brown & Levinson, who, by introducing the notion of 'face', focus exclusively on 'acceptability'.

2.2.3 Positive and Negative Face

--- Brown & Levinson's Approach to Pragmatics

Brown & Levinson (1978 & 1987) in their comprehensive study of politeness, introduce the notion of 'face' based on Goffman (1967). According to them, 'face' is 'public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself' and is something that 'must be constantly attended to in interaction' (1978:66). They classify face into two: positive and negative faces, and define them as follows:

negative face: the want of every 'competent adult member' that
his actions be unimpeded by others
positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others. (1978:67)

They state that negative face is associated more with the notion of 'politeness' 'with its derivative politeness of non-imposition', while positive face with 'its derivative forms of positive politeness are less obvious' (1978:67).

Negative politeness is essentially 'avoidance-based', while positive politeness is 'approach-based' (1978:75). The former is further characterized by 'self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of H's (the addressee) self-image, centring on his want to be unimpeded' (1978:75).

Along with the notions of negative and positive face, Brown & Levinson introduce the notion of 'face-threatening acts (FTAs)', which 'by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker' (1978:70). FTAs need to be minimised. Here, Brown & Levinson introduce various strategies for minimization of face risks. They state that in Western culture, 'negative politeness is the most elaborate and the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress' (1978: 135).

From the perspective of the present study, it will be of interest to examine whether there is any difference or similarity in the use of different strategies of politeness across cultures. This question will
be dealt with in the questionnaires of the present study (see Chapters 6 & 7).

In sum, Brown & Levinson (1978) by introducing the notion of 'face' (Widdowson's (1983) 'territoriality'), concentrate on politeness, on 'acceptability' or the 'territorial imperative'.

Another scholar who also focusses exclusively on 'acceptability' is Leech.

2.2.4 Leech's Approach to Pragmatics

In Leech's approach to pragmatics, what he calls 'Interpersonal Rhetoric', -which consists of several principles, but most notably the Gricean 'Cooperative Principle', on which basis his pragmatics develops,- and his own invention, the 'Politeness Principle', play an important role. In fact, Leech's pragmatics focusses attention mainly on these two principles although he deals with performatives and speech act verbs as well. It must, however, be borne in mind that Leech's 'Interpersonal Rhetoric' is mainly concerned with 'acceptability', whereas Grice's 'Co-operative Principle' principally deals with 'accessibility'. Leech (1983) develops the notion of 'acceptability' in terms of 'politeness'. He explains the necessity of the Politeness Principle as follows:

the CP in itself cannot explain (i) why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean; and (ii) what is the relation between sense and force when non-declarative types of sentence are being considered. (1983: 80)
He introduces the PP 'as a necessary complement' to the CP and states that while Grice is basically interested in propositional meaning, he himself is 'more interested in a broader socially and psychologically oriented application of pragmatic principles' (1983:80) and that 'this is where politeness becomes important' (1983:80). He also casts doubt on the universality of the CP and states that this is where the study of 'socio-pragmatics' comes on the scene although he himself does not widen his scope to include sociopragmatic phenomena. According to Leech's classification, there are two types of 'politeness': 'absolute' and 'relative'. It is on the former that he focusses, pointing out again that the latter should be dealt with in the domain of sociopragmatics. He further states that he deals with absolute politeness 'as a scale, or a set of scales (see 5.7, 6.1), having a negative and a positive pole' (1983:83). Thus, his interest lies in establishing a set of universal scales of politeness.

These 'universal' scales seem to be consonant with one of his maxims, the Tact Maxim, which he describes in detail in relation to the CP. However, once he moves on to an explanation of other maxims of politeness, notably, for example, of the Modesty Maxim, Leech's discussion of universal scales, without any consideration of language and culture-specific aspects, seems to become less convincing.

While admitting his negligence of 'the typological study of culture and languages in relation to the Interpersonal Rhetoric', Leech resorts to pointing out the relativeness of the values allocated to the different maxims by different cultures. These 'relative weights' of value,
however, do not seem to solve the problems. Leech is aware of the confusion in this area, but states that 'the Interpersonal Rhetoric provides a framework in which they may be systematically investigated' (1983: 150). Although this may be true, it nevertheless seems less than plausible, since the framework has been presented on the basis of English, while the concerns of other languages and different cultures have been excluded. It is not clear whether politeness in different cultures fits into this framework. It therefore seems necessary to have a cross-cultural perspective based on empirical back-up.

To summarise, Leech tries to establish a framework for what he calls 'Interpersonal Rhetoric', which he develops on the basis of Grice's conversational principles. He tries to compensate for the insufficiency of the CP by introducing the PP in order to make the framework universal. Thus, although basing on the CP, Leech focusses more on 'acceptability' by concentrating on the PP. He regards politeness as a major phenomenon of pragmatics. The difficulty here lies in the fact that the domain of politeness ironically seems most culturally variable; thus, it stands in need of a cross-cultural perspective. However, in contrast to Goffman, who, by introducing the notion of 'ritual constraints', presents a cross-cultural dimension, Leech limits his discussion to 'general pragmatics', excluding a sociocultural dimension. Its inclusion is inevitable if we are to develop a comprehensive framework for human communication. Although Leech intentionally disregards the study of sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics for the sake of idealisation, these two domains are highlighted in a study by Thomas (1983).
2.2.5 Pragmalinguistics versus Sociopragmatics

Thomas (1983), although starting from the standpoint of Leech's (1983) pragmatics, focusses attention on pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics, both of which Leech (1983) intentionally excludes from his focus. She also points out the inadequacy of Leech's definition of 'speaker meaning' and states the necessity of dividing it into two levels as follows:

Level 1-----to 'assign sense and reference to speaker's words'
Level 2-----to 'assign force or value to the speaker's words'

In other words, Level 1 speaker meaning seems to be what Austin (1962) calls 'propositional meaning' and Level 2, 'illocutionary force'. Failure in the interpretation of Level 1 and 2 speaker meanings would cause what she calls 'pragmalinguistic' and 'sociopragmatic' failures. For example, at one end of Level 2, where pragmatics conveys information on 'the speech act or communicative intent of the utterance' (1983:101), pragmalinguistic failure would occur: whereas at the other end of Level 2 speaker meaning, where pragmatics conveys information on

the attitude of the speaker towards the hearer (the degree of deference intended, perceptions of relative power, rights and duties, social distance, etc., existing between speaker and hearer) (Thomas 1983:101),

what Thomas calls 'sociopragmatic failures' are most likely to take place. Thomas (1983), however, admits that there is no clear demarcation between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failures and that there is a certain 'grey area' where the both types interact with each other on a continuum (1983:109).
Terminologically, Thomas' distinction between 'pragmalinguistics' and 'sociopragmatics' seems to have contributed to clarification of the difference between linguistically oriented pragmatics and pragmatics which is more sociolinguistically and psycholinguistically oriented as in Levinson (1983: 27).

At this stage, Thomas's definition of 'sociopragmatics' still sounds very general and wide-ranging, and includes such aspects as 'the size of imposition, cost/benefit, social distance and relative rights and obligations' (1983: 104) as criteria for sociopragmatic judgements. However, these merely represent a few of the possible causes of 'sociopragmatic failures', which occur, in particular, when there exist differences between two cultures; they are not exact definitions of the domain.

Elsewhere, Thomas (1983) defines sociopragmatic failure as 'the social conditions placed on language in use' (1983: 99). This seems to be more of a definition of 'sociopragmatics' itself than that of 'sociopragmatic failure'. It would be more accurate to say that sociopragmatic failure takes place when one fails to meet 'the social conditions placed on language in use', particularly as Thomas (1983) herself states that 'sociopragmatic failure stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behaviour' (1983: 99). But appropriate judgements on what 'the social conditions' are, or 'what constitutes appropriate linguistic behaviour', seem to depend on how correctly one understands 'the size of imposition, cost/benefit, social distance and so on'.
Thomas recently seems to have been concentrating more on 'cross-culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance', focussing on 'unequal encounters' (1985a:765) in terms of 'power relationship, social distance, role relationships, perceptions of relative rights and obligations or of size of imposition' (1985a:780). A central concern of pragmaticists here is to account for 'indirectness, discoursal indeterminacy and pragmatic ambivalence' (1985a:767). In doing so, she points out the inability of conversational analysts to explain 'how participants cope with these uncertainties since they refuse to seek explanations beyond the exchange system itself' (1985a:767-8). However, in rejecting the approach of conversational analysts for its lack of explanatory power, Thomas also disregards another contribution which Conversational Analysis has to make: she undermines CWA's ability to describe the signalling process of conversational interaction, which is concerned with conversation management such as turn-taking and topic shifts.

Thus, Thomas' pragmatic theory excludes the interactional aspect of discourse, concentrating mainly on the interpretation of the speech act. This is not satisfactory if we are to formulate 'a more general theory of human interaction' as she herself states, quoting Leech (Leech 1983 discussed in Thomas 1985a:777-8). Ideally, both aspects of discourse should receive equal attention. She, however, further advances the notion of pragmatics, introducing the term 'dynamic pragmatics', which she defines as taking into account the following three aspects:

1. the various pragmatic parameters (power, size of imposition, etc)
This seems to be a step forward from her earlier work (e.g. 1983), which mostly concentrates on the interpretation of one single utterance or exchange. Here, she is trying to bring exchanges into the context of ongoing interaction, judging from the parameters involved. However, she seems to be describing the parameters as the means to evaluate the product of negotiation but not the process of negotiation itself. This may be partly because she rejects Conversational Analysis as a descriptive instrument for its lack of explanatory power as mentioned earlier. As a result, she lacks a way in which to integrate all the parameters for the interpretation of extended discourse. What is needed is greater attention to the description of negotiating processes in ongoing interaction.

2.2.6 Situation Focussed Approach to Pragmatics (Gumperz's approach)

Gumperz (1987) has recently stated that there are three approaches to pragmatics; a language centred, a text centred and a situation focussed approach. He emphasises the importance of the third of these and points out the lack of an integrated theory of verbal communication:

---which integrates what we know about grammar, culture and interactive conventions into a single overall framework of concepts and analytical procedures. (1982:4)

Being interested in the analysis of 'the participants' ongoing process of interpretation in conversation (1982a:4), Gumperz finds that analysis by linguistic pragmaticists is 'largely sentence-based' (1982b:17) and that 'it does not attempt to deal with the role of language in
interactive processes' (1982b:17). He employs an ethnomethodological insight in order to obtain an in-depth qualitative and interpretive analysis of ongoing conversational interaction, where the participants' role-relationship, social-cultural and ethnic background are involved, and calls this approach an 'interpretive sociolinguistic approach' (1982b:1). Its goal is to show how ideology enters into face-to-face speaking practice to create an interactional space in which the subconscious and automatic sociolinguistic process of interpretation and inference can generate a variety of outcomes and make interpretations subject to question. (1982b:3) To achieve this goal, he concentrates in his data on the analysis of: verbal interaction sequences where speakers of differing social and ethnic backgrounds unconsciously employ distinct language usage and rhetorical strategies. (1982b:8) What characterises Gumperz's (1982a,b) approach to pragmatics, then, is that he has introduced empirical data collected in real human face-to-face interaction, where value-laden assessments might take place. His approach is basically ethnographic; however, he also emphasises the importance of understanding and evaluating a situation 'from a member's perspective' (1982b:10), which leads to ethnomethodology.

His account of human communication takes into consideration 'modern urbanised societies' (1982a:6), where various power relationships and conflicts exist. This is a realistic consideration since human communication cannot take place ignoring the external context, the participants, and the context the participants themselves create in the course of interaction. Yet, it is, in a sense, revolutionary since, as Gumperz (1982a,b) himself rightly points out, approaches to the study
of human communication have, so far, mainly given attention to the sentence level 'referential meaning or truth value of isolated propositions' (1982a: 3).

Another contribution of Gumperz (1982a,b) is his approach to data, which is founded on an 'empirical basis' (1982b:8) and analysis. He introduces an ethnomethodological approach into an ethnographical tradition. This has enabled him to look much more effectively at the data, and particularly at discourse contextualising cues, in which he is most interested. He claims the universality of 'the pragmatic conditions of communicative tasks' (1982b:12), which include such tasks as:

(1) narrating  
(2) explaining  
(3) arguing  
(4) emphasizing  
(5) instructing  
(6) directing  (1982b:11),

and states that what is 'culturally variable' (1982b:12) is 'the realizations of these tasks' (1982b:12) and that this variation can be analysed from different perspectives as follows:

(1) Different cultural assumptions about the situation and about appropriate behavior and intentions within it.
(2) Different ways of structuring information or an argument in a conversation
(3) Different ways of speaking: the use of a different set of unconscious linguistic conventions (such as tone of voice) to emphasize, to signal logical connections and to indicate the significance of what is being said in terms of overall meaning and attitudes. (1982b:12)

According to Gumperz, (1) covers such areas as 'politeness norms'; whereas (2) is related to 'issues traditionally covered in rhetorical analysis and deals with such phenomena as sequencing of arguments and
with decisions about what needs to be stated and what must be conveyed indirectly' (1982b:13). The demarcation between (1) and (2) seems less clear than this since some of the features listed under (2) seem to be covered under the category of (1) as well. However, we could say that category (1) seems to be related to what Thomas (1983) calls sociopragmatics, while categories (2) and (3) are related more to 'pragmalinguistics' (Thomas 1983), although it is also difficult to make a clear demarcation between them. In particular, 'pragmalinguistics', according to Thomas' original definition (Thomas 1983), seems to be narrower than what I have referred to as pragmalinguistics on the basis of Gumperz (see above), in that Thomas, in her study, does not pay attention to various linguistic conventions, which characterise different ways of speaking.

Thus, Gumperz's approach to pragmatics, by emphasising the importance of 'the role of language in interactive processes' (1982b:17), seems to be more concerned with 'accessibility', although a reference is made to 'acceptability' in terms of 'politeness norms'. On the other hand, both Leech and Thomas, as we have seen, focus more attention on 'acceptability'. A scholar who refers to both aspects of pragmatics is Lakoff.

2.2.7 Lakoff's Approach to Pragmatics

Lakoff (1973), emphasising the importance of 'context' in the interpretation of utterances, points out the necessity of 'some kind of pragmatic rules' (1973:296) and introduces 'Rules of Pragmatic Competence' as follows:
the pragmatic content of a speech act should be taken into account in determining its acceptability just as its syntactic material generally has been, and its semantic material recently has been. (1973:293-4)

An interesting further remark to be made here is that she formulates 'the rules of clarity' from the Gricean notion of co-operative principle, which according to her can be reduced to two maxims:

1 Be clear (i.e. Widdowson's(1983) accessible)
2 Be polite (i.e. Widdowson's(1983) acceptable) (Lakoff 1973:296)

Here, she states that 'politeness supersedes clarity' when two rules conflict with each other (1973:297) and includes the following in Rules of Politeness:

1 Don't impose
2 Give Options
3 Make A feel good---be friendly (1973:298)

She further states that 'rules of conversation' can be regarded as subcases of Rule 1, i.e., Rules of Clarity. Finally, she emphasises the universality of the rules but the existence of 'different orders of precedence for these rules' (1973:303).

In sum, it can be said that 'politeness' plays the most important role in Lakoff's 'pragmatic rules'. Grice's (1967, 1975) conversational rules, which are concerned mainly with 'accessibility', enter into Lakoffian Pragmatic Rules as subcases of Rules of Clarity*3. In everyday informal human communication, what seems to be most important is not just acquiring information, but establishing a 'rapport' between the interactants; the 'interactional' goal is more important than the
'transactional' one, to borrow Aston's (1988) terms. From the viewpoint of the present research, in which the emphasis is on dyadic face-to-face informal conversation, Lakoffian pragmatic rules also seem sensible, since these pay attention both to 'acceptability' and 'accessibility', although less weight is put on the latter. Ideally, both aspects should receive equal attention.

2.2.8 Communicative Capacity and Procedural Work

Although the term 'pragmatic competence' is not used ostensibly, what Widdowson (1983) calls 'communicative capacity' seems to be related to or even encompasses the domain of 'pragmatics' in a broader sense, capacity being 'the ability to use knowledge of language as a resource for the creation of meaning' (1983:25). What is significant here is that he includes the notion of 'use' and 'activation' in the static knowledge of language and 'social rules', which are represented by Chomsky's model of 'competence' and Hymes' model of 'communicative competence' respectively. He points out that Hymes' 'communicative competence' still seems to take an 'analytic, rather than a user perspective and assume an equation between user and analyst models of language' (1983:25). By contrast, Widdowson's 'communicative capacity' assumes 'the participant point of view' (1983:60), which is one of the main characteristics of the study of pragmatics. As he states, it is 'essentially ethnomethodological' while 'Hymes' capability is essentially ethnographic' (1983:25). It consists of the ability to realise and modify existing schemata by the use of procedures, which are concerned with 'accessibility' and 'acceptability' (Widdowson
Procedural work therefore plays an important role in discussing one's 'communicative capacity'. Widdowson (1983) states that:

the general basis for procedural work is what Grice has referred to as the 'co-operative principle. This provides for conditions for the negotiation of agreed meaning, both in respect of frames of reference and of routines. (1983:68)

Thus, Widdowson clearly states that procedural work should be accomplished through the interpretive procedures of 'frame' and 'routines', the former being used to 'clarify propositional information' (1983:77), the latter to 'establish illocutionary intent' (1983:77). He also emphasises the importance of being concerned with both 'accessibility' and 'acceptability' in procedural work.

'Communicative capacity', then, without carrying the name of 'pragmatics', seems to cover the domain of the latter more comprehensively than any other model.

2.2.9 Concluding Remarks

It seems there are as many different approaches to pragmatics as definitions. However, there seem to be two main approaches; the first is more linguistically oriented, and is primarily concerned with the relationship between semantics and pragmatics, pragmatics being one of the three components of semiotics. This approach mainly sees pragmatics as 'meaning minus semantics', 'pragmatics' dealing with
'what is left over' or 'everything that is not truth-conditional' or 'the stuff that is not encoded' (Fillmore in Verschueren (ed) 1987) and concentrates on 'sentence-based' (Gumperz 1982b: 19) analysis. As Gumperz points out, it is not satisfactory to deal with ongoing conversational interaction, where the participants negotiate the meaning in the process of interaction. Accordingly, it is inappropriate for the purpose of present research as well, which concentrates mainly on the analysis of the ongoing negotiating processes of face-to-face interaction, accounting for participants' socio-cultural backgrounds.

The second approach deals with pragmatics on a 'wider contextual level to understand how people communicate with one another' to borrow Ochs' (1987: 21) expression. Although this definition sounds too general, the scope of pragmatics by this definition seems to include 'cross-cultural pragmatics' or 'sociopragmatics', taking social and cultural behaviours into consideration. This approach is taken by such scholars as Gumperz and Thomas, whose work has been discussed in some detail in this chapter. They have widened the scope of concern to include participants' personal and social relationship in society. For example, the participants' role relationship plays an important role in 'unequal encounter' (Thomas: 1984, 1985a, b). This line of argument involves mainly the tradition of sociolinguistics, of the ethnography of communication and of ethnomethodology. From amongst these, the ethnomethodologists' approach has been the most influential on the analysis of the management of conversation. However, it has also been pointed out that in dealing with communication from a sociocultural
perspective, the study of conversational management alone is not enough. Because of the involvement of social positions in the interaction, 'acceptability' (Widdowson 1983) or 'ritual constraints' (Goffman 1976) must be borne in mind as well.

With this dimension come pragmatic approaches by, for example, Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1978) and Leech (1983), who ascribe the utmost importance to 'politeness', that is, to 'acceptability'. However, they concentrate on 'acceptability' at the expense of 'accessibility' with the exception of Lakoff, who also refers to 'accessibility' in terms of 'Rules of Clarity'. She does however believe that 'acceptability' supersedes 'accessibility'.

Unfortunately there does not yet seem to be a comprehensive framework for communication which covers both social 'acceptability' and cognitive 'accessibility' in a balanced way apart from that of Goffman (1976), who points out the importance of both 'system' and 'ritual constraints'. However, Widdowson (1983) is well aware of this fact and in his framework for 'communicative capacity' introduces the notion of 'accessibility', which has to do with 'system constraints', and of 'acceptability', which is related to 'ritual constraints' in Goffman's terms. In addition to this, he states that it is important to combine 'the study of the procedural aspects of discourse carried out by ethnomethodologists' and 'the study of its schematic aspects associated with workers in Artificial Intelligence' (1983:77).
It seems clear that Widdowson's 'capacity' encapsulates those aspects which are usually called 'pragmatics' by other scholars. Moreover, this 'capacity' seems to have a much wider perspective, encompassing all the levels of 'pragmatic competence'. In other words, a person who has 'communicative capacity' can be said to have 'pragmatic competence' simultaneously; whereas the opposite is not necessarily true. However, here we have to remember that 'pragmatic competence' defined within Hymesian or Chomskyan paradigms is still very limited. As the discussion in this section shows, pragmatic phenomena involve more than this knowledge level paradigm. In particular, they seem to involve what Widdowson (1983) calls schematic aspects, followed by procedural work which can be used to 'project and modify the existing knowledge' (Widdowson 1983).

In Widdowson's capacity paradigm, 'schematic knowledge', which consists of 'frames of reference' for 'propositional content' and 'rhetorical routines' for 'illocutionary intent' constitutes 'schematic competence'. However, in his recent article on communicative competence, Widdowson (1988) interprets Hymes' 'communicative competence' as consisting of 'linguistic competence' and 'pragmatic competence'. Here, Widdowson's 'schematic competence' can be considered to be included in the domain of 'pragmatic competence'.

In addition to 'schematic competence', 'procedural work' plays an important role in Widdowson's framework for communication, where a concern for both 'accessibility' and 'acceptability' must be borne in mind. I have introduced the term 'strategic capacity' to describe the
ability involved in 'procedural work'. This term has been chosen because both 'capacity' and 'strategies' are strongly related to procedural work. 'Strategic capacity' directly works on every competence to activate its knowledge in the process of negotiation, adjustment and compensation for breakdowns. It carries with it concern for both 'acceptability' and 'accessibility'. 'Strategic capacity' has an particularly strong relationship with 'pragmatic phenomena' since by its very nature pragmatics deals with the actual use of language in communication.

It is time to formulate a general framework for learner needs in communication, expanding the framework which was partially presented at the end of the previous section, and taking the discussions of pragmatics in this section into consideration.

At its simplest, an ideal framework for communication, which we could call 'communicative capacity', consists of communicative competence and strategic capacity, which is a procedural ability to activate various competencies. Communicative competence consists of linguistic competence and pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence includes such competencies as sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic ones in the Hymesian sense. Communicative capacity supercedes all the competencies and capacity. It results from the interaction of each of all the competencies and strategic capacity, which is analogous to what Widdowson (1983) calls 'procedural work' and also what Bialystok & Sharwood-Smith (1985) call 'control procedure'. Strategic capacity activates all the competencies at the knowledge level. Thus, for the
activation of knowledge, the role of strategic capacity is of vital importance. Communicative capacity cannot be fully vitalised without the help of strategic capacity. Therefore, in the framework I propose for learner needs in communication, strategic capacity plays an important role.

Amongst all the pragmatic phenomena, more attention will be paid to an ethnomethodological approach to pragmatics, that is, to 'the management of conversation'. This means interpreting the participants' ongoing process of negotiation, paying attention both to the social position of the interactants; to 'acceptability' (or 'ritual constraints'), an example of which is 'politeness', and to the way in which the interactants process the information in the course of interaction, negotiating the meaning and activating schematic knowledge; to 'accessibility' (or 'system constraints'), which is represented, for example, by the use of various 'discourse processing conventions' (Gumperz 1982c).

In discussing learner needs in communication, I have noted that the notions of 'appropriateness' as well as 'accessibility' play an important role in a framework. It is also indicated that what is 'appropriate' varies from one culture to another. Thus, in studying communicative behaviours of learners, it is inevitable that culture needs to receive special attention. In the next chapter, I shall explore how cross-cultural considerations relate to the paradigm of communication.
NOTES

1. Taylor (1988) tries to clarify the confusion associated with the interpretation and the expansion of the meaning of competence. He specifically introduces the new term 'communicative proficiency' in place of 'communicative competence'. However, he seems to have added yet another complication. That is, although he states that we should distinguish 'competence' from 'proficiency', the former for 'knowledge' and the latter for 'the ability to make use of knowledge', he uses the overall term 'communicative proficiency' as covering both 'competence' and 'proficiency' in each component. There is a contradiction here since he does not state anywhere that 'proficiency' is inclusive of 'competence'. He just lists the two concepts as independent entities. What he is doing here is basically rephrasing Hymes' ideas of 'communicative competence', utilising his own new terminology. It does not seem necessary to introduce a new term unless he introduces a new concept, which does not seem to be the case although he has slightly widened the dimension by adding the characteristics of dynamism and process. All he needed to do would be to clarify the notion, firstly using Hymes' own terminology. Thus, instead of introducing the two components 'grammatical competence' and 'grammatical proficiency', he could have explained that Hymes' competence has two components of 'knowledge' and 'ability for use' as Widdowson succinctly demonstrated (Widdowson 1988).

2. According to Widdowson (p.c.), presuppositions can be context-independent as can be explained in the following example:

Jane decided to go to London yesterday.

In this example, it is presupposed that 'Jane went to London. Thus, it can be said that not all presuppositions are context-dependent.

3. Here, it is interesting to know that Sperber and Wilson (1986) in their theory of pragmatics develop Grice's conversational rules into a single rule of 'relevance', which places the utmost stress on 'accessibility' at the cost of 'acceptability'. (Widdowson 1983: 7)
CHAPTER 3 CULTURAL DIMENSION

3.0 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 2, I explored a framework for learner needs in communication, by examining various existing frameworks, focussing on the notions of communicative and pragmatic competence. In the process of exploration, the inadequacy of Chomsky's competence model from the perspective of the present study has been pointed out. It was noted that when we talk about language 'use' in actual communicative situations, it is inevitable that we take into consideration what Hymes(1972) calls sociocultural 'appropriateness' and what Widdowson (1983) calls social 'acceptability', which is also closely related to Goffman's (1976) 'ritual constraints'. All these notions involve the different cultural values of each participant. Thus, the study of communication is closely related to the concept of culture. Further, it can be said that any study of communication necessitates the study of culture. This is not the case in the Chomskyan paradigm, which is only concerned with a 'homogeneous speech community'. Once we start talking about a 'heterogeneous' speech community, we cannot ignore the elements of culture in the study of language and communication as Hymes(1972) points out. Therefore, the main concern of this chapter is to examine how the study of communication is related to that of culture.
3.1 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

3.1.1 Introduction

Traditionally language teaching has meant teaching the formal aspects of language, i.e., the syntax, vocabulary, and sounds, without any reference to the context of use. Generally, culture has not been directly associated with language teaching and learning. However, the present decade has witnessed a sudden boom in teaching and learning in its cultural context. There seem to be several reasons for this, of which two can be identified in particular.

Firstly, the change has come from within the field of linguistics through a shift of interest in language teaching from Chomskyan 'linguistic competence' to Hymesian 'communicative competence', which has been discussed in some detail in the previous chapter. Hymes' emphasis on the importance of the sociocultural aspect as a component of 'communicative competence' has greatly heightened awareness of the importance of cultural aspects in language learning and teaching.

It is of course true that attention had been paid to culture from time to time before Hymes, e.g., Malinowski in the 1920s, Sapir and Whorf, particularly during the period of the 1930s to 1950s, also Firth in the period of the 1930-50s and Lado in the 1950s, to cite a few of the most influential figures of the time. However, somehow the appeals from these eminent figures were not seriously received in the field of pedagogy. This is partly because of the great popularity of structuralism followed by that of transformational generative grammar.
in the 1950-60s. It could be said that by the time Hymes presented his notion of 'communicative competence' in the early 1970s, people were ready to take it seriously because of their dissatisfaction both with structuralism and transformational generative grammar.

Secondly, another influential stimulus has come from outside linguistics, that is, from within the socioeconomic system. People have started moving from one country to another more frequently for various economic and political reasons. Thus, they have come to have more opportunity to communicate with people from different sociocultural, and often, from different language backgrounds. This increase in cross-cultural contact creates the need for cross-cultural understanding. Such compound reasons seem to have triggered the recent popularity in the study of cross-cultural communication. In the following sections I shall review the history of this awareness of the relationship between culture and language in an attempt to define what is meant by 'culture'.

3.1.2 Definitions of Culture in Recent Literature on Cross-cultural Communication

Defining what is meant by 'culture' precisely is extremely difficult. However, in an attempt to discuss the relationship between culture and language, several writers have undertaken this mammoth task. In the following sections I shall explore some of those attempts from the perspective of recent developments in teaching and learning culture and language.
3.1.2.1 Culture and Schematic Knowledge---On the Basis of Robinson's Definition

Gail Robinson (1985) asked the question of 'What is culture?' of 350 educators attending her lectures and workshops. She found that the most common responses consisted of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beliefs</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td>gestures</td>
<td>folklore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td>customs/habits</td>
<td>art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foods</td>
<td>music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artifacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Robinson 1985: 7)

She further classifies the above categories into two notions of 'culture as observable phenomena', which includes 'behaviors' and 'products' and 'culture as not observable', which consists of 'ideas' (Robinson 1985:8). She explains that 'culture as observable phenomena' is represented by 'behaviorists' and 'functionalists'; the former regard culture as 'discrete behaviors or sets of behaviors, e.g., traditions, habits, or customs, as in marriage or leisure' (1985:8), while the latter focus on 'the underlying structure or rules which govern and explain observable events' (Robinson 1985:12).

As Robinson points out, the above two approaches to culture, that is, the 'behaviorist' and 'functionalist' approaches, seem to be prevalent in 'classroom practices in second language and bilingual education' (1985:12). People who advocate this stance concentrate on teaching differences in behaviours, including such topics as customs, habits, attitudes, family, religion, etc. (Brooks 1986, Dunnett, Dubin, and
Lezberg 1986, Hughes 1986, Archer 1986). This is understandable, considering the fact that these courses are set mainly in a framework of second language and bilingual education, in which learners are often in a target language environment, where they learn the language for survival purposes, i.e. to live and to lead a social life in the target community. However, we have to bear in mind that teaching observable phenomena could also involve the possibility of promoting stereotypical views.

In addition to these two definitions, Robinson introduces two more definitions of 'culture': cognitive, and symbolic, 'which are non-observable and internal to the cultural actor or learner' (1985:12) and which, according to the first classification, encompass 'ideas'. 'Cognitive definition' focusses attention on

what is shared "inside" the "cultural actor". What is shared is a means of organizing and interpreting the world, a means of creating order out of the inputs. (Robinson 1985:10)

What Robinson calls 'what is shared "inside" the "cultural actor"' here seems to be closely related to 'schemata', which Widdowson (1983) has defined as 'cognitive constructs which allow for the organization of information in long-term memory and which provide a basis for prediction' (1983:34) and also as 'cognitive structures which constitute communicative competence' (1983:40).

The cognitive definition also sees culture as 'a process through which experience is mapped out, categorized' and 'is generally used to describe and explain the way other people process information and
structure their world' (1985:11). Here, again we see a close relationship between what Robinson calls 'culture' and Widdowson's 'interpretative procedures', which 'exploit schematic knowledge and bring it to bear on particular instances of use' (1983:40). Widdowson calls this 'procedural ability' 'capacity' (1983:41), which I have discussed in the previous chapter in relation to the framework for communication. If Robinson's 'cognitive definition' of culture is similar to Widdowson's 'capacity', then we can perceive clearly the close relationship between culture and communication, cultural aspects being a part of communicative capacity.

The exploration and application of this interpretation of culture is likely to deepen our understanding, since this is the area where miscommunication or misinterpretation of meaning often takes place without the interactants ever noticing it. To put it another way, information processing and 'structuring of their world' are strongly influenced by people's schematic knowledge, which is susceptible to cultural differences, but which tends to be ignored because it operates at a subconscious level. In fact, we could even say that the degree of cultural differences might be judged on the basis of how much schematic knowledge people share. Detailed study of this information process will lead to a better understanding of the communication between people with different schematic knowledge or cultures.

However, although Robinson attempts to define 'culture' from the perspective of bilingual, second and foreign language teaching, she does not specifically focus attention on the relationship between
language and culture. By focussing on 'culture as not observable', that is, on 'ideas' and on 'cognitive and symbolic' definitions, which are closely related to 'schemata', she indirectly demonstrates the relationship between culture and communication; and thus, culture and language. However, considering that language is deeply related to the cognitive and symbolic definition of culture, there should be a more explicit description of the inter-relationship between language and culture as well.

3.1.2.2 Language as 'a reflection of culture'---Loveday

Differing from Robinson (1985), who does not discuss the exact interrelationship between culture and language, Loveday (1982), in his attempt to explore the role of sociolinguistics in non-native language teaching situations, tries to define 'culture' specifically in relation to language from the perspective of language teaching and learning. He states that 'culture' involves:

the implicit norms and conventions of a society, its methods of 'going about doing things', its historically transmitted but also adaptive and creative ethos, its symbols and its organization of experience. (1982:34)

For Loveday, language is 'a reflection of culture'. The above definition appears to be analogous to what Robinson (1985) calls 'cognitive' and 'symbolic' definitions of culture in that the above features are mostly included in what she calls 'culture as not observable phenomena'. It is also because 'cognitive theory' in Robinson's terms 'is used to describe and explain the way other people process information and structure their world'. Moreover, according to
'symbolic definition', culture is 'a dynamic system— an ongoing, dialectic process, giving rise to symbols which may be viewed historically' (Robinson 1985:11). Accordingly, it could be said that Loveday's definition of culture is also related to 'schemata'. In this sense, although according to Robinson's classification, language comes under the heading of behaviour, thus, under the notion of culture as observable phenomena, we could say that language as 'a reflection of culture' in Loveday's sense has two dimensions: one as an observable phenomenon, that is, as a formal linguistic system and another as an unobservable phenomenon, as 'a reflection of culture', which embodies and symbolises various aspects of a society. Loveday is also aware that:

a world-view underlies all of cultural behavior of which language is but a part; culture is not solely represented and reinforced by the latter. However, it is generally the linguistic channel via which culture and its accompanying thought-world is felt to be active.

(Loveday 1982:45)

Here, Loveday's view of the relationship between language and culture is well-balanced, since he is aware of the importance of language as a means of activating cultural assumptions but, at the same time, realises the danger of regarding it as the only representative of culture. Thus, Loveday's definition of culture in relation to language seems to be more suitable from the perspective of this research.

3.1.2.3 Summary

As both Robinson and Loveday indicated, foreign and second language teaching cannot be separated from culture. Directly or indirectly, the
culture of both target and native countries affect learning, 'language being a means for communication among members of a culture' (Brown 1986:34) or, to quote from Loveday again, since:

\[
\text{it is generally the linguistic channel via which culture and its accompanying thought world is felt to be active. (Loveday 1982:45)}
\]

In addition to the importance of language as a means of communication, imparting and sharing cultural knowledge, there is another important relationship between language and culture. That is, language per se could be said to be the embodiment of a culture. This can be seen in the research of several scholars on the ways in which culture and language interact with each other. However, this relationship between language and culture, language as an exemplification of culture, has received less attention in the foregoing discussion.

Another point to be made here is that it has been indicated that there is a certain relationship between culture and the schemata, which are closely related to the notion of communicative competence, and thus, the notion of communicative capacity (see Chapter 2). To put it another way, we could say that cross-cultural communication is communication between people who have different schematic knowledge and that 'remoteness' or 'closeness' of the schematic worlds decides how much procedural work is needed for successful communication (Widdowson 1983:40).
3.2 THE EMERGENCE OF THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

In the preceding section (3.1.2), I have examined the study of cross-cultural communication and the definition of culture in the context of language pedagogy. Culture still seems to be vaguely defined in this context and no explicit statement has been made concerning the relationship between culture and communication. However, it has been noted that both Robinson's and Loveday's definitions of culture are closely related to the notion of schemata, which in turn is related to the theory of communication. In this section I shall explore how culture is traditionally related to language, starting with the work of Malinowski.

3.2.1 Language, Culture and Personality—The Work of Malinowski

For Malinowski, language is not just a mere reflection of thought but also 'a mode of action'. Thus, he emphasises that language should be 'studied against the background of human activities and as a mode of human behaviour in practical matters' (Malinowski 1923 in Laver & Hutcheson 1972:148). Here, 'the background of human activities' and 'a mode of human behaviour' can be interpreted as cultural phenomena. Accordingly, we could conclude that Malinowski's statement is also conscious of culture. What he really tries to emphasise, however, is not cultural differences but the necessity of a language function which serves the purpose of 'pure social intercourse' (Malinowski in Laver & Hutcheson 1972:149). He explains as follows that:

language in its primitive function and original form has an essentially pragmatic character; that it is a mode of behaviour, an indispensable element of concerted human action. And
negatively: that to regard it as a means for the embodiment or expression of thought is to take a one-sided view of one of its most derivative and specialized functions. (Malinowski 1923 in Layer & Hutcheson 1972: 152)

Here, what Malinowski is trying to say is that language has other roles apart from that of a 'means of transmission of thought' (1972: 151). He introduces the notion of 'phatic communion', 'which serves to establish bonds of personal union between people brought together by the mere need of companionship and does not serve any purpose of communicating ideas' (Malinowski in Layer & Hutcheson 1972: 151). In other words, he ascribes an 'interactional' role to language as well as the 'transactional' role (Brown & Yule 1983, Aston 1988), which is widely recognised, as that of imparting information and knowledge. Or if we borrow Goffman's (1976) terms, 'ritual constraints' and 'system constraints', because 'phatic communion' itself, is of ritual concerns, being used to 'establish links of fellowship' (Malinowski 1972: 150); thus, being conscious of preserving face or territory. This recognition of the 'interactional' role of language is important particularly from a cross-cultural perspective, since, as Goffman (1976) states, 'ritual constraints are patently dependent on cultural definition and can be expected to vary quite markedly from society to society' (1976: 267).

Malinowski has widened the scope from language merely as 'a means for the embodiment or expression of thought' to language also as 'a mode of behaviour'. This line of thought was further developed by J. R. Firth.
3.2.2 'Personality and Language in Society'—Firth

Firth (1957), being aware of the deficiency of a linguistics based on 'static mechanical structuralism' (Firth 1957: 181) represented by Saussure, emphasises the relationship between 'language and personality'. He states it as follows:

My intention is to link language studies with social human nature, to think of persons rather than individuals. Linguistics may learn something from the sciences which treat human beings as separate natural entities in their psycho-biological characters, but it is mainly interested in persons and personalities as active participators in the creation and maintenance of cultural values, among which languages are its main concern. (Firth 1957: 186)

Like Malinowski, Firth regards 'language as part of the social process' and argues that 'the study of the social process and of single human beings is simultaneous' (1957: 181), that is, personality and language play an important role in the Firthian definition of culture. In this sense, although he does not directly discuss the relationship between language and culture, he refers to culture by emphasising 'language as the social process' and also by referring to the relationship between language and personality in a general context. The interpretation is made possible by regarding culture not as a 'collective' entity as commonly regarded by anthropologists, which displays, according to Sapir, 'a more or less mechanical sum of the more striking or picturesque generalized patterns of behavior' (Sapir 1932 in Mandelbaum 1985: 515)*1, but as something being formulated as a result of the interaction of each member of a society. This interpretation of culture links the approaches of Malinowski, Sapir and Firth in that

*1 Sapir's quote is provided in Mandelbaum's work.
they interpret culture in terms of the interaction of people, language being one of its main concerns.

3.2.3 Summary
In this section, I concentrated on another role of language in culture, that is, language as 'the embodiment of a culture'. To explore this relationship, I reviewed some papers on 'language and culture', starting with Malinowski. His view of language as social action relates to what Goffman (1976) calls 'ritual constraints', which are culturally dependent. A scholar who takes a somewhat similar stance to Malinowski is Firth. He tries to 'link language studies with social human nature' and places emphasis on 'persons and personalities as active participators in the creation and maintenance of cultural values' (1957: 186).

Having looked at the work of these commentators, we can see that there are certain similarities in their way of defining the relationship between culture and language. They regard culture as very much related to individual persons as creators of or 'active participators' in culture, who themselves embody a certain culture. If we pursue this line of argument, the relationship between language, culture and individual persons as active participators in a culture, we could say that the idea is exemplified in the study of face-to-face interaction in that it is an ongoing negotiation process between individuals, using language, demonstrating their 'persons or personalities' and representing their cultures in the course of the interaction. In particular, when the two interactants are from different cultural
backgrounds, the study of face-to-face interaction becomes directly concerned with the study of cross-cultural communication. This idea can be observed in recent studies of face-to-face interaction, notably those by Gumperz, Tannen and Erickson, whose contributions to the study of cross-cultural communication I shall explore in the next section (3.3) as part of the study of the recent development of cross-cultural communication.

3.3 RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

In the foregoing two sections, I have explored the notion of culture and its relationship to language and communication in the context of the study of culture in language pedagogy (3.1) and also in the study of language, thought and personality (3.2). In this section, I shall consider the recent development of cross-cultural communication, which is mostly empirically oriented, on the basis of the actual analysis of conversational interactions.

3.3.1 Cross-Cultural Communication in Modern Society

The present day has seen the increase of cross-cultural/inter-cultural communication of various types -- political, commercial and academic, to name but a few. This sophistication of communication has arisen for various reasons, but mostly because of the changes in the political and economic map of the modern world. This has been touched upon in 3.1.1. In the following section, I shall examine the recent development of the study of cross-cultural communication by reviewing some papers in the
3.3.1.1 What is Communication?

In defining what is meant by 'communication', a reference needs to be made to at least three aspects: the roles, the mode and the means. I shall first examine how these aspects are realised in some of the definitions of communication, starting with a dictionary reference.

According to the LDOCE, 'to communicate' means, firstly:

\[
\text{to make (opinions, feelings, information, etc.) known or understood by others, e.g. by speech, writing, or bodily movements. (LDOCE 1987:201)}
\]

and secondly,

\[
\text{to share or exchange opinions, feelings, information, etc. (LDOCE 1987:201)}
\]

Judging from this definition, 'to communicate' is mainly concerned with exchanges of 'opinions, feelings and information' (i.e. roles, that is, the 'transactional' role of communication (Brown & Yule 1983), which focusses on the exchange of information). Communication involves not only verbal but also non-verbal means such as body-movements (i.e. means). 'Communication' can also be achieved both by 'speech' and 'writing' (i.e. mode). Accordingly, we could say that 'to communicate' means the involvement of all the skills and the features of verbal as well as non-verbal means, which can be utilised to impart one's meaning to an interactant. I shall now explore the three aspects of communication; its roles, its means, and its mode, in more detail.
3.3.1.1 The Roles of Communication

I have briefly stated that one of the roles of communication is 'transactional', which is to do with exchanging or transferring information. However, the role of communication is not just to transfer or exchange information, that is, 'transactional', although it is true to say that this aspect plays an important role. It is also to establish 'rapport', that is, 'interactional'. This is well represented by Malinowski's notion of 'phatic communion', 'which seems to establish bonds of personal union between people brought together by the mere need for companionship and does not serve any purpose of communicating ideas' (Malinowski 1923 in 1972:151 also see the discussion in 3.2.1).

To summarise, communication has two main roles: transactional and interactional. Transactional communication is concerned with the transfer and exchange of information, whereas interactional communication aims to establish rapport. In other words, 'transactional' communication is to do with what Widdowson (1983) calls 'accessibility', while 'interactional' communication has to do with 'acceptability' (Widdowson 1983). When we think of the roles of communication, it is important that these two roles receive equal attention. However, traditionally, the 'transactional' role of communication has attracted more attention as Aston (1988) rightly points out. In the present study, the interactional aspect will receive equal attention.
3.3.1.1.2 The Means of Communication

I have briefly discussed at the beginning of the section that communication can take place two ways: verbal and also non-verbal means such as gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions. These "may add support, emphasis, or particular shades of meaning to what people are saying" (Richards et al 1985:206). Apart from these kinesics, paralinguistic features such as tone of voice and prosodic features such as 'pitch, loudness, tempo and rhythm' (Crystal 1980:289) also constitute means of communication, conveying additional meanings such as 'attitudes' or 'roles' of the interactants. Moreover, even proxemics such as postures and the physical distance between the conversational interactants may convey a certain meaning. All these features belong to spoken discourse.

If we concentrate here on spoken communication, which is the main focus of the present study, the non-verbal features which accompany verbal features, and support them or are even used instead of them, play an important role in the interpretation of meaning. They can, in a sense, convey the attitudes and feelings of conversationalists more effectively than linguistic features. More importantly, people acquire these non-verbal features in their cultural settings as they grow up; thus, they are very much culturally dependent.

The study of these communicative conventions has started receiving attention recently, for example, from scholars such as Gumperz, Tannen, and Erickson (see 3.3.2, 3.3.5, 3.3.6 below).
3.3.1.3 The Modes of Communication

The modes of communication can be either written or spoken, both of which are important; however, the present research will focus attention on spoken communication.

Spoken communication takes various forms. It can be dyadic face-to-face conversation (on which the main focus of the present study lies) or group talks or discussions. It can also take place in various settings, including institutional ones, such as courtroom hearings, teacher-pupil and doctor-patient relationships, counselling, job interviews and so on, which usually involve some kind of role relationship between interactants. In these cases, the purpose of each interaction differs. However, they are mostly face-to-face. In the present research, the focus will be put on dyadic face-to-face interaction.

3.3.1.4 Sociocultural Features of Communication

As Hymes (among others) has pointed out (see Chapter 2), the acquisition of formal systems does not necessarily guarantee that one will be successful in actual communication. One also has to know how to use language appropriately, considering the social contexts. Moreover, it has further been pointed out that merely possessing knowledge, whether it be grammatical or sociocultural or even both, is not enough. The knowledge needs to be activated. Thus, the importance of strategic capacity has been emphasised. It has also been pointed out that in procedural work both ritual and system constraints need to receive equal attention. Here we must also bear in mind that
communication is an 'interpretive process' (Gumperz 1982a), which necessitates the participants interpreting and negotiating meaning with their partner(s) in an ongoing process of interaction. Canale also points this out, referring to Candlin (1980) and Wells (1981):

Communication involves the continuous evaluation and negotiation of meaning on the part of participants. (Canale 1983: 4)

The participants always have to make quick decisions about how to respond to their partners (in the case of conversation), activating their grammatical and schematic knowledge, and interpreting 'discourse processing conventions' (Gumperz 1982a). This is where participants' sociocultural differences come to the fore in that, as discussed in the previous section, schematic knowledge and especially the unconscious use of discourse-signalling conventions differ from one culture to another. Accordingly, we shall need to explore how this schematic knowledge is activated in the process of interaction between people from various social, cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

If one fails to make one's intended meaning known or understood, communication breakdown will take place. This happens quite often, even between people who share the same language and sociocultural background, if the relevant information is lacking. For example, it is not difficult to list examples of communication breakdowns between people in every day communicative situations. They can take place even between people, who are otherwise very close, e.g. a husband and a wife (see, for example, Tannen 1981b). However, the more information one has of one's interactant, the easier it becomes to get meaning across
It can, then, easily be imagined how difficult it is when people from different cultural and language backgrounds communicate with each other. There is every chance of misunderstanding and miscommunication taking place, since quite often people have different schematic knowledge and subconsciously utilise different 'communicative conventions or styles' (Gumperz 1982a, Tannen 1984a). The success of cross-cultural communication depends greatly on this, though it receives relatively little attention. This will be the focus of my research.

Having considered the nature of communication, then, I now come to examine the nature of cross-cultural communication.

3.3.1.2 Various Types of Cross-cultural Communication

Cross-cultural communication exists at various levels. It does not necessarily mean simply communication between people from different countries although it is true that national boundaries quite often coincide with language and cultural boundaries. Nor does it necessarily mean only communication between people from different language backgrounds. As is often pointed out, sometimes dialectal differences are greater than language differences, e.g., Mandarin and Cantonese in the spoken form v. the Swedes and Norwegians (Crystal 1980).

On the other hand, we must also be aware that we could use the term 'cross-cultural communication' even for communication between people who share the same language if we define it broadly, considering the
dialectal, social and ethnic differences of the interactants. For example, there might be cases where the people from more traditional rural areas find it difficult to communicate or where they encounter communication breakdown in talking with people from modern, urban areas, just as people from different countries with different cultural backgrounds find it difficult to communicate with each other. Quite often successful communication between the people from different social strata within the same society is more difficult than that between people from different cultural backgrounds but sharing the same social stratum (e.g. middle class people in modern Western countries). This is because, as we discussed in 3.1, cross-cultural communication is interpreted as communication between people who have different schematic knowledge.

Cross-cultural communication then might be defined as communication between people with disparities of schematic knowledge, and could be expressed on a continuum. On one end of the continuum we could place communication between people from different language and cultural backgrounds, who additionally do not share the same socioeconomic or class backgrounds or power-relationship. On the other end of the continuum we could place communication between people who, although sharing the same language and cultural backgrounds, do not share, for example, the same socioeconomic, class, and role relationship. To quote from Widdowson:

The more remote the schematic worlds of the interlocutors, the more procedural work will need to be done to achieve communicative rapport. (1983: 40)
It is often the case that people sharing the same mother tongue are originally from different ethnic backgrounds, who have their own cultural heritage which influences their use of language or their 'ways of speaking'. This is particularly true of a country like the U.S.A., where the population is made up of people from various parts of the world (see, for example, Erickson 1982a, Erickson & Shultz 1982 and Tannen 1981a, 1981b, 1984a, who focus on communication between people from different ethnic backgrounds, who, however, share the same language as a means of communication in everyday life). This difference in ethnicity subtly influences 'conversational style' or 'the ways of speaking' of the people, which often goes unnoticed by the conversational interactants because it usually operates at the subconscious level; thus, it quite often causes a breakdown of communication or miscommunication.

The research in this area has recently attracted much attention from people from different disciplines, but most notably from such scholars as Gumperz, Erickson and Tannen as listed above. They showed that certain differences in conversational style between people from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds might affect interpersonal relationship, or more importantly, academic and occupational opportunities in such situations as job interviews (Gumperz(ed) 1982), or counselling sessions (Erickson & Shultz 1982). This field of study also includes court cases (e.g. Drew 1985, Maynard 1985, Wodak 1985), the doctor-patient relationship (Candlin et al. 1974, Cicourel 1985), and various sales encounters (Ventola 1983, 1984). The problems are serious once they occur, since people usually do not notice where the
causes lie: the reason being that they overtly share the same linguistic medium with each other but have not realised that they are covertly utilising different ways of speaking or conversational styles (Gumperz 1982a, Tannen 1984a).

In sum, the domain of cross-cultural communication includes both communication between people from different language and cultural backgrounds and that between people within the same speech community but from different ethnic, socioeconomic and sociocultural backgrounds. The focus of the present research lies mainly on the former type of communication, that is, cross-language and cross-cultural communication in a literal sense, considering the backgrounds of the subjects and the situation involved. However, deeper insights for the study of cross-cultural communication have often come from the latter tradition of investigation. This is because, in exploring communication, in which the interactants share the same language, one has to pay more attention to systems or conventions which might be used differently by people who are from different sociocultural and ethnic backgrounds. They are also mostly subconsciously utilised. Thus, the scholars who work in this field concentrate mainly on 'discourse signalling cues' or 'communicative conventions' (e.g. Gumperz, Tannen, Erickson). Moreover, this latter type of communication often involves another level of cross-cultural communication; that is, the power relationship of the interactants, where one party holds a degree of power over the other party in such situations as job interviews, counselling, and court hearings. These types of communicative situations could be called 'cross-cultural' in that they involve communication between
people who do not hold equal status politically, socioeconomically, and psychologically. There is no doubt that this insight helps to further the study of 'traditional' cross-cultural communication as well. Or rather, we could go further and state that the study of cross-cultural communication should take into consideration both linguistically and socioculturally oriented aspects equally.

In the following sections I shall review some of the works by leading scholars in this field, looking at both approaches to cross-cultural communication.

3.3.2 Conversational Inference and Different Ways of Speaking

---Gumperz

Gumperz (1977) dissatisfied with the existing framework for 'the process of interpretation', sets up the notion of 'conversational inference' as 'the situated or context-bound process of interpretation'. He is well aware of the lack of a comprehensive framework for describing this interpretive process, pointing out that 'no systematic attempts are made to show how social knowledge is used in situated interpretation' (1982a: 153) apart from the three traditions of ethnography of communication, discourse and conversational analysis, which, he admits, have provided some insights. Therefore, he suggests that 'a more comprehensive theory of conversational inference' (1982a: 161) be built, 'utilizing the insights' of the three traditions.

Starting from the standpoint that 'a cognitive approach to discourse must build on interaction' (1982a: 166), Gumperz introduces the term
'speech activity', which is 'a set of social relationships enacted about a set of schemata in relation to some communicative goal' (1982a:166). In this representation, the notion of 'speech activity' is closely related to culture. Gumperz himself states that the identification of speech activities is a function of ethnic and communicative background and goes on to illustrate the relationship between 'conversational inference' and culture, stating that 'a conversational inference is a function of identification of speech activities' and that 'speech activities are signalled by culturally specific linguistic signs' (1982a:167). Accordingly, 'conversational inference processes' involve 'the perception of contextualization cues' and 'the problem of relating them to other signalling channels' (1982a:170). Thus, the identification and the interpretation of 'contextualization cues' play an important role in the process of interpretation. Gumperz regards this knowledge of 'contextualization cues' or 'discourse processing conventions' as an important component of 'communicative competence' (1984:280 also discussed in 2.1.4). He goes on to say that 'linguistic signalling mechanisms' such as 'discourse cues', which include 'prosody, code switching, and formulaic speech, on the one hand, and syntax and semantics, on the other' (ed 1982:13) interplay with each other.

Gumperz further states that the differences in communicative conventions might 'present serious problems':

when the situation is stressful, i.e., when much depends on the outcome as in a job interview or in a formal negotiation, they are quite likely to affect communication. (ed 1982:18)
He highlights 'interethnic encounters in urban settings' (1982a:6), 'where people have widely varying communicative and cultural backgrounds' (1982a:167).

Thus, Gumperz has brought a new dimension to the study of language, which includes serious social encounters such as job interviews and courtroom hearings, on which the survival of the participants in society depends. Although the present research does not involve institutional settings, his insight into the interpretation process and various speech events are applicable to this enquiry in that the interpretation of contextualization cues plays as important a role in cross-cultural communication as it does in intra-language and cross-ethnic communication. Also, the insight into communication in stressful situations is useful in that non-native speakers are always, in a different sense, put into stressful situations in communication with native speakers, since their power relationship is unequal because they lack communicative capacity.

It is important to heighten the awareness of any language learner in the areas of communication Gumperz mentions, in particular, that of communicative conventions, if we are to make learners competent communicators (see Chapter 2) and this is precisely the area to which the present study pays special attention. However, it is clear that the study of cross-cultural communication also involves the study of a more discrete utterance-level interpretation of speech act types, as in, for example, CCSARP, to which I now turn.
3.3.3 The Project of Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP)

The CCSARP project was started by a group of people who were interested in research on cross-cultural contrastive pragmatics. For the purpose of cross-cultural comparison, they limit their focus to two types of speech acts, that is, 'requests' and 'apologies'. Their goals are the cross-language comparison of realization patterns of these two speech act types and the establishment of 'the similarities and differences between native and non-native speakers' realization patterns in these two acts in each of the languages studied within the project' (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain BK & O 1984:196). Their concern through the pursuit of these goals lies also in the question of 'universality', that is, they are concerned with 'to what extent it is possible to reveal basic pragmatic features for given speech acts, expected to be manifested in any natural language' on the one hand and with the identification of 'cross-cultural variance in speech act realization' (BK & O 1984:209) on the other.

However, although their attempt is ambitious, the aim of the project is not clear enough. It seems that it is the product of a pure research interest based on a bottom-up analysis of two discrete utterance level speech act types. By limiting the research to two speech act types, cross-linguistic comparison may have been reduced, since one is able to control the variables to some extent. On the other hand, because of this limitation, it seems difficult to generalise or to draw any conclusion on cross-cultural speech act realization patterns. It is
necessary to investigate more speech act types if exhaustive coverage of the characteristics of the speech act is aimed at.

Another problem to be noted here is that, it is now generally understood that the 'speech act' is just one aspect of pragmatics; therefore, there is a concern that to limit the area of investigation into 'speech act types', and moreover, to just two types of speech act, might lead to a too simplistic description of differences and similarities. Moreover, in spite of the fact that pragmatics is more and more widely interpreted as 'the use of language' in its actual context, listing only two types of discrete speech acts is far less satisfactory for a global view of cross-cultural communication. The result will be an illustration of only a small area of the communicative knowledge necessary for communication. Another remark to be made is that because of the type of instrument used---a discourse completion test---it is impossible to see the process of interaction and negotiation through which pragmatic phenomena can best be detected. Although the situations, which reflect the importance of the general concern with 'the use of language in context' (Levinson 1983 discussed in BK & O 1984:196), are given, they are far from being natural. If the interpretation of speech acts in context is intended, the elicitation should be carried out in as natural a situation as possible.

Though the project itself, and most of the members of the project, are concerned with discrete items of speech act, it is necessary, as Ventola points out, to connect 'the study of independent verbal acts to
contextual theory' (BK & 0 1984: 188) and she emphasises the need of 'a
dynamic point of view' in approaching 'texts', that is,
'interpretation' as 'on-going process'. She also states the importance
of teaching both the 'micro-level', that is, 'concentrating mainly on
difference in speech act types', and the 'global level', that is,
moving from micro speech acts to 'texts', to which speech acts are
related, to wider 'contexts' (1984: 283).

What Ventola is saying compensates for what I have shown to be some of
the deficiencies of the CCSARP project, that is, the fact that it only
deals with the discrete items of just two speech act types without any
specific reference to texts or contexts. This is an improvement from
a context-independent, one sentence-level completion test; however, it
is still a discrete and static context separated from the ongoing
process of negotiation between the interactants, where they
continuously create their own context through interaction. However,
Ventola is mainly interested in the accessibility of information and
lacks concern for acceptability in communication. Nor does she pay any
attention to the interpretation of illocutionary intent.

3.3.4 Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure—— The Work of Thomas

Thomas widens the scope of cross-cultural communication from the most
accepted version, that is, communication between native and non-native
speakers, to 'any communication between two people who, in any
particular domain, do not share a common linguistic or cultural
background' (Thomas 1983: 91). According to this definition, we could
say that Thomas' 'unequal encounters':
interactions in which one participant is in a position of authority relative to the other, as in police-suspect, teacher-pupil interactions (1984:226),

can be regarded as examples of 'cross-cultural' encounters in a broader sense. Her main concern seems to have shifted from the cross-cultural comparison of native-non-native interactions with a view to the analysis of pragmatic failure, to the more theoretical background reasons for pragmatic failures, especially in asymmetrical/unequal encounters. She explores the pragmatic features employed by the dominant participants of various interactions and illustrates how these features 'restrict severely the discoursal options of the subordinate participant'; at the same time she tries to introduce 'a model of discourse organization' (1985a:765), which is 'dynamic' (1985a:781) and has 'greater predictive and explanatory power' (1985a:765) by bringing together insights from both conversational analysis and recent work in interpersonal pragmatics. Here, Thomas is not using the term 'dynamic' merely to explain her descriptive model of discourse as Ventola does, but she uses it in the sense that 'it admits at least the possibility that':

language can be used to challenge, and not merely to reproduce passively, the dominant ideologies of a society. (1985a:781)

Thus, she is talking about the 'dynamism' of language itself, of its power. This is a dimension which is lacking in Ventola's model, although she briefly refers to her concern for 'the role relationships between the interactants' (Ventola 1983:242). Thomas, in talking about 'dynamism', introduces the role relationships of the interactants. What she is attempting here is to elaborate 'complexity and
multiplicity of discourse meaning' (1985b:38), coining her own terminology for each of the diversified illocutionary acts.

Methodologically, she believes that she is approaching the descriptions of 'a dynamic system of utterance interpretation' as opposed to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model of discourse analysis, which, she thinks, is not just 'descriptively inadequate' but 'totally obscures the richness, complexity and multiplicity of pragmatic and discourse meaning' (1985b:38).

Thomas hopes her pragmatic theory will be able to 'handle the complexities of naturally-occurring discourse in a more adequate manner' (1985b:2), however, and though it gives examples from various unequal encounters, they are never the examples for one whole extended text of discourse like that of Sinclair & Coulthard's. It is more difficult to analyse comprehensively if one has to analyse, for example, a whole hour-long naturally occurring conversation than to analyse just two or three exchanges which have been carefully selected or prefabricated to include interesting illocutionary acts, and this is exactly what Thomas seems to be doing. Thus, from the viewpoint of research methodology, Thomas' approach is not of practical use for the analysis of an extended naturally occurring discourse; nonetheless, her attention to various illocutionary acts in the context of the participants' power-relationship should be remembered when interpreting any kind of discourse.
One commentator who does explore cross-cultural communication on the basis of the analysis of naturally occurring discourse conversation is Tannen, to whom I shall now turn.

3.3.5 Conversational Style—The Work of Tannen

Tannen's definition of cross-cultural communication basically resembles that of Thomas and Gumperz. According to her:

The notion of "cross-cultural" encompasses more than just speakers of different languages or from different countries; it includes speakers from the same country of different class, region, age, and even gender. (Tannen 1985b:203)

In an exemplification of this definition, Tannen explores, for example, the difference in 'conversational styles' between New Yorkers of Jewish background and Californians of non-Jewish background (Tannen 1981a, 1984a). This is a case of the combination of regional and ethnic differences.

Tannen (1984a, 1985a,b,1986), like Gumperz, explores cross-cultural communication specifically from the perspective of what she calls 'conversational style', which parallels Gumperz' 'ways of speaking'. They are characterised by 'contextualization cues' (Gumperz 1982 a,b), which are constituted mainly of 'paralinguistic' and 'prosodic features'. According to Tannen, such features include:

- intonation, pitch, amplitude, pacing, rate of speech, pausing, rate of turn-taking, choices of words and phrases, topics preferred and avoided, genres (story-telling, joking, lecturing), and ways of serving the constraints of these genres. (Tannen 1985a:101)

Of these, Gumperz in his empirical studies mostly concentrates on
'intonation', 'pitch' and 'amplitude' and illustrates how these features influence people's judgement of their interactants. Tannen, on the other hand, concentrates more on features such as 'rate of speech, pacing, pausing, rate of turn-taking' (see Tannen 1984a, 1985a, b, 1986 but especially 1984a). In the analysis of 'Thanksgiving dinner table conversation', for example, she describes in a detailed manner how even people 'who spoke the same language' differed in their turn-taking habits, such as the length of turn-taking pauses and tolerance for overlapping. Her observation is not just confined to turn-taking habits but covers other features of conversation such as topic, pacing, and paralinguistic features. Concerning the difficulty in using these features in cross-cultural communication in comparison with intracultural communication, Tannen states that while in the latter 'the interpretation of metamessages is likely to be shared by speakers and hearers', in the former, it is not. She therefore consistently emphasises the importance of becoming aware of the differences in the use of various conversational devices, which are automatically interpreted in 'intracultural' interactions but which, because of the sub-conscious level of processing, might bring about miscommunication in cross-cultural communication.

What Tannen is attempting to demonstrate is analogous to what Gumperz is trying to do. However, their method of collecting data and the kind of data being investigated seems to be different. The interactions Gumperz deals with are mostly serious encounters on which the survival of one of the participants in a modern urban society depends, such as job interviews. On the other hand, Tannen's conversational situations
do not involve such serious social encounters, but rather, everyday situations. Through the descriptions of general human relationships, her insight goes deep into the nature of cross-cultural communication and human relationships. She points out the seriousness of miscommunication in cross-cultural communication as follows:

judgements are made not about how others speak but about their abilities and/or personalities. (1985a: 101)

Furthermore, she emphasises 'the double bind' of cross-cultural communication. Following Lakoff, she states that 'there are two main benefits to indirectness' (1985b: 205), which is one of the characteristics of 'most communication', that is, 'rapport' and 'defensive'. Later, she uses the words 'involvement' and 'independence' as alternative terms (Tannen 1986). These seem to parallel what Widdowson (1983) calls the 'co-operative' and the 'territorial imperative' and what Scollon & Scollon (1983), after the distinction made by Bateson and Mead between 'exhibitionism' and 'spectatorship', call 'solidarity' and 'deference' (Scollon & Scollon 1983: 173). Tannen emphasises this double-bind of communication, agreeing with Scollon:

As Scollon (1982) points out, all communication is a double bind, simultaneously showing interpersonal involvement and respect for individuality. Thus, in cross-cultural communication, showing respect for cultural differences is a violation of rapport, denying ways that all people are alike. (That is why some people object to any research documenting cross-cultural differences, which they see as buttressing stereotypes and hence exacerbating discrimination.) At the same time, ignoring cultural differences leads to misinterpretation and hence discrimination of another sort. (Tannen 1985b: 212)

Later, she also states the following:
Because of this double bind, communication will never be perfect. 
(Tannen 1986: 17)

Hence, the importance of negotiation between the interactants. 
Tannen's work is significant in that she proceeds with this understanding of the double bind of cross-cultural communication. Without this awareness, the study of cross-cultural communication carries the danger of stereotyping people from certain cultural backgrounds. This double bind of communication takes a different form in cross-cultural communication, that is, different societies seem to place a different degree of emphasis on whether they value 'rapport' (Tannen 1985b): the 'co-operative imperative' (Widdowson 1983) or 'defensive' (Tannen 1985b), the 'territorial imperative' (Widdowson 1983). For example, a certain culture might have a tendency to value the 'territorial imperative' (or 'defensive') more than the 'co-operative imperative' (or 'rapport') while the reverse might be the case for other cultures. If, then, the people from these two different societies communicate with each other, they might misinterpret their partners' intentions or personalities, the one having the impression that the other is, for example, too intrusive or aggressive while the second on his/her own part might think that the first is too aloof or standoffish. Thus, interpretation becomes more complicated. In the present research, this aspect will also receive attention through a detailed analysis of conversational interactions between native speakers of English and Japanese speakers of English.

3.3.6 Communicative Behaviours---The Work of Erickson

Erickson's approach to cross-cultural communication is, like that of
Gumperz and Tannen, based on face-to-face interactions in a multicultural and multiethnic society. Like Gumperz and Tannen, Erickson is also aware of the importance of 'contextualization cues', but what distinguishes him is that he regards posture and gaze orientation as 'functioning as contextualization cues' (1982a:53) as well. He includes the description of 'postural position' and 'gaze direction' in his transcript, since

\[
\text{a change in floor management (speaker-audience relationship) cooccurred with changes in postural and gaze orientation. (1982a:52)}
\]

The relationship between gaze and posture and conversation has been investigated by Kendon (1977); however, Erickson combines these nonverbal behaviours with other features and tries to analyse them with a multi-dimensional perspective, which he calls 'an interpretive analysis' (1982a:43).

Another characteristic of Erickson is that he realises the importance of 'rhythm in maintaining cohesion in topics and floors' (1982a:64). For example, he describes how the Italian-American 'multiply floored conversation' is conducted successfully by 'rhythmic fine tuning without having the overlapping talk constitute an interruption' (1982a:65). The importance of rhythm is also emphasised in his earlier work with Shultz, The Counselor as Gatekeeper. Erickson and Shultz (1982) emphasise the importance of 'rhythmic patterning of speech and body motion by the parties engaged in interaction' and regard this 'rhythmic organization of verbal and nonverbal behavior during uncomfortable moments in the interviews' as one of the two aspects of
the 'social steering processes', which are affected by 'cultural differences' (1982: 103).

Another characteristic of Erickson & Schultz's analysis which is worth mentioning is that they realise not only the importance of becoming aware of the 'knowledge of culturally stylistic ways of speaking', but also of the 'knowledge of culturally stylistic ways of listening' such as 'posture, gesture, eye contact, and the amount and kinds of talk one should do while listening' (1982: 7). This attention to the stylistic 'ways of listening' is significant, considering the fact that conversation is a co-product of the interactants. Thus, behaviours both of speaking and listening have to be borne in mind, when talking about communication. Research on conversation mostly focuses on 'ways of speaking' (e.g. Gumperz, Tannen) but not necessarily on 'ways of listening' (but see, for example, research on 'back-channels': Maynard 1986).

Erickson's insight into communicative behaviours as carrying cultural patterns has an important bearing on all research on cross-cultural communication. In particular, his combined attention to rhythmic organization and the role of gesture and posture has widened the descriptive method of cross-cultural communication. Having said this, it has to be understood that the present research is not specifically concerned with either gestures or posture, although occasional reference to gestures and eye movement is made if judged necessary in the interpretation of interaction.
Lastly, mention must be made of Erickson's attention to the equal importance of both speakership and listenership in face-to-face communication, since it is usually the case that the former receives greater attention. The present research intends to focus equal attention on both sides, by introducing analyses of listenership as well as speakership in describing the process of interaction.

So far, I have covered two main types of recent studies of cross-cultural communication. One is an utterance level comparison of the interpretation of speech acts, represented by CCSARP. Thomas' approach to the study of communication widens the scope of research to take the role relationship of interactants into consideration. However, her analysis still basically remains at the level of utterance or exchange and it does not show the whole process of negotiation; that is, how the interactants have arrived at the interpretation of meaning.

On the other hand, another group of scholars, represented by Gumperz, Tannen and Erickson take an ethnomethodological approach and pay more attention to the process of interaction. They particularly pay attention to conversational style although their foci differ slightly, concentrating respectively on slightly different aspects of conversational cues. However, in focussing on specific features of conversational style, they are not just interested in linguistic or paralinguistic features per se, but are more interested in how conversationalists manage social interactions by means of such features in circumstances which carry all the social constraints and complications of modern societies. In this view, communication is a
social action and miscommunication could affect one's judgement of the ability and the personality of the interactant. It is the main aim of researchers who work in this field to describe how interactants manage to go through this ongoing negotiation process.

3.3.7 Summary

In this chapter, I have concentrated on examining some of the recent studies of cross-cultural communication. I started with the discussion of the relationship between culture and language and have found that there are two main relationships between them: first, language as a means of imparting cultural knowledge, and secondly, language itself as an embodiment of culture. I have particularly explored the second approach, since this line of definition seems more promising.

The view that culture is a product of 'social interaction' between individual persons still seems to hold. Thus, 'person' and 'personality' play important roles. The recent studies of cross-cultural communication, in particular, those conducted by Gumperz, Tannen, and Erickson, who base their analysis on data from face-to-face interaction, are closely related to the ideas of, for example, Malinowski, Sapir, and Firth in that what they are doing basically follows these predecessors' ideas on culture, which is the by-product of social interaction of individuals in the ongoing processes of negotiation. In this sense also, their studies can be said to be the study of 'culture'. They have expanded and elaborated this original idea of culture and in their definition of cross-cultural communication they include not only communication between interactants from different
language backgrounds but also that between people who share the same language but originate from different ethnic, social, and class backgrounds. The examples of the former type of cross-cultural communication are often linguistically oriented, as, for example, can be observed in the comparison of speech act types, represented by the work of CCSARP. The research on the latter type of communication has been best represented by the work of Gumperz, Tannen and Erickson. They have demonstrated the importance of various communicative conventions in interpreting the communicative behaviours of the interactants in their negotiation process.

Having reviewed some theories of communication and culture, it is now appropriate to examine approaches to the description of cross-cultural communication. In the following section, I shall review various approaches to the study of cross-cultural communication, focussing mainly on the three traditions of Contrastive, Discourse, and Conversational Analysis. In particular, special attention will be paid to the ways in which the relationship between language and culture in communicative situations is described and the role of the above three traditions of analysis in discussing it. In addition to this, the relationship between the contrastive framework and Discourse and Conversational Analyses in the description of cross-cultural communication will be discussed.

-------------------------------

NOTES
1. Sapir (1932), not satisfied with the anthropological definition of culture argues that:
The true locus of culture is in the interactions of specific individuals and, on the subjective side, in the world of meanings which each one of these individuals may unconsciously abstract for himself from his participation in these interactions.

(Sapir 1932 in Mandelbaum 1985: 594-5)

Thus, his interpretation of culture is heavily based on each individual and culture.

2. The CCSARP group claim that they have taken the context into consideration, by giving 'a short description of the situation, specifying the setting, the social distance between the interlocutors and their status relative to each other' (BK & O 1984:98) for their discourse completion test.
CHAPTER 4 CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION: APPROACHES TO DESCRIPTION

4.0 INTRODUCTION

In Chapters 2 and 3, I concentrated on establishing a theoretical basis for the present study. Chapter 2 worked at learner needs in communication, focussing on communicative and pragmatic competence, and finally communicative capacity. In Chapter 3 I discussed the concept of culture and how it relates to the study of communication. The link between communication and culture has led us to the study of cross-cultural communication. In this chapter, an enquiry will be made into the theoretical background for contrasting the cross-cultural study of communication; that is, Contrastive Analysis (4.1). I shall also examine the theories advocated for the description of spoken discourse; that is, Discourse Analysis (4.2) and Conversational Analysis (4.3). Further, I shall also discuss the way in which Contrastive Analysis interacts with the theories of Discourse Analysis: Contrastive Discourse Analysis, and Conversational Analysis: Contrastive Conversational Analysis in search of a cross-cultural contrastive framework for spoken discourse.

4.1 THE PERSPECTIVE OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS (CA)

In this section, I shall discuss how the perspective of Contrastive Analysis plays an important part in formulating a framework for contrasting cross-cultural communication in the present study and how
it is related to Discourse Analysis and Conversational Analysis respectively. I hope to establish a general framework for a contrastive study of the present research on the basis of the discussion in Chapters 2 & 3.

4.1.1 Cross-Cultural Communication and Contrastive Analysis (CA)

Although as early as 1957, Lado explained 'how to compare two cultures' as well as linguistic features, the actual experiments on CA, its subsequent criticism, and its recent reappraisals have mostly concentrated on pure linguistic systems such as phonology and syntax. Very few cultural comparisons based on Contrastive Analysis have been carried out yet. Various cultures seem to have been compared mostly on a traditional anthropological or sociological basis. Culture and language have been treated separately, and there have not been many attempts to relate culture and language as an integrated entity within a framework of cross-cultural communication. However, recent years, in particular the 1980s, have produced various articles whose titles convey some aspects of cross-cultural comparison based on CA; and CA, after being criticised heavily in the field of phonological and syntactical comparison, seems to have found its way out of trouble through the comparison of new domains such as 'contrastive rhetoric, pragmatics, discourse and text analysis' (James 1991:206).

The interest in the comparison of culture or cultural phenomena can be said to have increased mainly due to two reasons. Firstly, a change in the needs of society, that is, a growing need for actual inter-cultural communication in this shrinking world, for the purposes of commerce,
politics and education. Secondly, from a theoretical perspective, one of the starting-points for the popularity of cultural comparison seems to have been Hymes' introduction of the notion of 'communicative competence', which pointed out the importance of the sociocultural dimension in a competence framework for communication. This has widened the focus of study to include 'heterogeneity' compared to Chomsky's restricted interest in 'homogeneity' and thus, to encompass cross-cultural aspects of communication. I shall now move on to a discussion of what a contrastive analysis of cross-cultural communication entails, starting with the distinction made by James (1980) between 'microlinguistic' CA, and 'macrolinguistic' CA, which he relates to the notion of 'communicative competence'.

4.1.2 'Microlinguistic' vs 'Macrolinguistic' Contrastive Analysis

James (1980) (prior to the 1990 study, which introduces a new domain of the study of contrastive analysis) introduces a distinction between 'microlinguistic' and 'macrolinguistic' CA. 'Microlinguistic' CA, which he also calls 'code-oriented' CA, covers the traditional territory of CA: the 'three levels of Phonology, Lexis, and Grammar' (1980: 61). On the other hand, the focus of 'Macrolinguistic' CA is not on the code but on 'the process of communication' (1980: 100). A direct stimulus for this 'macrolinguistics' has been the notion of 'communicative competence', while 'microlinguistic' CA is based on Chomsky's notion of 'grammatical competence'. Thus, it is apparent from the foregoing discussion that the interest of the present research lies more on 'macrolinguistic' CA.
James subdivides macrolinguistics into two areas of 'text analysis' and 'discourse analysis'. 'Text analysis', according to him, 'is on the formal level and addresses the question of how sentences are organised into larger, suprasentential units or texts', while 'discourse analysis' is on the 'functional' level, and 'looks at the ways in which people put language to use' (1980:102).

The most recent development in CA is in the field of discourse analysis. Under this heading, James introduces, for example, 'the discourse markers of English' (e.g. Winter 1971 discussed in James 1980:120) and Kaplan's 'language or culture specific' view of 'rhetorical devices' (Kaplan 1972 discussed in James 1980:121). He also places pragmatics, or to be more precise, pragmalinguistics in this category. His view of pragmatics remains within the domain of the interpretation of speech act types. Thus, what James regards as 'pragmatics' here is very similar to the CA of the CCSARP group who have been concentrating on pragmalinguistics. He then moves on to include 'two-way and dyadic' conversation in the domain of discourse, quoting Riley (1979), who considers 'discourse as involving not one but two simultaneous act-sequences: the sequence of illocutionary acts and the sequence of 'interactive' acts' (1980:127). He explores Grice's conversational maxims in relation to the 'conversational implicatures' (1980:128), and subsequently moves on to Lakoff's (1973) 'Rules of Politeness', of which he states it is of contrastive interest to know:

1) what different cultures consider unmentionables, since this is a relative notion.
2) which kinds of implicature different languages exploit.
3) what the linguistic markers of 'power and solidarity' (Brown and Gilman, 1960) are in L1 and L2. (1980:130-131)
Here, James is including in his definition of 'discourse analysis' what Thomas (1984) calls 'sociopragmatic' aspects as well. He then moves on to another dimension of conversation, that is, to 'the management of conversation'. He includes such problems as conversational openings, maintainings and closings, and 'the subject matter for phatic communion' (1980: 132) in the aspect of conversational management based on Goffman (1976).

The above list of the features of macrolinguistic CA covers the same area as what James (1991) calls the new domain of CA, which includes 'contrastive rhetoric, pragmatics, discourse and text analysis' (1991: 206). While James predicts the further development of 'macrolinguistic' CA, other scholars, including Ellis, affirm the necessity of exploring the same area, using the different term, 'contrastive pragmatics'. I now turn to the study of contrastive pragmatics.

4.1.3 Contrastive Pragmatics——Some Examples

It seems that most examples of contrastive pragmatics which have been developed recently concentrate on the classification and comparison of speech act types across cultures. For example, Riley (1981) demonstrates a model of contrastive pragmalinguistics, which consists of a 'formal' comparison of what he calls 'illocutionary structure' and 'interactive structure'. By 'illocutionary structure' or 'communicative' structure, Riley deals with the 'sequences of illocutionary acts' (e.g. Inviting, Accepting, Confirming, Thanking)
and by 'interactive structure' or 'discursive' structure', he deals with 'linguistic organisation in terms of interactional tactics: turns (opening, reply, closing) address, relative distribution of utterances (exchange, transaction)' (1981:129).

He contrasts two classroom teaching situations one in English and the other in French. Thus, the situation and the relationship of the interactants are very limited and although he claims that the description is 'applicable to any face-to-face oral discourse', it seems doubtful whether this is possible without any actual examples being given. This is partly because this descriptive method is very formalised and mechanical. Although Riley states that the speech act is 'simply one possible realisation' of 'the act of communication' (1981:123), he himself seems to concentrate solely on the classification of speech act types.

Another group of scholars, who utilise contrastive analysis in the domain of pragmatics, are, as we have seen, those who work in the CCSARP project. Ventola's attempt is particularly significant in that she attempts to 'link the study of independent verbal acts, as undertaken by CCSARP, to contextual theory, which takes into account the global social activity' (Blum-Kulka and Olshtain 1984:188) as discussed earlier. Ventola herself calls this 'a social semiotic perspective'. This attitude, which treats speech acts not as discrete items but within the context seems to be a clue to the future development of Contrastive Pragmatics.
Ellis refers to this point as well, stating that a 'more ambitious' contrastive pragmatics is 'to compare the discourse structure of representative interactions in the two languages' rather than just 'to take a particular function (e.g. suggesting) and then contrast its linguistic realization in two or more languages', or to examine the different functions served by the same linguistic structures in two languages (1985:38), which has been explained, for example in Riley (1981) and in some CCSARP studies.

Certainly, the present trend seems to be towards a more global comparison of 'discourse structures' although there still remains the problem of how to compare different discourse structures across cultures.

Having observed some of the developments of cross-cultural CA in recent years, the most promising area of CA seems to lie in a relatively new field of pragmatics, discourse analysis, and conversational analysis. The study of this area is closely related to the development of the theory of communication which I discussed extensively in Chapter 2. Further, on the basis of the foregoing discussion, we could expect CA to be able to cover the ongoing process of negotiation, that is, the domain of communicative capacity, which encapsulates both concepts of communicative and pragmatic competence. This seems to be a new, promising dimension of cross-cultural contrastive analysis.

4.1.4 Summary

In the study of cross-cultural communication, it is inevitable that one
utilizes the perspective of contrastive analysis. It is no exaggeration to say that all studies of cross-cultural communication employ this perspective to a certain extent whether they explicitly state the fact or not. That being so, it is essential for the present research to include this investigation, particularly when the area of contrastive pragmatics, to which this research is also related, is attracting attention as a new field of CA.

I have pointed out that one of the limitations of traditional CA is that it assumes language can be contrasted as an abstract system without reference to its users. For example, Lado tries to contrast languages and cultures as separate entities, ignoring the possibility of integrating them. This view has been proved to be inadequate if we are concerned with language 'use'. The new dimension of CA needs to establish a framework which can account for both language and culture as an integrated entity. Further, I have argued that the CA framework in the present study needs to be able to deal with the comparison of the ongoing process of negotiation, that is, with a CA which takes communicative capacity into consideration.

4.2 CROSS-CULTURAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In the previous section, the importance of a CA framework for the study of cross-cultural communication has been discussed. However, in most cases of CA, language and culture have been dealt with separately, contrasting, for example, pure linguistics items such as syntax and
phonology, on the one hand and various concrete observable cultural phenomena on the other.

With the development of the notion of 'communicative competence', the demand for the introduction of new insight into the CA framework has been raised. It seems that the rehabilitation of the CA Hypothesis can best be achieved by shifting the data from language and culture as separate items to an integrated whole which encompasses the two. In this sense, a perspective from Discourse Analysis (DA) and Conversational Analysis (CNA) seems promising as already pointed out briefly in the previous section (see 4.1.1).

In this section, I shall consider what DA offers as a framework for CA.

4.2.1 The Nature of Discourse Analysis
Discourse Analysis is a product of inter-disciplinary concerns; it developed rapidly, particularly in the early 1970s, based on the advancement of studies in various disciplines. Van Dijk (1985), in his comprehensive review of the neighbouring fields of DA, lists six main individual disciplines which have influenced the development of DA. These are sociolinguistics, Speech Act Theory, text grammars, psychology and artificial intelligence, sociology, and anthropology.

In sociolinguistics, Chomsky's notion of 'competence' has been seriously questioned because of sociolinguists' focus on 'the importance of language variation in the sociocultural context' as opposed to Chomsky's notions such as 'ideal speakers' and the
existence of a 'homogeneous speech community' (van Dijk 1985:5, see also the discussion in 2.1). The inclusion of the sociocultural context introduces a contrastive dimension; thus, it relates the study of DA to the framework of CA. Van Dijk specifically lists Labov's (1972) work as notable 'because of its interest in spoken language and the functions of discourse in the social context'. As to Speech Act Theory, he cites 'the philosophical work by Austin, Grice, and Searle, whose approach considers 'verbal utterances not only as sentences, but also as specific forms of social action'. Thirdly, van Dijk regards 'the development of text grammars' as a contribution to the development of DA, although he admits that this study 'demonstrates a more formal point of view' (1985:6). Fourthly, van Dijk considers that 'psychology' and 'artificial intelligence' have contributed to DA through 'the cognitive and information processing paradigm against the prevailing behaviorism of the previous decades'. They also bring a great interest in 'semantic memory and the representation of knowledge' (1985:6) based on Bartlett's (1932) work. In the new field of Artificial Intelligence, 'knowledge representations in memory' have been defined as (and Bartlett's original notion of 'schema' has been expanded to) the notions "script", "scenario" and "frame" (1985:6).

Another field which has contributed to the development of DA is sociology. There has been a move away from 'the prevailing macrosociological approaches to social structure' towards 'interpretative, phenomenological sociology' (1985:7) on the part of people such as Goffman & Garfinkel. Also the new field of conversational analysis has been developed by Sacks. Finally,
anthropology, in particular, the field of the 'ethnography of speaking' represented by Hymes, has had a great influence on the development of DA.

Thus, as summarised briefly by van Dijk, through influences from various fields, the inter-disciplinary field of DA has been established as an independent field of study.

Cameron & Taylor (1987) in their recent book *Analysing Conversation* confirm the inter-disciplinarity of the field and outline 'certain key themes in conversational analysis' (1987:4). These are: firstly, pragmatics, which 'focuses on the interpretation of utterances and on how an account of this aspect of language use may be incorporated into a more general grammatical model' (1987:4); they include 'Austin's and Searle's speech act framework' in this category as well. Secondly, they refer to the 'ethnography of speaking' as another important theme which they think 'seeks to describe the typical features of varied speech events; to catalogue features of speaker, addressee, setting, topic, channel and the like' (1987:5). Thirdly, they list 'conversational structure', 'which seeks to describe conversation as a distinctive, highly organized level of language' (1987:5) as one of the important themes of conversational analysis. This, of course, is related mostly to the work of the 'ethnomethodologists'.

What Cameron & Taylor list as main themes of conversational analysis (they use this term interchangeably with DA) seems to have been covered in van Dijk's (1985) summary as well. Judging from this, we may
conclude that DA has certain inter-disciplinary fields of study as its background. However, since the aim of this chapter is not a comprehensive survey of the neighbouring fields of DA, in the following sections I shall focus only on some recent attempts to establish practical models for DA.

4.2.2 Labov & Fanshel—Therapeutic Discourse

Labov and Fanshel (1977) approach discourse analysis from two different perspectives: 'conversational analysis and the speech act framework of Austin and Searle' (Cameron and Taylor 1987:49 also see Edmondson 1981:57-8). As to conversational analysis, although they regard Sacks and Schegloff et al's 'rules of sequencing' as 'a matter of considerable importance for the understanding of what takes place in conversation', they still consider that 'a more exact characterization of the units that are sequenced' (1977:25) needs to be developed. In addition, they regard conversation as 'a type of human interaction, taking place within a social frame' (1977:26). This interpretation is very important in that it introduces the perspective of contrastivity into the framework of CNA.

Labov and Fanshel are not completely satisfied with the speech acts of Austin and Searle either, because of their inability to handle 'the more abstract types of social interaction such as, challenges, defenses, and retreats, which have to do with the status of the participants, their rights and obligations, and their changing relationships in terms of social organization. (1977:58-9).
In order to 'provide a reasonable accounting', the book focusses on 'the hierarchical structure of propositions and speech actions' (1977:354). However, this system of analysis does not seem to be devoid of problems either. Cameron and Taylor point out the problem of how conversationalists themselves know that a particular utterance should be treated as instantiating a specific deep-level act. (1987:50)

Furthermore, they cast doubt on 'rules of discourse' as being unclear as to 'how one can possibly check that conversationalists are following the rule one has hypothesized' (1987:51). Edmondson (1981) also points out the same problem stating:

the terms and categories used here seemed ad hoc, sequencing rules are not specified explicitly, turn-assignment problems are not clarified in connection with sequencing possibilities, and illocutionary and interactional aspects of talk are not distinguished in the labels offered for different types of 'speech actions'. (1981:60)

As Edmondson points out although we can see in Labov and Fanshel's model two different procedures of analysis, that is, 'cross-sectional analysis' and 'sequencing rules', they regard the latter as relatively simple compared to 'the rules of production and interpretation' (1977:110). Edmondson argues that the weakness in Labov and Fanshel's model derives from the lack of the distinction between 'illocution and interaction'. Based on this observation, he presents his own framework for discourse.

4.2.3 Edmondson's Model of Discourse Analysis

Edmondson's 'model for the analysis of spoken discourse' (1981:1) has
evolved from a critical survey of two approaches: the speech act theory of the philosophers represented by Austin and Searle and the conversational analysis of the ethnomethodologists represented by Sacks et al.

Concerning speech act theory, Edmondson presents the convention of the 'H-support' maxim, which, according to him, 'in part governs our perception of conversational events, and underlies our perception and evaluation of social behaviour in general' (1981:25). His formulations of the H-support maxim can be seen in the following:

---Support your hearer's costs and benefits!
---Suppress your own!
---Give benefits when you receive them!

(Edmondson 1979c discussed in 1981:25)

This, as Edmondson himself is well aware of, is related to the notion of politeness (1981:25). Next, he states that it is necessary to 'distinguish between a locutionary and an illocutionary act, and rejects the notion of co-occurrent direct and indirect illocutionary acts' (1981:30). He further states the necessity to assign a 'specific illocutionary force' to every case (1981:30) although he is also aware of the difficulty of doing this. Finally, he emphasises the 'indeterminate' aspect of illocutionary force, thus 'interpretation' and 'negotiation' mean a great deal (1981:29).

This leads Edmondson to stress the importance of an ethnomethodological view, which emphasises, for example, 'the central importance of "placing" and of turn-taking procedures' (1981:51) in the theory of
speech acts or text linguistics, and he emphasises the necessity to 'look outside speech act theory in order to capture the notion of discourse structure' (1981:32). However, he also points out the difficulty of utilising the ethnomethodologists' approach with empirical data because of a lack of adequate explanation of such terms as 'transition relevance place'. He also notes the 'interpretative problems' of Sacks et al (1974) and argues that:

the links between what is said and what is done thereby are not investigated in any detail inside the ethnomethodological approach. (1981:50-51)

Having scrutinised both the work of the speech-act theorists and the ethnomethodologists, Edmondson emphasises the necessity of a new model of discourse which compensates for the deficits of the work of these two approaches and which is sensitive to both illocutionary and interactive acts. Edmondson, like Labov and Fanshel (1977), regards 'his selection of the illocutionary act as a fundamental conversational unit' (Cameron & Taylor 1987:52), and invents eighteen 'technical terms', each of which is given a detailed explanation in the manner of Labovian 'rules of discourse' (Labov & Fanshel 1977:78) though in more detail.

In order to follow or adopt Edmondson's model, one must master this detailed classification of eighteen acts for the identification of an illocutionary act. However, as Cameron and Taylor point out, Edmondson's terminology is by no means original. Cameron and Taylor (1987) argue that the origin of Edmondson's acts is not clear and that it is 'often quite obscure why specific utterances have been classified
as they have' (1987:53). Moreover, they also cast doubt on the etic analysis Edmondson adopts. This attitude is quite different from that of, for example, Erickson and Shultz (1982), who actually foster and utilise an emic view of analysis in their work *The Counselor as Gatekeeper*. Edmondson's etic analysis might have been possible because of the type of data he used—mostly prefabricated or elicited in controlled situations. Also his 'axiomatic' view that 'each utterance has only one illocutionary force' does not work very well with authentic data.

Thus, Edmondson's approach to discourse analysis, which takes both interactional moves and illocutionary force into consideration, combining both the ethnomethodologists' and the speech act theorists' approaches, is not without problems. In particular, it seems more vulnerable when used for the analysis of natural data, the formulation of a model based mostly on controlled data. Moreover, although it contains insights from the conversational analysis of ethnomethodologists, its basic stance is still that of an analyst and it does not take a participant's view, which is essential for an ethnomethodological approach.

4.2.4 The Birmingham Model

The Birmingham Model of Discourse Analysis was actually the first 'systematic' attempt to provide a descriptive model of DA. It is problematic in two senses. Firstly, its focus is too narrow and it is doubtful whether it is applicable to other situations as a model for DA. Its focus is limited to classroom discourse, and therefore, lacks
various aspects of what Sinclair and Coulthard call 'desultory conversation' (1975:4). Moreover, even within classroom discourse, they limit the situation to that of a teacher-fronted one. Thus, the model 'cannot handle' 'pupil/pupil interaction' or 'discussing groups' (1975:6). As a result, in spite of Sinclair and Coulthard's intention to 'specify a descriptive apparatus capable of greater generality' (1975:7), the latter seems to be far removed from 'generality'.

Secondly, although their model appears superficially to be based on the speech act theory of Austin and Searle, in reality their speech acts are based on 'their function in the discourse' (Cameron & Taylor 1987:66) and have little to do with Austin and Searle's philosophical tradition of speech act theory. This can be seen in the questions Sinclair & Coulthard set up, such as:

- how are successive utterances related; who controls the discourse; how does he do it; how, if at all, do other participants take control; how do the roles of speaker and listener pass from one participant to another; how are new topics introduced and old ones ended; what linguistic evidence is there for discourse units larger than the utterance? (1975:4)

They are related to what Widdowson (1979) calls 'interactive acts', but not to 'illocutionary acts' (1979:138) in the sense of Searle (1969). This has also been pointed out by several other scholars such as Hatch (1980:19), Edmondson (1981:73), and Cameron & Taylor (1987:66). Cameron and Taylor (1987) argue that the Birmingham model of DA is essentially 'a form of functionalism. They go on to say that the Birmingham Model 'started out as a discourse version of Hallidayan scale and category grammar, thus, it is placed 'in the general category of 'slot and filler' approaches (1987:67). Sinclair and Coulthard
themselves acknowledge this. At first they had no means to approach 'the organization or extent of linguistics patterning in long texts' (1975:19). In order to 'avoid the danger of confusing pedagogic with linguistic structure' they determined 'to work upwards from the smallest linguistic unit' (1975:20).

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) regard 'the level of discourse as lying between the level of grammar and non-linguistic organization' (1975:24) and set up five discoursal ranks on the basis of classroom discourse. However, because of this very focus of analysis, the model is of limited use for the analysis of greater varieties of discourse types, particularly, for the analysis of face-to-face dyadic conversation, in which the interest of the present study lies.

4.2.5 Summary

Most of the existing models of DA have been influenced to a certain extent by the speech act theory of Austin and Searle. For example, Labov and Fanshel (1977) and Edmondson (1981) are certainly under the influence of this theory. However, Labov and Fanshel's model has been criticised for the vagueness of the distinction it draws between illocution and interaction. Edmondson, after reviewing the problems of the ethnomethodologists' and the speech act theorists' approaches, sets out his own model of DA, which is concerned with both illocutionary acts and interactive moves. However, his category of illocutionary acts is also problematic. Moreover, his analysis is based on an etic view and lacks a participant's point of view. This also applies to the Birmingham Model of DA, which basically takes an analytic view, and is
interested in classifying language functions into their hierarchical categories, which have little to do with the speech act theory of Austin and Searle.

It is clear from the foregoing discussion that DA has been greatly influenced by both the speech act theory of Austin and Searle in terms of the interpretation of illocutionary force and from the ethnomethodologists' insights into interactive sequences. An ideal framework for DA needs to focus attention on both illocutionary and interactive aspects of discourse. However, it seems that until now not a single framework for DA completely satisfies this requirement. Most of them have some problems with the categorisation of illocutionary acts, or in some cases, with the distinction between illocutionary and interactive acts. Another point to be made is the fact that DA seems still to be viewed from an analyst's perspective; thus, it is principally concerned with communicative competence but not with communicative capacity, which places great emphasis on the participants' view; this was discussed in Chapter 2. I shall now move on to a review of Conversational Analysis, which, since it was developed by ethnomethodologists, does take a participant view.
In the foregoing section, I explored DA in search of a research framework for the present study. In the exploration of Contrastive DA (CDA), it was indicated that the DA framework is not satisfactory from a participant perspective nor is it sensitive to the sequencing mechanism of connected discourse. As an alternative, the ethnomethodologists' insight into the analysis of spoken discourse seems promising in that it takes a participant view into consideration. Moreover, it pays attention to such features of conversation as turn-taking, which DA does not specifically deal with.

4.3.1 CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS (CNA) AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (DA)
Levinson (1983) in his survey of the study of conversation identifies 'two major approaches to the analysis of conversation' (1983: 286): 'discourse analysis (DA)' and 'conversational analysis (CNA)'. Although there are some scholars who do not necessarily differentiate the two approaches (see for example Cameron & Taylor 1987), there are certain differences between the theoretical backgrounds of the two: DA originates in linguistics, whereas CNA originates in sociology and especially that advocated by ethnomethodologists. This results in different approaches to the study of conversation. According to Levinson's distinction, DA 'is essentially a series of attempts to extend the techniques so successful in linguistics, beyond the unit of sentence' (1983: 286) and it employs the following procedures:

(a) the isolation of a set of basic categories or units of discourse.
(b) the formulation of a set of concatenation rules stated over
those categories, delimiting well-formed sequences of categories (coherent discourses) from ill-formed sequences (incoherent discourses). (Levinson 1983: 286)

Apart from this, DA depends very much on 'intuitions' in deciding 'what is and what is not a coherent or well-formed discourse' (1983: 286).

As to CNA, Levinson highlights two characteristics. Firstly, he lists CNA's empirical approach and its inductive methods (1983: 286). Secondly, he states that the emphasis of CNA lies in 'the interactional and inferential consequences of the choice between alternative utterances'. Thus, it rejects 'intuitive judgements' and aims 'to discover the systematic properties of the sequential organization of talk, and the ways in which utterances are designed to manage such sequences' (1983: 287). Another remark to be made is that while DA tends to prefer analysing single texts in depth, CNA examines 'as many instances as possible of some particular phenomena across texts' (1983: 287).

Having briefly compared the difference between CNA and DA, it appears that DA encounters problems in its tendency prematurely to categorise 'restricted data' based on single texts, although it has the advantage that it is capable of in-depth analysis of 'all the interesting features of this limited domain' as has been observed by Labov & Fanshel (1977). Also there are some doubts as to whether 'there are rules of a syntactic sort governing conversational sequencing' (1983: 294) as Levinson points out. Moreover, observing that conversation is 'the outcome of the interaction of two or more
independent, goal-directed individuals with often divergent interests',
DA with its rigid frameworks of analysis does not seem to be able to
cope with the interactional side of conversation. Whereas CNA, 'by
showing how a large proportion of the situated significance of
utterances can be traced to their surrounding sequential environments',
has made important contributions to the understanding of utterance

4.3.2 Ethnomethodology and Conversational Analysis

The term 'ethnomethodology' originates in Garfinkel (1974), who defines
it as:

an organizational study of a member's knowledge of his own
ordinary affairs, of his own organized enterprises, where that
knowledge is treated by us as part of the same setting that
it also makes orderable. (1974: 18)

It is concerned with 'studies of practical activities, of common-sense
knowledge, of this and that, and of practical organizational reasoning'
(1974: 18). Garfinkel states that this "common sense" knowledge of
what can count as reasonable, factual, related and the like' (Gumperz &
Hymes 1972: 304), that is, 'shared rules of interpretation' is the basis
of culture; 'shared knowledge', which is 'common substantive
information, already acquired' (1972: 304) is not. Here, what Garfinkel
calls 'common sense knowledge' itself is in fact culturally determined
in that 'common sense knowledge' for a person from a certain cultural
background might not be 'common sense' at all for another person from
another cultural background. If, as Garfinkel says, 'shared rules of
interpretation' is the basis of culture, it can be said that
Ethnomethodology is closely related to contrastive study, since what is 'shared' differs from one culture to another. Gumperz and Hymes further explain this common sense knowledge of Garfinkel's, which, for Garfinkel, is:

that of "members", member being used as a technical term to refer to mastery of a natural language, where language includes not only grammar but also its use. (Gumperz and Hymes (eds)1972:303)

Thus, ethnomethodology is also related to 'the nature of language' (Gumperz & Hymes 1972:305) as well as 'culture as interpretive rules' as Gumperz and Hymes rightly point out. Here, we could advance this argument and say that if ethnomethodology is related to both 'the nature of language' and 'culture' and if it is also related to contrastive study, then the perspective of ethnomethodology can give us a framework for Contrastive Analysis which integrates both language and culture. Therefore, the insight from ethnomethodology plays an important part in the present study. Garfinkel considers that:

Common understanding is never simply recognition of shared contents or rules, but it is always open-ended, brought about in any given case because participants bring it about as their "artful (if unconscious) accomplishment." Adhocing remains the ultimate concern. (1967:11 also 1972:304)

He sees that 'the orderliness, rationality, accountability of everyday life is a "contingent, ongoing accomplishment," a kind of "work," or "doing" (1972:304). If this is the fundamental viewpoint of ethnomethodology, then we could say that it is concerned with 'communicative capacity', which is to do with procedural work and deals with the on-going processes of negotiation as discussed in Chapter 2. We could then also infer that CNA, which derives from the theory of
ethnomethodology, is related to the notion of 'communicative capacity' rather than to 'communicative competence', which is more related to DA. This seems to be the major difference of the two approaches.

4.3.3 The Emergence of Conversational Analysis

How ethnomethodology has come to create an approach to the analysis of conversation can be explained in the following statement.

The spirit of ethnomethodology is exactly that of the sociolinguistics with which we are concerned in many respects—the insistence that the number and kinds of ways of speaking are problematic and to be discovered; that analysis begin within the data of speech events themselves; and that a person's speaking competence is not passive or mechanical, but part of strategies for the encompassing of situations. (cf Burke 1941) (Editorial Preface to Garfinkel in Gumperz and Hymes (eds) in 1972: 307)

Thus, the ethnomethodologists, being aware of the importance of the study of 'the ways of speaking', start working on various empirical data and gradually formulate a framework for CNA. The most notable feature of their method is that it takes the participants' view, unlike DA, which is still based on the researcher's view and is analytical, relying on units and categories into which the data is automatically classified:—notwithstanding the fact that there are often no appropriate categories for the data. The method used by ethnomethodologists is basically 'inductive' and it 'avoids premature theory construction' (Levinson 1983: 286), concentrating on an empirical approach, and searching for 'recurring patterns across many records of naturally occurring conversations' (ibid 1983: 287).
Sacks, from an ethnomethodological perspective, concentrates on the study of natural conversation, discovering 'how its structure and resources reflect speakers' social knowledge' (Sacks 1972a:325). In his research on the Analysability of Stories by Children, he has succeeded in demonstrating 'what Garfinkel calls practical reasoning' (1972a:325) by explaining how the famous two sentences 'The baby cried. The mommy picked it up' (1972a:330) come to be understood that 'the mommy' in the second sentence is the baby's mommy. In explaining the above interpretation, he introduces 'a conceptual apparatus', coining several terms such as 'membership categorization device' (1972a:332), which in this case put 'the baby' and 'the mommy' into the same category of 'family'. At the same time, he introduces a few rules of application such as 'the economy rule' and 'the consistency rule', which Sacks calls respectively a 'reference satisfactoriness' rule and a 'relevance' rule (1972a:333). Both rules help to show how the adequate interpretation of the relationship between 'the baby' and 'mommy' in 'the mommy of the baby' is possible. But again, we have to bear in mind that 'practical reasoning' is based on common sense knowledge, which could vary across cultures. Thus, 'shared rules of interpretation' might not be possible.

In addition to this, Sacks introduces the term 'category-bound activities', which explains the relationship between some particular categories of members and certain activities which are supposed to be done by them. Thus, an explanation is given for the relationship between 'baby' and 'cry'. In this way, by introducing his unique apparatus, Sacks has succeeded in describing how 'our knowledge of
social structure' (1972a:327) is utilised to interpret everyday discourse. Here, what Sacks is talking about is the importance of 'shared knowledge' to interpret everyday discourse. We can then understand how a lack of 'shared knowledge', which varies across cultures, could cause a serious problem. This might occur in the communications of non-members of a society, that is, in cross-cultural communication, as Gumperz and Hymes (1972:327) also point out.

Sacks' description of this everyday discourse interpretation bears a certain similarity to the utterance interpretation of Sperber and Wilson (1986), who, under the sole principle of 'relevance', try to explicate the process of utterance interpretation, deciding the degree of relevance in terms of 'contextual effects' and 'processing effort'. However, the theoretical basis of Sperber and Wilson's utterance interpretation lies in the understanding of information processing in terms of cognitive psychology based on deductive reasoning and also in linguistics. They do not utilise practical reasoning based on 'common sense knowledge', which is specific to members of a certain culture; thus, culture specific. They emphasise a natural linkage between 'linguistic form' and 'pragmatic interpretation' (1986:204), whereas Sacks' utterance interpretation, while dealing with linguistic interests such as 'coherence of texts' and 'the limitation of semantic fields' (1972a:325), is basically characterised by its attention to the members' knowledge which listeners utilise in interpreting utterances. When talking about cross-cultural communication, it is inevitable that we consider the way in which culture interacts with language in our utterance interpretation.
Sacks also refers to 'sequencing rules for two-party conversation': this is further developed in Schegloff (1972) and subsequently in a paper by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), to which I shall refer in detail in the following section dealing with the structure of conversation.

4.3.4 Conversational Analysis: Its Characteristics

The framework for conversational analysis has been constructed mainly through research by Sacks and Schegloff. Based on empirical data on natural conversation, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) succeeded in formulating rules of turn-taking, introducing a term 'transition relevance place (TRP)'. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) also introduced another important aspect of conversational management, 'adjacency pairs'. I shall firstly explore these two features of conversational organization, and then move on to the study of the overall organization of conversation.

4.3.4.1 Turn-taking

When discussing CNA, the system of turn-taking must be mentioned as one of the most essential aspects of conversational mechanism. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) in their paper on the organization of turn-taking, describe 'a model for turn-taking' as 'locally managed, party-administered, interactionally controlled, and sensitive to recipient design' (1974: 696). From empirical data, they present 'a basic set of rules governing turn construction' (1974: 704) at a 'transition relevance place (TPR)'. Here, I shall present a reasonably simplified version of Sacks et al (1974) by Levinson (1983), 'where C is
current speaker, N is next speaker, and TRP is the recognizable end of a turn-constructional unit' (1983:298) as follows:

Rule 1 - applies initially at the first TRP of any turn
\( (a) \) If C selects N in current turn, then C must stop speaking, and N must speak next, transition occurring at the first TRP after N-selection
\( (b) \) If C does not select N, then any (other) party may self-select, first speaker gaining rights to the next turn
\( (c) \) If C has not selected N, and no other party self-selects under option \( (b) \), then C may (but need not) continue (i.e. claim rights to a further turn-constructional unit)

Rule 2 - applies at all subsequent TRPs
When Rule 1\( (c) \) has been applied by C, then at the next TRP Rules 1\( (a)-(c) \) apply, and recursively at the next TRP, until speaker change is effected (1983:298)

In addition to the above rules, Sacks et al present several other findings which attend the system of turn-taking, of which a few are of specific interest to this research as well. Those are firstly, 'overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time'; however, this is followed by the next finding, which claims that 'occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief' (1974:706). This finding leads to another important aspect of turn-taking, that is 'overlap'.

4.3.4.1.1 Overlap and Interruption
Overlaps take place, firstly in relation to Rule 1\( (b) \) 'by competing self-selectors for a next turn, when each projects his start to be the earliest possible start at some possible transition-relevance place, producing simultaneous starts' (Sacks et al 1974:706-7). Secondly, they take place 'where TRPs have been misprojected for systematic reasons, e.g. where a tag or address term has been appended, in which case overlap will be predictably brief' (Levinson 1983:299). Levinson, on the grounds of this observation, further distinguishes between
'inadvertent overlap' and 'violative interruption' (1983:299). This distinction between 'overlap' and 'interruption' is important since the latter tends to carry negative meaning in conversation while the former does not necessarily do so - moreover it might sometimes be interpreted as a signal showing cooperativeness or encouragement in conversation. Another point to be made here is that while 'overlap' tends to be dissolved soon by one party yielding the floor naturally, 'interruption' may meet resistance or the speaker may have to fight for the floor.

Now if overlap should occur, there is 'quite an elaborate back-up machinery for resolving' it, which is, firstly, rapid dropping out of one speaker; secondly, recycling by the other speaker of 'the part of the turn obscured by the overlap', and finally, 'a competitive allocation system which works roughly on a syllable-by-syllable basis, whereby the speaker who "upgrades" most wins the floor, upgrading consisting of increased amplitude, slowing tempo, lengthened vowels and other features'. This takes place 'if one speaker does not immediately drop out' (Levinson 1983:300-1).

Attitudes towards 'overlap' and 'interruption' seem to vary a great deal depending on the cultural backgrounds of conversational participants. Moreover, the frequency of occurrence of 'overlap' and 'interruption' itself might differ across cultures. Since the empirical data in which these findings were observed were drawn solely from conversations in English, it would be interesting to see how these aspects differ or are similar across cultures. This point will
be pursued further (Chapter 8) in the actual examination of the data of the present research.

4.3.4.1.2 Silence

Levinson (1983) discusses silence and classifies it into three; that is, 'gap', 'lapse' and 'significant silence'. He explains each of them in relation to the turn-taking rules; that is:

(1) a gap before a subsequent application of Rules 1(b) or 1(c),
or (ii) a lapse on the non-application of Rule 1(a), (b) and (c),
or (iii) a selected next speaker's significant (or attributable) silence after the application of Rule 1(a). (1983:299)

He uses the term 'pause' as a 'general cover term for these various kinds of periods of non-speech' (1983:299 note). However, it seems that what is essential in cross-cultural communication is not these different terms for silence but the actual length of various types of silence and the places where they take place. This is because the length of silence and the place of silence in conversation might vary cross-culturally. This will also be discussed again later in the analysis and comparison of the empirical data of this research.

Another finding to be mentioned here is 'Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and overlap are common' (Sacks et al 1974:708). I have already mentioned briefly that gaps and overlaps take place at TRPs. This finding might, therefore, seem a contradiction. On the other hand, we must bear in mind that the rules, in most cases, secure 'transitions with no gap and no overlap' (1974:708) at TRPs. However, from a cross-cultural perspective, I doubt whether this is truly so.
There may be cases where transitions with gaps and overlap are common. This contradiction will also receive special attention later, in the analysis of the data.

The lack of a cross-cultural perspective in the original data of CNA has also been pointed out by Levinson (1983:296). Although comparisons of turn-taking between male and female (Zimmerman and West 1975) and children's turn-taking (Ervin-Tripp 1979) have been reported, it is true that there has not been very much empirical research into the turn-taking systems in other languages, and what is more, on how the learners' mother tongue turn-taking system influences their turn-taking in the target language. Therefore, a small-scale attempt to compare learners' interactional management particularly that of turn-taking in their mother tongue and the target language will be made in this research. Further, how the values of the participants from different cultural backgrounds affects the practice of turn-taking will be investigated.

Before concluding the discussion on turn-taking, it must be pointed out that there is another approach to the turn-taking system based on 'signals', which is represented in works by Kendon (1967), Duncan (1974) and Duncan & Fiske (1977). They claim that non-verbal features such as gaze and the direction of posture form 'the basis of our turn-taking ability' (Levinson 1983:302). However, research on telephone conversations, in which people have to operate the turn-taking system without any visual aids casts doubt on the validity of the 'signalling model'. It has also been reported that even without visual aids,
which, according to the signalling model, are vital to the turn-taking system, the average 'gaps' in phone conversation have been proved to be shorter than those in interviews (Brady 1968 and Jaffe & Feldstein 1970 discussed in Ervin-Tripp 1979:392). Thus, Levinson, admitting the plausibility of 'the signalling view, states that it is wrong to regard it 'as a complete account of turn-taking' as a system (1983:302). However, he admits the occurrence of 'signals indicating the completion of turn-constructional units'. Moreover, the role of signals in turn-taking is still considered to be important as one aspect of overall interaction management. For example, Erickson (1982a) and Erickson & Schultz (1982) incorporate gaze and posture as part of their data in their analysis of conversation and interviews respectively.

In the present research no systematic investigation on gaze direction or posture will be made; however, from time to time, when these signals seem to play an important role, reference will be made to them, particularly, at what Erickson and Schultz (1982) call an 'uncomfortable moment', when some kind of communication breakdown takes place, because it is essential to utilise all the possible apparatus in order to obtain a comprehensive description of these moments.

A final remark to be made is that some scholars who basically advocate CNA are not entirely happy with the descriptive model of CNA. For example, Gumperz points out that in the CNA model it is not clear how TRPs are indicated (see Chapter 3). Sacks et al (1974) define turn-constructional units as 'sentential, clausal, phrasal, and indexical---i.e. syntactically' (1974:720). According to them, turn-taking occurs
at the point of 'unit completion'. Levinson explains the units of Sacks et al's model as 'determined by various features of linguistic surface structure: they are syntactic units (sentences, clauses, noun phrases, and so on) identified as turn-units in part by prosodic, and especially intonational means' (1983:297). However, how these TRPs are recognized in actual ongoing conversation and how conversational interactants actually manage to take turns at TRPs is, as Gumperz points out, not illustrated comprehensively. This point will be discussed extensively later in relation to the analysis of empirical data (see Chapter 7).

4.3.4.2 Adjacency Pairs

4.3.4.2.1 Characteristics of Adjacency Pairs

Adjacency pairs are also very much related to the turn-taking system. Levinson (1983) presents a succinct summary of the definition of adjacency pairs by Schegloff and Sacks (1973):

adjacency pairs are sequences of two utterances that are:
(i) adjacent
(ii) produced by different speakers
(iii) ordered as a first part and a second part
(iv) typed, so that a particular first part requires a particular second (or range of second parts) - e.g. offers require acceptances or rejections, greetings require greetings, and so on

(Levinson 1983:303-4)

However, he points out 'that there are many other kinds of more complex sequential organizations operating in conversation,...nor indeed can the constraints across such pairs be properly modelled by formation rules analogous to syntactic rules' (1983:304). He states that adjacency pairs are regarded as 'a fundamental unit of conversational
organizations' in terms of speech act models, referring to Goffman (1976) and Coulthard (1977), who have taken this view. This applies especially to some closed sets of adjacency pairs, whose 'particular' first part requires a 'particular' second part such as 'question-answer' 'greeting-greeting' 'offer-acceptance/refusal' 'summons-answer' and 'farewell-farewell'.

Richards and Schmidt (1983) distinguish between tightly constructed adjacency pairs and those with more freedom for conversationalists responding to first pair parts, with several options available as second pair parts (1983:129) such as 'compliment', 'complaint' and 'offer'. For example, in the case of 'compliment' there is the possibility of several types of second pair part such as 'agreement' 'rejection' 'shift' and 'return' (1983:129).

These speech act types of adjacency pairs have received attention in cross-cultural comparison of speech act types particularly from the members of CCSARP. Although the project itself narrows their focus to the two speech act types of 'request' and 'apology', some researchers have extended their investigation to other types as well (for example, Wolfson, Blum-Kulka & Olstein, see discussion on CCSARP in 3.3.3). Although they compare these speech act types in terms of subjects' responses to certain speech acts across languages, it would be interesting to analyse the result in terms of 'preference organization'; given that there is a 'preferred' and a 'dispreferred' second pair part to a certain first part, it might be useful to
investigate whether the notion of 'preference' or 'dispreference' to a certain first pair part is the same or different across cultures.

According to Levinson (1983), 'preference' is 'a structural notion that corresponds closely to the linguistic concept of markedness'; thus, preferred seconds are 'unmarked' while dispreferred seconds are 'marked by various kinds of structural complexity' (Levinson 1983:307), with such features as 'delays', 'prefaces', 'accounts' and 'declination component' (Levinson 1983:334-5). Here, it has to be borne in mind again that this notion of preference and dispreference is culturally loaded; preferred seconds in one culture might not necessarily be preferred in another culture. Thus, the notion of preference has to be defined from the perspective of culture. This is another area where contrastive CNA can be utilised.

It is also probable that even when 'preference organization' is universal, its ways of organizing features might differ or organization itself might be different. For example, in a certain culture, a preferred second to 'invitation' and 'offer' might start with a refusal or a hesitation and a 'reinvitation' or 'reoffer' might be needed as a third part, followed by a final acceptance of the invitation or the offer. Alternatively, in some other cultures this refusal procedure may repeat itself several times. Thus, it would also be interesting to utilise 'preference organization' for the interpretation of cross-cultural communication, combining it with the cross-cultural comparison of speech act types. In this way we might be able to overcome the weakness of the speech act type analysis.
4.3.4.2.2 Insertion Sequence

Another important phenomenon to be discussed in relation to one of the problems with adjacency pairs is that 'adjacent positioning of component utterances' (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:295) cannot always be maintained. This phenomenon of embedding is called 'insertion sequences' by Schegloff (1972) and 'side sequences' by Jefferson (1972) (although there are slight differences between them). Levinson explains that in 'insertion sequences':

> the relevance of the answer is merely held in abeyance while preliminaries are sorted out, and insertion sequences are thus restricted in context to the sorting out of such preliminaries (1983:305).

He goes on to explain that 'insertion sequences can effectively structure considerable stretches of conversation' 'by means of the accumulation of first pair parts' (1983:305-6). Secondly, observing the fact that there are cases where neither an initial request nor the first question ever receives its second part but instead 'an explanation or account is provided for the failure to provide' it, he introduces the importance of the Schegloffian notion of 'conditional relevance' (Schegloff 1972) instead of 'the strict criterion of adjacency' (1983:306). To quote from Levinson again:

> what binds the parts of adjacency pairs together is not a formation rule of the sort that would specify that a question must receive an answer if it is to count as a well-formed discourse, but the setting up of specific expectations which have to be attended to. (1983:306)

Thus, the notion of conditional relevance seems to complement the weakness of one feature of adjacency pairs, that is, its adjacency.
4.3.4.2.3 Insertion Sequence and Side Sequence

Jefferson (1972) introduces the notion of 'side sequences', with a subclass, 'misapprehension sequence' to account for similar phenomena to Schegloff's (1972) 'insertion sequences'. A 'side sequence' takes place 'at an unpredictable point by a request for clarification', 'and then the conversation picks up again where it left off' (Coulthard 1985:75). Coulthard (1985) tries to distinguish an 'insertion sequence' and a 'side sequence' in terms of 'return' in that 'the former has a ready-made return, the second pair part of the question-answer pair, while for the latter it has to be "worked at"' (1985:76-7). By 'working out' Coulthard means that when 'there is a problem in accomplishing a return', a 'resumption' must be achieved by the use of 'attention getters such as "listen" or "hey you know"' (1985:76). However, I have already shown that an insertion sequence does not necessarily have a 'ready-made' answer although some kind of explanation or account is expected to be provided. Coulthard (1985) comes to realise that there is not very much difference between an 'insertion sequence' and a 'side sequence' in that it is also possible to 'insert a misapprehension sequence into Schegloff's Question/Answer pair' (1985:77). In the end he comes to the conclusion that different labels come from different viewpoints; that is to say, an insertion sequence arises from a 'structural label' and 'misapprehension sequence' from a 'semantic label'.

Thus, it seems that the difference in labels does not matter very much. What is important here is the recognition that adjacency pairs are not always adjacent, and that when this happens some kind of effort such as
a 'resumption' or explanation or an account for failure to answer is needed to return to an expected answer. From a cross-cultural perspective, it would be of interest to investigate whether this phenomena of insertion /side sequence exists across languages and if so whether its sequencing is the same or different. It is possible that in a certain culture there are fewer misapprehension sequences if conversationalists tend to hesitate to clarify. If such a phenomenon exists, it could be considered from two perspectives, cultural and learner-specific. Also it might be the case in a certain culture that once some kind of insertion is made, a 'return' to the former topic is less common compared to English interaction. This could be considered in relation to the problem of 'interruption'. Cross-cultural analysis of this insertion-sequence does not seem to have attracted very much attention yet. The present research would like to focus attention on this as well as on one aspect of cross-cultural comparison of conversation management.

4.3.4.3 Overall Organization
I have so far concentrated on the exploration of what Levinson(1983) calls 'conversational activity', which is locally managed in that it is based on just two turns. I shall now review conversation as a unit.

4.3.4.3.1 The Organization of Telephone Conversation
Attempts to work out an overall framework of conversational organization have most notably been made on telephone conversation because it usually has recognizable opening and closing sections. It has been pointed out that in the case of telephone conversations the
opening section starts with a 'summons', in this case the ringing of
the telephone' (Schegloff 1972). Thus, telephone conversation starts
with a special type of adjacency pair, summons-answer sequences, which
are 'always a prelude to something'; they 'are actually elements of
(minimally) three-turn sequences' (Levinson 1983:310). After the
opening section, the first topic, which is usually 'an announcement by
the caller of the reason for call' (Levinson 1983:312) will be
introduced. Then 'a series of one or more' topic changes take place
before the closing sections, which usually end with an adjacent pair of
'Farewell'. However, quite often before this terminal exchange, there
comes 'some pre-terminal section where undelivered news and the like
can be fitted in' (Levinson 1983:325). Then, there follows 'possible
pre-closings', which are usually topic-less passing turns' (Levinson
1983:325) such as '"We-ell---", "O.K.---", "So-oo---", etc. (with
downward intonation contours)' (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:303).

Thus the overall organization of telephone conversation is
characterised by a special summons-answer sequence opening and a very
recognizable closing with pre-closing sequence sections. In between,
'a series of one or more' topic changes take place. However, this
very basic organization also applies to most face-to-face dyadic
conversations. I shall now explore the meaning of overall
conversational organization in a slightly more detailed manner,
focussing on openings and closings.

4.3.4.3.2 Conversational Openings

Not all conversations start with summons-answer sequences like
telephone conversation, but they usually start with what for telephone conversation is the second interactional part: the adjacency pair of 'Greeting - Greeting'. However, there seem to be cases where a conversation starts with other adjacency pairs; for example, with 'Request- Grant, Question-Answer, or Statement-Response' as Richards and Schmidt (1983) point out, quoting from Ervin-Tripp (1964). The examples are as follows:

Request  A: Got a match?
Grant B: Sure.

Question A: How do you like our show?
Answer B: You have some beautiful paintings here!

Statement A: That was a terrible lecture!
Response B: Yeah, I wish he could speak in normal English.

(Richards and Schmidt 1983:134)

It is not certain whether each conversation continues further, since, as Richards and Schmidt point out, 'none of the examples above consist of openers that must inevitably lead to a full conversation' (1983:134) as in a telephone conversation, which, starting with a summons, needs at least one topic to be provided by the caller after the initial exchange of greetings, in order to justify his or her summons.

To develop these exchanges into a full conversation, both parties need to cooperate, presenting, maintaining and changing topics; otherwise a conversation may terminate after an initial exchange. This may be the case, especially when neither parties has an urgent need to talk apart from the purpose of 'phatic communion', that is, for the sake of 'companionship' (see Malinowski 1923 in Laver and Hutcheson 1972:151).
For a language learner, the management of conversational openings is very important in conversation with a native-speaking conversational partner in that it is not just the opening of a verbal act of conversation through the use of linguistic skills he has learnt such as the adjacency pair of greetings; it is also a participation in a social interaction. That is, 'he is entering the arena of social action and exploiting some available procedures for social organization by doing so' (Spier 1972: 402).

It is also important to observe this opening phase from a cross-cultural perspective since although the structure of overall conversation may be universal, the operation of each section and the conditions which are necessary for operation may vary across cultures. In a particular culture, the decision as to who opens a conversation may not be totally free of rules but may depend on the status and roles of the participants. Also some cultures may encourage people to use address terms together with 'greetings' while in other cultures, such a habit may be rare; or again it may depend on the status of participants as to what kinds of address terms should be used, if they are encouraged at all. Also in certain cultures, people may need non-verbal exchanges such as shaking hands, bowing and eye-contact as well as the verbal exchange of, for example, greetings. It is necessary to bear this in mind when comparing conversational interaction across cultures.

4.3.4.3.3 Conversational Closings

A conversation which has been opened has to be terminated at a certain stage after a series of topic changes. The closing of conversations is
also a cooperative work in that it needs both parties' agreement. Schegloff and Sacks state that 'an initial problem concerning closings is:

How to organize the simultaneous arrival of the conversationalists at a point where one speaker's completion will not occasion another speaker's talk, and that will not be heard as some speaker's silence. (1973:294-5)

A conversation cannot be simply terminated by one party declaring that s/he is going to close the conversation. Usually there is no such official announcement unlike, for example, in public speech. However, it is now widely known from empirical data that there are certain observable features which characterise the closing section of conversation.

To start with, the terminal exchange may be characterizable by an adjacency pair of 'farewell'; by 'an exchange of "good-byes" (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:295). What is difficult is not the terminal exchange itself but the closing of topic and the method of reaching the terminal exchange. How do people close topic and come to a terminal exchange? Here, Coulthard, summarising Schegloff and Sacks' (1973), states that one way of 'bounding topics to produce a clear ending' is for one party to produce 'a proverbial or aphoristic summary or comment on the topic which the other party can agree with' (1985:90), quoting an example from Schegloff and Sacks (1973):

DORINNE: Uh ---you know, it's just like bringing the --- blood up.
THERESA: Yeah well. THINGS UH ALWAYS WORK OUT FOR THE BEST.
DORINNE: Oh certainly.

(Schegloff and Sacks 1973 cited in Coulthard 1985:90)
Schegloff and Sacks (1973) themselves introduce 'pre-closing' or rather a 'possible pre-closing' such as 'We-il---", "O.K.-", "So-oo", etc (1973:303) as 'the first proper way of initiating a closing section' (1973:303). Following this, there are two options for the conversational partner. S/he can either introduce a new topic particularly 'some heretofore unmentioned mentionable' (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:304) or decline this opportunity and respond to the possible pre-closing, returning a 'pass' as follows:

A:  O.K.
B:  O.K.  (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:304)

which Schegloff and Sacks think constitutes 'the first part of the closing section' (1973:304). Moreover, they need to be placed 'at the analyzable (once again, TO PARTICPANTS) end of a topic' (1973:305) to be recognized as possible pre-closings. The analyzable end of a topic can be identifiable by the 'aphoristic topic-bounding' technique mentioned above or by such a special exchange as:

A:  OKay?
B:  Alright  (Schegloff & Sacks 1973:306)

Although at the beginning of this section I mentioned that there is no official announcement of the closing of a conversation, Sacks and Schegloff (S & S) (1973) point out that there are some 'possible pre-closings which announce a warrant for closing' (1973:311). Firstly, they give specific examples from telephone conversation, in which there are two types of 'inviting the initiation of closing sections'. One is 'caller-specific and makes reference to the interests of the other' as follows:
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A: Well I'll lechu go. I don't wanna tie up your phone.  
(S&S 1973: 310)

Another is 'called-specific techniques, also making reference to the other's interests' such as:

A: This is costing you a lot of money.  
(S&S 1973: 310)

Secondly, the 'devices which do make use of conversationally developed materials' could be preclosings such as:

"Well, I'll let you get back to your books." (S&S 1973: 311),

which could occur not only in telephone conversations but also in face-to-face conversations. Thirdly, there are some pre-closings which do not 'make reference to materials derived from the conversation' and which are 'generally usable' such as:

"I gotta go"
"The baby is crying, I gotta go"  
(S&S 1973: 311)

These 'overt announcements' can be placed irrespective of topic boundaries; thus, they 'can be used to interrupt a topic'. Although these pre-closings do not guarantee the termination of conversation, they can surely discourage further talk; they are thus more 'effective' than other 'possible pre-closings which accomplish a warrant without announcing it' (S&S 1973: 312).

From the discussion in this section it has emerged that conversational closing has a very finely sequenced organization of its own, and, more importantly, it needs to be regarded 'as a constituent part of an
occasion or interaction' (S&S 1973:325). In terms of practical techniques of terminating a conversation, it has been noted that closing sections must be properly initiated at the proper places. This could be achieved by the use of various types of possible pre-closings according to the situations and the intention of the conversationalists. However, to achieve an eventual closing, the cooperation and agreement of co-conversationalists in terminating conversations is vital, since otherwise it is possible to reopen a new topic even after terminal exchanges. We can reemphasize the importance of conversational closings by quoting from Levinson (1983):

Closings are a delicate matter both technically, in the sense that they must be so placed that no party is forced to exit while still having compelling things to say, and socially in the sense that both over-hasty and over-slow terminations can carry unwelcome inferences about the social relationships between the participants. (Levinson 1983:315)

In addition, according to the author's previous questionnaire on conversational closings (Murata 1986), half of both the Japanese learners and the native-speaking respondents have experienced some difficulty in closing conversations. Nearly sixty percent of the learners attributed this to their lack of knowledge of 'idiomatic expressions useful for ending a conversation' while eighty percent of the native speakers gave a sociocultural reason, that is, that the Japanese are afraid to be rude by taking the initiative themselves in ending a conversation. This is an interesting observation since the above inhibition definitely exists in a Japanese-Japanese conversation, in particular, when there is a difference in age and status between the co-conversationalists. This brings us to the cross-
cultural dimension of conversational organization and we can therefore conclude that conversational closings, like openings, are also of cross-cultural interest.

Although the phenomenon of conversational closing is of great interest and is open to exploration from a cross-cultural perspective, the present research does not specifically focus attention on closing sections. However, various possible pre-closings will be referred to indirectly in reference to topical change, which will be discussed in the following section.

4.3.4.4 Topic Management
Topic introduction, development by means of topic maintenance and change, and closing are important parts of conversational structure, and without them, conversation never starts nor lasts after an initial adjacency pair of opening (e.g. Greetings).

In this section I shall explore how management of a topic relates to the overall structure of conversation and to the maintainance of conversation, beginning the discussion with the problem of identifying a 'topic'. Secondly, I shall investigate the notion of conversational coherence and what 'speaking topically' entails. Let us now start with the definition of a 'topic'.

4.3.4.4.1 The Definition and the Identification of a 'Topic'
The term 'topic' has been used vaguely depending on the situation, since people have a general intuitive idea of what 'topic' means. This
Idea of topic also influences the analysis of conversational data. As there is no recognized way of dividing up conversational data into chunks of discourse, analysis is often based on 'intuitive notions' as various scholars point out (see for example Brown & Yule 1983:69, Gardner 1984:112 and 1987:132). Gardner (1984) also points out that although there have been some attempts to define 'topic' (e.g. Keenan & Schieffelin 1976, Schank 1977, Hurtig 1977, van Dijk 1977, Burton 1980 discussed in Gardner 1984), 'none of them entirely satisfactory' in that eventually, at the very final analysis the analysts have to rely on their intuition.

Brown and Yule also explore some scholars' attempts to define 'topic' and find that although what they are really interested in is 'discourse topic', there have been some attempts to define 'topic' in terms of sentence structure, that is, 'sentential topic' which 'may coincide with the grammatical subject' (Brown & Yule 1983:70, referring to Hocket 1958). However, Brown & Yule make their approach to 'topic' clear by discarding this notion of 'sentential topic'. They state:

"We are primarily interested in the general pretheoretical notion of 'topic' as 'what is being talked about' in a conversation." (1983:71)

They believe Morgan's opinion that 'it is not sentences that have topics, but speakers' (Morgan 1975 cited in Brown & Yule 1983:71). I shall come back to this specific notion of 'speaker's topic' later in relation to 'conversational topic'.
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With this difficulty in pinning down "what is being talked about" in mind, Brown and Yule, not being satisfied with the definition of discourse topic by Keenan and Schieffelin (1975), who claim that "a single proposition represents the whole of the fragment", introduce the notion of "topic framework", which can incorporate "all the reasonable judgements of "what is being talked about"" (1983:75) and "consists of elements derivable from the physical context and from the discourse domain of any discourse fragment" (1983:79).

This topic framework, according to Brown & Yule (1983), is similar to Venneman's "propositional pool" which contains information "constituted from general knowledge, from the situative context of the discourse, and from the completed part of the discourse itself" (Venneman 1975:314 discussed in Brown & Yule 1983:79). "Each participant in a discourse has a presuppositional pool" and "within the presuppositional pool there is a set of discourse subjects" and "the relevant "discourse subjects" for a particular discourse fragment must be those to which reference is made in the text of discourse" (Brown & Yule 1983:80-1). However, Venneman's definition of discourse topic, which is "what two participants are concentrating on", is also not without problems. It has emerged that Venneman's definition of topic has "single constructed sentences as the bases" (1983:83), which Brown and Yule consider to be "misleading".

Gardner (1987) also concludes that "none of the definitions of topic is entirely satisfactory" (1987:136) after a comprehensive review of the attempts by several scholars to produce a definition of topic.
However, he states that 'a working definition' might be possible and suggests the following:

-----one may use a number of techniques to show the propositional links between utterances that form a topic. Such propositions may be identified as formulations for each exchange, expanded if necessary. Their mutual fit into a frame of reference or into an intuitively grasped concept of global coherence will point towards their topical connection. There will also be clues and indications from lower levels, namely completion of expected second pair parts, or the incorporation of a claim or presupposition into the subsequent utterance. (1987:137-8)

This also seems very vaguely defined. However, at present it seems that one cannot define a topic by completely ignoring one's intuition.

The notion of topic also plays an important role in the present research in discussing the conversationalists' interpretative processes, that is, in interpreting how two parties negotiate meaning in an ongoing process, speaking topically and relevantly. I shall therefore move on to explore the notion of relevance in conversation.

4.3.4.4.2 The Notion of Relevance-----Speaking Topically

One important aspect of topic management is the fact that topics should be handled relevantly. Conversational contributions have to be relevant 'in terms of the existing topic framework' (Brown & Yule 1983:84). In other words, conversationalists need to 'speak topically', 'by making their contributions relevant to the existing topic framework' (1983:85). Here Brown and Yule make it clear that 'speaking topically' and 'speaking on a topic' is different in that in the latter case 'the participants are concentrating their talk on one particular entity, individual or issue' (1983:84). Both aspects need
to be present in patterns of talk in 'any conversational fragment' (1983:84).

Speaking topically seems to be particularly difficult for learners since what is relevant seems to vary depending on culture. This notion of 'relevance' derives from Grice (1975). However, Brown and Yule point out that Grice does not elaborate on how to decide 'what is relevant'. They therefore, from a discourse analyst's point of view, interpret it as 'Make your contribution relevant in terms of the existing topic framework' (1983:84) and further explain:

a discourse participant is 'speaking topically' when he makes his contribution fit closely to the most recent elements incorporated in the topic framework. This is most noticeable in conversations where each participant 'picks up' elements from the contribution of the preceding speaker and incorporates them in his contribution----- (1983:84)

Judging from this explanation, Brown and Yule's interpretation of the notion of 'relevance' seems to be analogous to the notion of 'coherence'. To put it another way, we can say 'speaking topically' means 'speaking in a topically coherent manner'. Coulthard (1985), quoting from Sacks(1968), makes an interesting distinction between 'talking topically' and 'talking about some topic chosen by another speaker' (Coulthard 1985:80). He explains that it is possible for co-conversationalists 'to talk in a way topically coherent with the last utterance, but in which each speaker talks on a different topic' (1985:80). Conversationalists need elaboration to lead a conversation towards their intended topics. Here, it is worth introducing Gardner's (1987) observation on the relationship between 'cohesive links' and
topic maintenance. He quotes Richard's (1980) example:

A: How much did you pay for that blouse?
B: Do you like it? I got it at Metro.


which is both coherent and cohesive in that B's utterance includes 'the anaphora of the two 'it' pronouns, referring to blouse' (1987:136). However, he points out that here 'topic fading', a kind of 'topic shift' has taken place. Thus, he concludes that 'cohesive links can occur not only where the topic continues, but where the topic is shifted, as well as avoided, or even where a previous topic is introduced' (1987:137). He also says that they can take place even with 'topical changes'. Thus, as Coulthard points out, it is possible for conversationalists to speak in a topically coherent manner and even cohesively, but to change topics as they wish since each conversationalist usually has his/her own 'speaker's topic'.

4.3.4.4.3 Speaker's Topic

Brown and Yule (1983) differentiate 'speaker's topic' from 'conversational topic', the latter being based on the analytic device of 'topic framework' as 'a means of characterising the area of overlap in contributions to a discourse' (1983:88). In other words, in search of a 'conversational topic', we 'look at a fragment of spoken discourse' in terms of 'how we would characterise the participants' shared information'; thus, 'conversational topic' is associated with conversational data 'as a static product of some recorded interaction' (1983:88) from an analyst's point of view. On the other hand, in search of a 'speaker's topic', we look at the data in terms of
a process in which each participant expresses a personal topic within
the general topic framework of the conversation as a whole' (1983:88);
therefore, 'speaker's topic' is associated with the dynamic handling of
data as a process.

We can, then, further agree that an approach which focusses attention
on 'speaker's topic' owes more to ethnomethodology, taking a
participant's viewpoint while an approach which focusses on
'conversational topic' owes more to the ethnography of speaking, taking
an analyst's viewpoint. We could say that the study of 'conversational
topic' is in the domain of Discourse Analysis, which is mainly
concerned with speakers' 'communicative competence' while that of
'speaker's topic' is in the domain of Conversational Analysis, which is
cconcerned with speakers' 'communicative capacity', focussing on the
dynamic nature of conversational discourse as a process.

In conclusion, Brown and Yule emphasise the fact that there is no
'single, static "topic of conversation" in any conversational
fragment', that 'conversation is a process and that each contribution
should be treated as part of the negotiation of "what is being talked
about"' and that 'it is speakers and not conversations or discourses,
that have "topics''' (1983:94). Accordingly, speakers as active
participants in conversation play an important role in navigating a
conversation towards their own intended direction, inserting their own
personal topics when necessary, while speaking topically about the
'conversational topic'. I shall now move on to explore how
conversationalists manage to choose topics relevant to a given conversation.

4.3.4.4 The Relevance of Topic Choice

So far I have discussed 'relevance' of topic mainly in relation to the relevance of what is being talked about, that is, relevance to an ongoing interaction. One has to be conscious of speaking topically and coherently. At the same time one also has to be aware that there exist various constraints, social, cultural and psychological, on the choice of topics. We could therefore say that speakers need to be relevant in two ways. Firstly they need to be relevant to the ongoing topic—i.e. the need to speak topically, and secondly, they need to make relevant topic choices, considering, for example, co-conversationalists' cultural, social and psychological backgrounds.

The power and role relationship of the two speakers also influence the choice of topic. They need to be able to judge what is 'tellable' from what is not before they present their own topics. This causes a special difficulty in the case of cross-cultural communication, 'what is tellable' depending heavily on 'cultural norms' as Richards and Schmidt (1983) point out. Thomas (1983) refers to taboo topics whose norm might differ from one culture to another. She states that failure to recognize differences might bring about 'sociopragmatic failure' (Thomas 1983).

Related to this problem of topic choice is the notion of face-threatening and face-saving acts. Gardner presents an interesting
observation regarding conversationalists' face-saving efforts in the choice of conversational topics, referring to Co-operative principles (Grice 1975), the rules of politeness (Lakoff 1973) and 'positive' or 'negative face' (Brown & Levinson 1978). He states that conversationalists:

will seek topics that are not excessively threatening to positive or negative face (see Brown and Levinson 1978), and for which their own resources are sufficiently rich for them to make good contribution and topics which they judge to be ones for which the other conversationalists will have sufficiently rich resources to enable them to make good contributions. (Gardner 1982: 116)

Thus, the choice of topics is a very complicated business, even for those who share the culture, and conversationalists need to be careful to choose relevant topics in the course of an ongoing conversation. The choice of topics, therefore, could also be studied from contrastive dimension.

4.3.5 Summary

In this section, I have reviewed the study of CNA, starting with a comparison of CNA and DA. It has emerged that DA focusses on the interpretation of illocutionary force while CNA focusses more on the interactional side. It has been argued also that DA is still based on an analyst's view while CNA is based on the emic view of the participants. Thus, DA is still in the domain of communicative competence while CNA is more in that of communicative capacity. However, it has been pointed out that the CNA of Sacks et al also has some problems. For example, Sacks et al have been criticised for not explaining how TRPs are signalled by some discourse analysts,
notably by Gumperz (1982b), who states the importance of 'chunking or phrasing of speech' (1982b:328) at TRPs, and also of 'contextualization cues' as signals for conversational management. It has also been pointed out that CNA lacks the power to explain illocutionary force (see for example Thomas 1985, also the discussion in 2.2.4).

Notwithstanding some of the deficiencies of CNA, it is obvious that it is a promising approach to discourse from the perspective of preparing learners for communicative capacity, since it takes an emic view of participants in the data. From a CNA perspective, the data is not a piece of static discourse to be analysed by researchers according to a classification based mainly on the speech act theory of Austin and Searle or on the functions within a piece of discourse. Instead, the participants are involved in the interpretative process of the data, and, moreover, the data itself is interesting, since it describes the ongoing interactive processes of the participants.

It is however true to say that ethnomethodologists are less keen to explain how, for example, the turn-taking mechanism is operated or how participants manage smooth turn-taking at TRPs. It is necessary to support this deficiency of CNA with insight from a neighbouring field such as DA. It is also true that conversational analysts are not much interested in the interpretation of illocutionary force in discourse. If a comprehensive analysis of discourse is to be made, it is essential that both interactive moves and illocutionary acts receive equal attention. It seems that an ideal framework needs to be formulated in
consideration of the characteristics and the problems of both CNA and DA.

Also from a contrastive viewpoint, it has been indicated in the discussion that both ethnography and ethnomethodology have implications for contrastivity; in particular, ethnomethodology, by its nature, is closely related to culture. Thus, CNA, which is derived from ethnomethodology has greatly to do with a contrastive framework. This has been identified through the observation of various conversational features, including preference organization, opening-closing sequences, side-sequences, pause/silence, overlapping, interruptions, to list a few. All of these can be culturally varied. Thus, a contrastive dimension is required. Moreover, it has been suggested that the use of these features is usually characterised by values specific to that culture. Therefore, not only the differing conversational features but also the values attached to the use of each feature will be of contrastive interest.

4.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter, I first reviewed the framework of contrastive analysis (CA), together with its criticism and the recent revitalisation. CA was reviewed specifically because of the nature of the present research; the cross-cultural study of conversation. It is inevitable that any enquiry which takes a cross-cultural view apply some kind of contrastive framework. Secondly, discourse analysis (DA) was reviewed
and its relationship to CA was discussed. Contrastive DA seems to be most popular in its comparison of the interpretation of speech act types. However, it was also pointed out that it is limited by its inadequacy to cope with the sequencing acts of conversation. This problem is also crucial to the present research, since its focus lies more on the study of the interactive side of conversation. From this viewpoint, conversational analysis (CNA) is more appropriate to the present research and it plays a complementary role to DA in terms of its power to express conversational sequences. CNA, derived from ethnomethodology, has also greatly to do with the cultural dimension; thus, a contrastive dimension is naturally required. This chapter specifically listed some features of conversational behaviours which are of contrastive interest. They are, for example, overlapping/interruption, pause/silence, and the choice of topic, all of which are related to the management of conversation. It is also noted that the use of these features should be interpreted in relation to the values attached to them. Thus, the contrastive framework in this study involves not only comparison of the physical conversational features but also of the values attached to the use of each feature. The use of the same features to a different degree in different circumstances could certainly reveal the conversational style of that culture. Thus, a contrastive CNA dimension is very useful when comparing the conversational style of different cultures. In the next chapter, I shall formulate a research framework for this study on the basis of the discussion in the foregoing chapters, before moving on to the actual analysis of data in Chapters 6, 7 and 8.
CHAPTER 5  THE FRAMEWORK FOR A CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE IN THIS RESEARCH

5.1  THE DEFINITION OF CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN THIS RESEARCH

In Chapter 3, I noted that the modern interpretation of cross-cultural communication does not simply mean communication between the people from different cultural or language backgrounds; significant recent contributions to the field also derive from the study of communication between people who share the same 'language' or 'culture', 'culture' in this case being interpreted in its broadest sense. In other words, even communication between people who superficially share the same language and culture can be called 'cross-cultural' when there is a difference, for example, in ethnicity, class, and socioeconomic background or even in the power relationship between the interactants (see Gumperz 1982, Erickson 1982, Tannen 1984, and Fairclough 1989, also see the discussion in 3.3.1.2). This can be observed, for example, in job interviews, courtroom hearings, patient-doctor interaction, teacher-pupil relationships and so on, where one party usually has more power over the other in the role-relationship (see Thomas 1985a,b on 'unequal encounters').

Recent studies in cross-cultural communication increasingly focus more attention on the latter. There are two main reasons for this; the first derives from a socioeconomic perspective. Multiethnic/multicultural society has witnessed various problems arising from hitherto unnoticed communication breakdowns or misunderstandings in
interactions between people from different ethnic backgrounds who otherwise share the same language as members of the same society.

The second reason is related to the development of the notion of 'communicative competence'. Recognition of the importance of the sociocultural aspect in the study of communication has widened its scope from the study of grammar to include, for example, sociocultural and psychological aspects (see Chapter 2.1).

In addition to this, the framework for communicative competence later came to include the notion of strategies (see Chapter 2). This is very much related to what Gumperz calls communicative conventions in that both are concerned with processes of negotiation. It is this area, the use of communicative conventions, which has been receiving special attention recently. This is because, firstly, it is possible for interactants to use different communicative conventions subconsciously, even when they speak the same language; secondly, because of the subconscious activity associated with communicative conventions, there tends to be more chance of serious misunderstandings taking place.

Thus, the scope of cross-cultural communication has widened and it has become more sophisticated, particularly, in the area of intra-language but cross-ethnic communication. It is different from the traditional study which tends to concentrate on the comparison of different language systems and the interference of the mother tongue in native—non-native interactions. However, there is no reason why the more traditional cross-language study should not include these new
dimensions as well. It is possible that even in a traditional cross-cultural and cross-language encounter there exists another level of cross-cultural communication which involves the power relationship of the interactants. Or rather it could be said that every native—non-native interaction itself involves a power relationship in that non-native speakers are always put into a disadvantageous position in communication with native speakers because of their lack of command of the language and of the cultural knowledge.

In addition to this, it is probable that another power-relationship which usually exists in ordinary communication between native speakers could also be involved in such interactions, since various exchanges on academic, economic and social levels take place in this international world between people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. It is therefore likely that non-native speakers, in communication with native speakers, suffer from a double disadvantage if they are involved in such 'unequal encounters' (see Fairclough 1989:47 as well). The situation could be more serious if non-native speakers are relatively fluent in the target language, because then, native speakers are apt to interpret the different conversational style of their partners according to their own cultural norms, forgetting the fact that they are from different cultural backgrounds. Thus, for example, they might judge the personality of their partners as being rude or aggressive, not realising that a difference in conversational style might have caused the difference in their conversational behaviours. Accordingly, we need to focus attention on these two levels of power relationship, that is, native-nonnative relationship
and 'unequal encounters' of various sorts, in traditional cross-language and cross-cultural communication.

This research arises from a concern for Japanese speakers of English. Inevitably, cross-cultural communication here means the traditional, broader version of cross-cultural communication. That is, it is a communication between native and non-native speakers of any language (but in this case between English and Japanese). It inevitably involves some cross-language and cross-cultural comparison in a traditional sense; a contrastive approach will, in fact, be employed in order to explain the difficulties of learners. However, one thing that is different from an ordinary cross-cultural communication is that it will utilise a perspective of the second type of cross-cultural communication; that is, from that of intra-language but cross-ethnic communication, considering the power relationship of the interactants and paying attention also to different conversational styles.

Therefore, in the term 'cross-cultural communication', I intend to include the two levels. One is in a sense 'universal' in that its features exist in all types of communication, including intra-language and intra-cultural communication. This type of communication often involves some unequal relationship between the interactants, one partner usually holding more power over the other. The difference in power-relationship can be considered 'cross-cultural' in that it is an unequal encounter, where the two interactants cannot hold the floor equally (see 3.3.1.2). The relationship becomes more tense when there is a difference in cultural background between the interactants. A
conversation between a native and a non-native speaker itself satisfies the condition for this type of cross-cultural communication in that the latter is 'weaker' in front of a native speaker. This type of cross-cultural communication usually involves various other different kinds of inequality in the power-relationship between the interactants. However, in the present research an unequal relationship will be understood only in terms of native and non-native interaction and no serious situations such as job interviews and counselling are involved.

The other level of communication is purely cross-cultural in the sense that the language and cultural backgrounds of the interactants are different. Traditionally, at this level, linguistically oriented language comparisons and socio-anthropologically oriented comparisons of cultural behaviours have been popular. The study of this type of cross-cultural communication is still, at best, based on the notion of communicative competence, which remains at the level of knowledge of the various components. Although it may be useful to compare static knowledge of language and culture, if we are interested in the actual use of language across cultures we have to be able to compare real ongoing negotiation processes. Communication at all levels necessarily involves the negotiation of meaning and the positioning of the interactants. This is where the notion of strategic capacity comes in.

The present study aims at describing and comparing ongoing processes of communication between interactants who are from different cultural and language backgrounds and who communicate in one of the interactants' languages (in this case, English). Thus, the framework for cross-
cultural communication in this research is not static. It is closely related to the notion of 'communicative capacity'; as such, it places a great emphasis on exploring the procedural ability of the participants in ongoing negotiation processes.

5.2 THE FOCUS OF THIS RESEARCH

In the previous section, I discussed the definition of the term 'cross-cultural communication' in this research and concluded that the notion of 'cross-cultural communication' is closely related to the notion of ' communicative capacity' (see Chapter 2). In studying the communication between native speakers of English and Japanese speakers of English, I am not interested in merely comparing the static knowledge of the interactants in cross-cultural communication, but in examining the ways in which they manage conversation, particularly, by utilising strategic capacity.

One thing that plays an important role in this ongoing negotiation process is the use of communicative conventions, which, as discussed in Chapter 3, are signals for conversational management and are closely related to the notion of strategic capacity. They signal, for example, TRPs, where speaker changes or continuation take place.

It is in the use of these various communicative conventions that a cross-cultural perspective is most fruitful. As discussed extensively in Chapter 4 in relation to works by Gumperz and others, these
conventions are utilised almost subconsciously, and to exacerbate matters, they seem to vary across cultures (see the discussion in Chapter 3). Therefore, although it is often the case that native speakers are tolerant of the linguistic mistakes or incompetence of their non-native partners, they tend to misjudge the different conversational style of their partners, not being aware that the latter might utilise different types of communicative conventions from their own. This applies to non-native speakers as well. They tend to judge the conversational style of native speakers by their own norms; thus, they sometimes misjudge their native-speaking conversational partners as being, for example, aggressive or arrogant.

The important point here is the fact that these communicative conventions are always closely related to a particular language and culture at a very subconscious level. To put it another way, they are very much under the influence of specific cultures. Therefore, even when people speak in other languages, they almost always subconsciously employ their own familiar communication patterns. The difficulty here is that because of this 'automaticity', communicative conventions are difficult to control intentionally and cannot easily be changed along with the target language. The relationship between the use of a particular linguistic code and communicative conventions might be illustrated as follows in case of the English-Japanese communication.

1) NSE* Communication---English language + English communicative conventions
2) NSJ* Communication---Japanese language + Japanese communicative conventions
3) JSE* Communication---a) English language + Japanese communicative conventions
   b) English language + English + Japanese
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communicative conventions

(c) English language + English communicative conventions

*NSE---Native Speaker of English
*NSJ---Native Speaker of Japanese
*JSE---Japanese Speaker of English

The third example explains the probable patterns of relationship between English and the accompanying communicative conventions which might be utilised when Japanese speakers of English communicate with native speakers of English. It seems that combination (a) is the most probable pattern although patterns (b) and (c) are also possible if Japanese speakers are aware of the difference in the use of conventions between English and Japanese and if they intentionally try to conform to the target language conventions.

Nevertheless, the reality is that because of the automaticity associated with communicative conventions, it is difficult even for advanced speakers of the target language to switch these in line with the target language. Even if they are aware of the difference in the use of some of them and try to adjust, it is quite natural that once they are deeply involved in the conversation they subconsciously go back to their familiar cultural conventions.

Apart from the subconscious nature of these conventions, there is another important point to be made here. Since they are deeply related to people's cultural patterns, the employment of those of another culture might threaten the identity of the conversational participants. Consequently, even in the unlikely event of some people having a certain awareness of the differences in the use of communicative
conventions, they might simply choose not to conform to the target norms but to use their own conventions intentionally or subconsciously. On the other hand, because conversation is a cooperative business, they need to cooperate with their conversational partners, which sometimes means conformity to the norms of the target language. Non-native speakers therefore may experience a contradiction between keeping their identity and conforming to the target culture.

However, when English is used as an international language between, for example, non-native speakers of English from different language backgrounds, it might be the case that less conformity to English norms is required while conformity to that specific field of English such as scientific and business English might be required instead.

The use of communicative conventions needs a great deal of awareness, consideration and understanding by conversational participants. So far this point has received little attention and has been less researched because it is at a subconscious level. It relates to the procedural ability of participants in ongoing interactions and the notion of strategic capacity.

To summarise, non-native speakers in communication with native speakers can be said to have three main difficulties. Firstly, they have to have appropriate linguistic knowledge; this is a well-recognised fact. Secondly, sociocultural difference in the general sense plays an important role, particularly when the culture of the target language community is quite different from that of the non-native speaker.
Thirdly, difference in communicative conventions greatly affects communication. This third dimension is related to both the first and the second to a certain extent in that communicative conventions partly consist of linguistic conventions such as intonation and formulaic expressions, and in that they are cultural conventions as discussed in the previous section.

It is the intention of this research specifically to highlight the use of communicative conventions. However, they will receive attention in the context of the ongoing process of interaction but not as discrete selected items of study. To put it another way, the whole interpretation process itself will receive attention in the course of studying the use of communicative conventions. Thus, the study aims at an integrated exploration of the area.

A final point needs to be made concerning the nature of this research. It is not my intention to prove any specific point. Rather I intend to describe ongoing processes of interaction between two people who do not share the same cultural backgrounds in as detailed and comprehensive a manner as possible, paying attention both to the interpretive process of negotiation and to the way in which interlocutors use communicative conventions in the course of interactions. At the same time this research also aims to investigate a model for a consciousness-raising methodology. That is, the process of enquiry itself plays an important role in providing a model for heightening awareness. This two-fold nature of the present research has to be borne in mind.
5.3 FRAMEWORK FOR THIS RESEARCH

5.3.1 Communicative Capacity and Conversational Analysis

I have shown in the foregoing sections that the notion of cross-cultural communication and the focus of this research are closely related to that of communicative capacity. It follows that a general framework for the analysis of empirical data needs to reflect this notion.

This logic brings us back to the discussion outlined in Chapter 4. In examining various approaches to cross-cultural communication, I came to the conclusion that Discourse Analysis (DA) is basically concerned with communicative competence, taking an analyst's evaluative view of the data, whereas Conversational Analysis (CNA) is more related to communicative capacity, placing great importance on a participant's view. Inevitably, the general framework for the analysis of data in this research will be based on that of Conversational Analysis. However, this does not mean that the framework of CNA will be rigidly followed.

It has been pointed out that CNA also has drawbacks such as not being able to explain the ways in which TRPs are signalled: this is vital, considering the fact that one of the foci of this research is a description of the way in which conversationalists utilise communicative conventions at TRPs; or the ways in which illocutionary force is interpreted. These facts have been pointed out mainly by discourse analysts (see the discussion in Chapter 4). Therefore, I
shall now explore how DA can compensate for such drawbacks of CNA in the framework for this research.

5.3.2 Discourse Analysis and Conversational Analysis

Although DA principally takes a static analytical view of the data, its insight into the analysis of discourse can also contribute to the framework for the present research, in particular, to two areas where CNA lacks explanatory power. Firstly, being based mostly on speech act theory, DA is able to explain the illocutionary meaning of the utterances of discourse.

Another area where DA can contribute to CNA is through its concern with hierarchical order. Although conversational analysts have introduced the notion of TRPs, they do not explain how these TRPs are identified. They seem to assume that TRPs are intuitively identifiable. Discourse analysts are much more explicit: they divide a string of discourse into units and analyse them as interactive constituents. In so doing, they utilise, for example, discourse markers such as 'well, O.K., now, good, right, alright', which 'mark boundaries in the discourse' (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975:40). Although this early model of Sinclair & Coulthard is limited to a certain type of discourse, i.e., classroom discourse analysis, the basis of later classification is exemplified in this model.

Topic boundaries, on the other hand, are usually signalled in a more complicated way. Gumperz (1982) has demonstrated how they are signalled by focussing attention on various contextualization cues, including
paralinguistic features such as intonation, pitch, amplitude and so on, which are lacking in the early models of conversational analysis. For example, Sacks et al do not seem to have envisaged the problems in identifying TRPs. If a full account of interaction management is to take place, it is essential that we explain how people manage to interpret their partners' communicative conventions and also how they themselves utilize those conventions to manage conversational interactions. Approaches to the analysis of conversation demonstrated by, for example, Gumperz (1982), Tannen (1984, 1985a, b, 1986) and Erickson (1982a) seem promising in that although their approach to the data is principally ethnomethodological, they are well aware of the drawbacks of CNA and have modified the approach presented by traditional conversational analysts by adding a DA perspective.

Another area, which is closely related to the notion of TRPs is the management of topics; CNA does not necessarily seem to be interested in handling this, or rather it might be correct to say that CNA cannot explain it since, as Gardner (1987) points out, 'it is at the level of illocutionary structure that the thread of topic can most closely be followed' (1987: 129). We have learnt from the foregoing discussions that CNA is more concerned with interactive moves. DA, on the other hand, being principally interested in dividing a string of discourse into chunks for the sake of interpretation of illocutionary meaning, is inevitably related to topic management at a macro level. However, as discussed in Section 4.3, the definition and the identification of topic are still problematic and they are mostly based on the intuition of the researcher.
Conversational analysts tend to criticise discourse analysts because of this reliance on intuition. However, it seems almost impossible to disregard intuition when talking about the identification of topics even with the help of discourse markers or contextualization cues. Nonetheless, it is essential from the point of view of this research that we deal with topic management as a part of discourse interaction management, particularly, from the perspective of the way in which conversationalists manage topic shifts, changes and maintenance. In order to observe this, it is necessary to divide a string of discourse into units of topic.

However, the main purpose of this research is not simply to identify units and ranks and slot them into a classification system. Nor do I intend to classify utterances into various functions on the basis of speech act categories. Rather, division into units is necessary in order to follow the topic development of the conversational participants. Therefore, the division here will be according to a general intuitive notion of 'what is being talked about' (Brown & Yule 1983:71). However, to assist this judgement, attention will also be paid to such aspects as discourse markers and contextualization cues, which usually appear at topic boundaries. Also the relationship between a speaker's topic and a discourse topic will receive special attention.

It has to be borne in mind however that TRPs do not necessarily equate with topic boundaries. These are usually larger units, which may contain a few TRPs. To avoid unnecessary confusion, I shall introduce
the term 'episode' as a unit for topical division in this research. The term will be used in the sense of Labov and Fanshel (1977). However, no systematic way of identifying 'episodes' is presented in Labov & Fanshel (1977), apart from the fact that they are 'based upon radical shifts in the overt topic or reference of the conversation' (1977:38). Identification of topic by this approach is based on the intuition of the analysts.

To increase objectivity, I shall also introduce 'emic' codes for segmentation 'in which units are identified impressionistically by the encounter participants themselves from an "insider" perspective, or by naive judges from a "quasi-insider" perspective' (Erickson & Shultz 1982:65). These are different from 'etic' codes for segmentation, which define units 'from the "outsider" perspective' of the researcher.

In this research, 'emic' codes for segmentation will take the form of a combination of the identification by the encounter participants and by naive judges from a 'quasi-insider' perspective. That is, an 'insider' perspective will be taken when possible but when not, 'quasi-insider' perspective will be taken. In addition to 'episodes', the category of 'subepisodes', which is also introduced in Labov & Fanshel (1977) will be utilised when necessary.

Thus, the identification of 'episodes' will take place, taking both 'etic' and 'emic' views into consideration. That is, conversational discourse will firstly be divided into 'episodes' by the researcher and at the same time, the participants themselves will have the chance to
decide units of episodes either through play-back sessions or by going through the transcription of recorded data by themselves.

Apart from the above units of 'episodes' and 'subepisodes', no smaller units of functional ranks of discourse will be utilised in this research.

However, this elimination of units and rank scales does not mean that the interpretation of illocutionary acts will also be excluded from the analysis. Although it will not follow the systematic method of analysis into chunks of acts, the processes of interpreting illocutionary force on the part of participants will be followed in the course of the analysis from the macrolevel of discourse. The general framework for this research could be stated as a combination of two main perspectives; CNA and DA, although the basic framework is that of CNA.

5.3.3 Cross-Cultural Contrastive Perspective

Another point to be made concerning the framework for this research is that it also takes a cross-cultural contrastive perspective. By this I do not mean that I will follow the rigid Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. Nor am I attempting to draw too simplistic a conclusion as to the differences between English and Japanese discourse patterns or to predict the difficulties of Japanese learners of English deriving from these differences. It is clear from the foregoing discussion (Chapter 4.1) that an assumption of this sort would not necessarily hold. It has been shown that learner difficulties have many and
various causes. What I intend to achieve in this research from a cross-cultural contrastive perspective is to describe interactive processes between native (in this case, English speakers) and non-native speakers (Japanese speakers of English) in as detailed and comprehensive a manner as possible and to observe differences or similarities between the interactants.

The intention here is not to predict learner difficulties by the use of comparison, but to describe native--non-native interactions as they are. If there are any differences between them, at least people can be made aware of the differences. By highlighting the communicative patterns of both languages, it will become less difficult to compare and explain special features which appear in the interactional pattern of non-native speakers.

Here I am not rigidly trying to compare the communicative patterns of the two languages. The main purpose remains to describe the interpretive process of native--non-native interactions.

However, any sort of cross-cultural comparison of two languages or language patterns utilises some sort of contrastive analysis. Consequently, the analysis to be utilised in this research takes a contrastive perspective as well.

5.3.4 Overall Research Design

In the final section, I shall present the overall research design of this thesis. In the empirical studies of the present research, both
questionnaires and video-recorded data of dyadic face-to-face interactions will be introduced.

5.3.4.1 The Questionnaires
The purpose of introducing questionnaires in this research is two-fold. Firstly, the aim is to check the awareness of both native and non-native speakers of English of their conversational style in their mother tongue, and in the case of non-native speakers, also in the target language (in this case English). It also intends to heighten the awareness of both native and non-native speakers in the area of conversational style, which is deeply rooted in their cultural conventions. Subsequently, it also plays the role of checking how the awareness of people of their conversational behaviours coincides with or differs from their actual behaviours by contrasting the result of the questionnaires with that of the recorded data.

Secondly, the intention is to check learners' pragmatic knowledge in the target language in comparison with that of native speakers. This type of question might look a little haphazard, covering a wide range of topics such as knowledge of formulaic language, or the use of understatement and intonation. However, the questions are included in order to have a more comprehensive view of learner difficulties, which might not be covered by actual recorded data (see Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion of the questionnaires).

5.3.4.2 Recorded Data of Dyadic Face-to-Face Interactions
Another characteristic of the empirical data, which is a major feature
of this research, is the inclusion of video-recordings of dyadic face-
to-face interactions between native and Japanese speakers of English. 
For the sake of comparison, mother tongue interactions in both 
languages have also been included. The main purpose of introducing 
actual recorded interactional data is to observe the negotiation 
processes of the interactants in ongoing conversations. Special 
attention will be paid to the way in which the interactants utilise 
various communicative conventions in maintaining conversations, 
managing turn-taking and negotiating the meaning. Attention will also 
be focussed on the way in which miscommunication takes place or 
misunderstanding occurs. This process will be observed and examined 
from various perspectives lest there should be stereotypical views.

Another point to be noted concerning the introduction of recorded data 
of face-to-face interaction is to do with the awareness of each 
individual. They are utilised to see how the awareness of the 
participants is related to their actual conversational behaviour. This 
is interesting to examine since the conversational style of each 
individual is deeply related to cultural conventions at a subconscious 
level; it is possible that even if one is aware of a certain 
difference, once s/he is deeply involved in conversation, natural 
communicative conventions are still employed. This discrepancy between 
the awareness and the actual behaviour of participants will be 
clarified by the use of the two instruments: questionnaires and the 
recorded data of interactions.
There is also a pedagogical point to be made. That is to say, the process of this enquiry itself intends to provide an implication for pedagogy. For example, it is hoped that both questionnaire and recorded data may be used in teaching situations to heighten the awareness of learners. It is also possible that they be used to heighten the awareness of native speakers who have contact with non-native speakers of English for various purposes. Thus, the process of enquiry itself is an exploration of approaches to the development of a consciousness-raising methodology.
CHAPTER 6 RESEARCH DESIGN

6.1 ELICITATION METHOD (EXPERIMENT)

In the foregoing chapters, I have reviewed the approaches for the analysis of spoken discourse and have presented a theoretical framework for this research. In this chapter, I discuss the design of the empirical research and its implementation. A point needs first to be made concerning the nature of the present study. That is, although empirical data: questionnaires and recorded data, are utilised in the study, and numerical reference will be given to support the data from time to time, it is not my prime concern to prove any specific hypothesis, utilising a statistical analysis.

6.1.1 Elicitation Method

In order to obtain data on the processes of interaction between native and non-native speakers, it is important to consider how to utilise various tasks to elicit the most natural conversational interaction. The data need to be able to display negotiation processes of interactants so that it is possible to observe the ways in which they negotiate meanings and maintain conversation, utilising various communicative conventions.

Among these, task-based, goal-oriented activities seem to be most likely to elicit interlocutors' 'vernacular' (Scarcella & Higa 1981, Long 1983, Gass & Varonis 1985, Roberts & Simonot 1987). Tarone's (1987) emphasis on designing an elicitation task which can control
variability is also relevant. However, I decided to use a rather
general task of 'getting to know each other' (Gass & Varonis 1985,
Willis 1987). There were three reasons for this decision. Firstly,
utilising 'tightly-controlled' (Tarone 1987) elicitation tasks might be
ideal for controlling variability, but it has the danger of limiting
the scope of the topics in the interaction. One of my main concerns is
to investigate how the conversational co-participants manage topics in
order to maintain a smooth conversational flow. With the task tightly
controlled, topics are usually limited to a small range specific to
that task, whereas this 'getting-to-know each other' situation seemed
to be ideally suited to looking at the natural development of topics;
in particular, at the ways in which two strangers maintain a
conversation.

Secondly, because of the very nature of a 'getting-to-know situation',
which is familiar to everybody, and because everyone, whatever his/her
nationality, has to cope with this situation quite often in his/her own
mother tongue as well, its use could reduce the artificial nature of
the experiment.

Thirdly, the impression people give to their conversational partners on
their first encounter is very important. There is a proverb in Japan,
which originates from the tea ceremony and which literally means 'every
encounter is the first and the last one'—ichigo ichie—: this
highlights the significance of meeting people for the first time and
the need to make the most of each encounter.
Many first time encounters may also be the last and may be relatively short. On such an occasion, the ways in which people present themselves to their conversational partners and the kinds of impression they give to their co-conversationalists are very important; moreover, if the encounter is to be the last one, there will be no way of repairing of misunderstandings if they occur. Or, there may be cases where the second or the third meeting depends on the result of the first encounter (e.g. job interviews). Therefore, people are usually more aware of their own behaviour, and try to adjust themselves to that which is expected in those circumstances. Thus, in these situations it is easier to observe the awareness of the interactants of their conversational behaviour. For these three reasons, 'getting-to-know each other' has been selected as an elicitation task. I shall now move on to the implementation of this task in the experiment.

6.1.2 The Pilot Study

6.1.2.1 The Implementation of the Pilot Study

Before conducting the major research, a small-sized experiment was conducted on a total of eight pairs of people in three different interactive combinations, i.e., NSE (Native Speakers of English)-NSE, NSJ (Native Speakers of Japanese)-NSJ, and NSE-JSE (Japanese Speakers of English), utilising the elicitation task discussed above. The combination of the participants is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>NSE-NSE in English (2 pairs)</th>
<th>A, B, C—NSEs</th>
<th>A-B, A-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>NSE-JSE in English (4 pairs)</td>
<td>B, C—NSEs, D, E—JSEs</td>
<td>B-D, C-D, B-E, C-E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The reason for including mother tongue interactions here is that if we only include native-nonnative interactions, the explanation of the features tends to become subjective, being based on the analyst's intuitive judgement through her experience; whereas if mother-tongue interactions are included, we can at least consult mother-tongue interaction patterns when examining native-nonnative interactions.

To satisfy the conditions of a 'getting-to-know each other' situation, each participant met her conversational partner for the first time in this experiment. Also for the sake of comparison, at least one person in each group was asked to conduct a conversation with two different people. Incidentally, most of the participants were students at the Institute of Education at the time of the experiment with the exception of three; two, ex-students of the Institute and one, a language school student. The participants were mostly in their late twenties and early thirties with the exception of two, who were in their forties. This point might seem minor; however, if we consider the nature of Japanese conversational style, in which age difference plays an important role in terms of the choice of honorifics and also of the initiation of conversation, it is worth mentioning. This is also proved by the result from an NSJ-NSJ interaction, where one participant's use of politeness and formality changed drastically when she conversed with her senior.
Before starting a conversation, each participant was informed that she would converse with somebody she had not met before and that she was just required to introduce herself and then, to conduct a conversation freely on whatever topics she liked.

Each conversation was recorded by two cassette tape-recorders which had been set in between the two interlocutors. This might have looked a little intrusive and threatening at the beginning and one of the participants actually claimed so; however, after a couple of minutes of initial awkwardness, they seemed to have forgotten the existence of the recorders and became involved in the conversation. This was underlined by the fact that most of the participants continued their conversation even after the planned time.

The length of time was set at ten minutes. However, this length turned out to be a little too short for the full development of conversation. The participants themselves remarked on the shortness of the time after the termination of the conversation. This, in a sense, is a good sign since it shows the participants' involvement in the conversation; thus, 'naturalness'.

Another minor problem which emerged from the experiment is the difficulty of setting up a real 'getting-to-know each other' situation. In this experiment, it was often the case that the interactants actually met each other just before the recording started because of the meeting arrangements. Thus, a somewhat awkward situation occurred.
when they postponed introducing themselves until the actual recording started because of the nature of the setting.

Another point worth mentioning concerns the setting of the recording. Because of various temporal and physical constraints, the three different types of interaction (i.e. NSE-NSE, NSE-JSE, NSJ-NSJ) took place in slightly different places. The NSE-JSE interactions took place in the informal setting of the researcher's room; the NSE-NSE interactions, in a large common room at a hall of residence; and the NSJ-NSJ interactions, in a lecture room at the Institute. Considering the sensitive nature of casual conversation, this slight difference in environment may have affected the outcomes of these conversations. In a major study, therefore, the setting needs to be fixed in order to eliminate unnecessary variables.

In relation to the problem of setting, a final point needs to be made. That is, only audio-tape recorders were used in the experiment because of the constraints of the setting. Considering the focus of the present research, it would be advisable to utilise video-tape recording in order to have an overview of the whole range of communicative behaviours of the interactants. This is because certain nonverbal features play an important role in communication. For example, the nonverbal feature of nodding indicates an answer or agreement in Japanese conversational style; thus, it is an important part of conversational interaction, which audio-recording cannot handle. However, it is not my intention to describe all the non-verbal features
of the interactants in detail. A reference will be made only when it seems vital to include these features for the sake of interpretation.

6.1.2.2 The Result of the Pilot Study

After the recording, the data was transcribed utilising the notation of conversational analysts, i.e. notably, Sacks et al (1974) (see the explanation of 'Transcription Conventions' used in this research in Appendix 7). Then, each transcript of the conversation was divided into small sets of 'topics' on the basis of Brown & Yule's (1983) definition (see 4.3.4.4), according to which 'topic' is defined 'as "what is being talked about" in a conversation' (1983:71).

However, Brown & Yule admit the difficulty of defining topics and, as an alternative, suggest a different way of approaching the question of 'what is a topic', i.e. by looking at 'topic boundary markers', which mark the points of 'topic-shift'.

The approach of the present study lies somewhere in between the two above-mentioned approaches: I started by dividing a conversation into some chunks of topic rather intuitively. This is similar to what Labov & Fanshel (1977) call 'episodes', which are 'based upon radical shifts in the overt topics or reference of the conversations' (1977:38). To increase objectivity, this topical division was also carried out 'emically' (Erickson & Shultz 1982) by one of the conversational participants, who divided the conversations into topical units (see the discussion in 4.3.2.4), going through the transcripts of conversation.
The two types of division generally coincided apart from the estimation of the relative size of a unit.

After the division, the topic boundaries were examined in detail in order to check whether there was any specific boundary marker in the sense of Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) and whether there was any difference between the Japanese and the English version.

Brown & Yule (1983), in describing topic boundary markers in spoken discourse, introduce the notion of 'paratones', which are the equivalent of 'paragraphs' in written discourse: the end of a paratone is marked most consistently by 'the long pause, normally exceeding one second'. They also state that:

> the occurrence of different types of "fillers" such as "well", "mmm", "you know", and "er", and others may also regularly coincide with topic-shift. (1983: 106)

This is similar to what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) call 'markers', which is 'a closed class of items---'well', 'O.K.', 'now', 'good', 'right', 'alright' (1975: 40). However, in contrast to the work of Sinclair & Coulthard (1975), which is based on classroom discourse, the data in this research is based on two-party informal conversations, thus, certain differences between the two sets of data can be expected to emerge.

To start with the observation of topic-boundaries, firstly I have listed every occurrence of 'long pauses' (see Brown & Yule's (1983: 161)). After the two different combinations (NSE-NSE, NSJ-NSJ) were
compared, a difference in the length of pause at topic boundaries was noted between the Japanese and the English versions.

This is significant for two reasons. Firstly, the topic boundaries of the Japanese versions are marked more frequently with the presence of pauses than the two English versions. In one NSJ-NSJ pair, half of the six topics are marked by either 'long' or 'extended pauses' (Brown & Yule 1983:162), and in the other case, eight of the twelve topics are marked with long and extended pauses. In NSE-NSE interactions, on the other hand, in the case of one of the pairs, there is only one instance of topic boundary marked with a pause within the total of eight different topics. Moreover, the length of the pause is 0.5 seconds, which, according to the classification by Brown & Yule (1983: 162), is a 'short' pause. Although the number of occurrences of long pauses in the other version of NSE-NSE is a little higher (---four out of nine topic boundaries are marked with pauses---), the average length of the pauses is only 0.8 seconds.

In fact, the average length of the pause in NSE-NSE version is 0.5 seconds while that of Japanese version is 2.0 seconds. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that a second difference between NSE-NSE and NSJ-NSJ conversation is the length of pauses. This difference is significant in that it has been measured in the native tongue of the conversationalists; consequently, there is no possibility of linguistic difficulties affecting the results.
The above findings have a significant implication if we consider a real life situation, where NSE's maximum tolerance to a pause is 0.5 seconds and Japanese speakers' average length of pause is 2 seconds. Japanese speakers of English who are in conversation with native speakers of English rarely get a chance to take turns nor to initiate a topic; thus, they always tend to play the role of listener. This tendency was observed in one of NSE-NSJ pairs, where the Japanese speaker's utterances were cut into several times within a turn, while she was still continuing her talk, but was merely pausing.

We cannot simply deduce from these data that the Japanese difficulty in turn-taking/initiation derives solely from the difference in the length of pause; we also have to bear in mind individual differences since 'the number and duration of pauses used by a speaker varies' (Brown & Yule 1983:161). Nonetheless, there are some grounds for saying that this may be one of the reasons for the above-mentioned difficulties, and further investigation seems necessary.

Apart from topic boundaries, topic development and the initiation of topics were also examined. However, as far as the examples in the experiment are concerned, there is no significant difference in choice of topic between the NSE-NSE, NSJ-NSJ and NSE-JSE. It seems that, in general, conversational interactants tend to spend some time in finding a common ground between themselves and then develop topics in line with it. This is particularly obvious between NSE-NSJ; however, it was also observed in the NSE-NSE interaction. Only a slight difference was observed in the NSJ-NSJ interactions, where the range of topics extends
from their past career in Japan to the present life in London, and to their future career. Two reasons are conceivable for this. Firstly, their range of topics might have arisen from the fact that they are both Japanese living abroad; thus, the emergence of specific topics characteristic to them, e.g., the life in London, the purpose of their stay in this country, etc. Secondly, a slight difference may have arisen from the different combinations of the participants' backgrounds. That is, in both the NSE-NSE and NSE-JSE interactions, the participants involved were all either students or ex-students of the Institute, whereas in the NSJ-NSJ interactions, one of the participants was a language school student; the participants therefore needed to establish common ground in topic areas other than the course work at the Institute.

Accordingly, we cannot, at this moment, draw any conclusion as to the influence of cross-cultural difference in topic choices between Japanese and English interactions. Further research is needed regarding this matter.

In the following sections, I shall pursue my exploration into the major study. The procedure of the major study will mostly follow that of the experiment. Only the technical settings will be changed slightly. We shall start with the questionnaire, which is a part of the major study but which at the same time serves to select subjects and prime them for major interactions.
6.2 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

This section will start with the purpose of the questionnaire (6.2.1) and move on to the discussion of the organization of the questionnaire (6.2.2). Next, the background to each question will be discussed in detail. Finally, the administration of the questionnaires will be described.

6.2.1 The Purpose of the Questionnaire

The purpose of the questionnaire in this research is three-fold. The first is related to the findings of the research itself; the second, to the process of enquiry; and the third, to the selection of the Japanese subjects for further enquiry into conversational interactions.

Concerning the first purpose, two types of questionnaire: Japanese Learners' and Native Speakers' Questionnaires, were introduced in order to identify what difficulties are experienced by Japanese speakers in conversational English. Here, native speakers played the role of a control group. The questionnaire was intended to reveal the awareness of the Japanese subjects of their behaviour in the field of conversational management and also in the particular field of language use. For this purpose, the Japanese subjects were asked to answer the same questions twice, imagining two different language situations: Japanese-Japanese interaction in Japanese, and English-Japanese interaction in English.
The second purpose is related to the process of enquiry itself. That is, it aims to make respondents aware of certain areas of conversational management which usually operate subconsciously but which might operate differently across cultures; and thus, tend to cause cross-cultural misunderstandings. This process also prepares some of the respondents for further enquiry into conversational interactions, which will be held after they have filled in the questionnaire.

The third purpose is very much related to the first and the second, in that after heightening the awareness of the respondents in certain aspects of conversational management (the second purpose) and also after having discovered from the questionnaire their awareness in certain areas (the first purpose), some of the respondents who showed certain tendencies (these will be explained further in the later section (6.3.1)) were asked to become subjects for a further enquiry. Participation in the research was on a voluntary basis and the respondents to the questionnaire were asked to volunteer for the further investigation if they were interested in the research. Several people volunteered, but not all the students were ideal from the purpose of the research, which required advanced students. Those who showed great interest were not necessarily advanced students; in fact, there were more intermediate level students than advanced ones. However, because it was not always possible to obtain advanced students voluntarily, most of the students who volunteered were accepted as subjects. This rendered the students' level slightly more variable than planned. Nevertheless, the findings from the questionnaire should
be able at least to provide the necessary information on all the subjects mentioned.

The findings from the Students' and Native Speakers' questionnaires will be cross-examined carefully here and any significant differences and similarities will be discussed in some detail and will be investigated further to find whether the difference influences communication between native and non-native speakers. They will also be cross-referred to the findings of the conversational interactions in order to examine whether there is any discrepancy between learners' awareness of their conversational management and their actual behaviours. The introduction of both questionnaires and actual conversational interactions as an enquiry methodology seems to be useful in that this combination enables us to make such a comparison.

6.2.2 The Organization of the Questionnaire

Both Students' and Native Speakers' Questionnaires consist of three parts. Part I of both questionnaires asks for general personal background information on learning and teaching. The learners' version also asks for their learning experiences in the past as well as for self-evaluation of their language proficiency (see Appendices 1 & 2), while the native speakers' version asks whether they have actually taught Japanese speakers of English or have communicated with them (see Appendix 3).

Part II of both questionnaires deals with various aspects of conversational management and is the most important component. The
questions are common to both Japanese and native speakers although Japanese respondents need to answer every question twice; i.e., both with regard to Japanese-Japanese interactions and to English-English interactions. This double situation is introduced to discover the awareness of the Japanese respondents of the differences and similarities in conversational style between Japanese and English interactions. This type of question is very difficult to answer because the management of conversation is deeply rooted at a subconscious level. It can therefore be said to be culturally variable. The questions in Part II serve to heighten the awareness of the respondents as well; thus, preparing them for the actual experiment in conversational interaction.

Part III covers various aspects of Japanese learners' difficulties, concentrating on more formal aspects of language use, including formulaic expressions and expressions related to understatement. Most of the questions (Questions 1-6, see Appendices 1, 2 & 3) are quoted from Brown and Levinson (1987). These questions are included in the light of the results from a previous survey (Murata 1986) on Japanese learners' difficulties and also of the results from the pilot study for this research (see 6.1.). Thus, Part III has been included to illustrate the difficulties of Japanese learners in conversational English from a wider perspective. This section therefore might appear to be a little haphazard because of its coverage. However, if we are to examine learners' conversational difficulties comprehensively, it seems that it is also essential these aspects should be included.
The Students' Questionnaire has been phrased in Japanese in order to avoid misinterpretation of the questions. Both Students' and Native Speakers' Questionnaires were piloted by three native speakers of Japanese and English respectively in order to ensure the validity of the questions involved and also to check the comprehensibility of the phrasing. Necessary modifications were made after piloting, and the modified versions were checked again.

In the following section, I shall examine each part of the questionnaires in more detail and reasons for having chosen certain types of questions will be given.

6.2.3 Background to the Selection of Questions

6.2.3.1 Part I

Part I of both Students' and Native Speakers' Questionnaires asks for background information on learning and teaching respectively. However, the Students' Questionnaire is more detailed for the sake of further enquiry; it includes questions on their learning experiences (Questions 5-7), length of stay in Britain (Question 3), amount of exposure to English through face-to-face conversation and media (Questions 8-9), and self-evaluation of proficiency levels in four skills. It is hoped that all the information obtained here will assist an interpretation of the findings from the enquiry. It is also useful for the selection of the subjects for the conversational interactions to follow after the questionnaire.
On the other hand, Part I of the Native Speakers' Questionnaire was simplified, since the native speaker respondents are basically a control group. However, their experience of travelling to Japan and communicating with the Japanese was asked for as a reference. Also, their experience of teaching Japanese people was asked for specifically for further reference (There is a specific question in Part III for those who have taught or talked to Japanese people).

Not all the questions asked in Part I have a direct relationship with the present research in terms of their findings. Nonetheless, they should give important background information on learners; thus, they will indirectly help us to interpret the findings of the enquiry.

6.2.3.2 Part II

Part II is directly related to the further enquiry into conversational interactions and is the most important part of the questionnaire. It is important in terms of its findings and also of its role in raising the awareness of the respondents in the area of conversational management.

Both Students' and Native Speakers' Questionnaires ask the same questions. However, as mentioned earlier, the Japanese respondents are asked to answer the same question twice, imagining two different situations: Japanese-Japanese interaction in their mother tongue and English-Japanese interaction in English. It might be difficult for them to differentiate between the two situations since the features of conversational management usually operate unconsciously, being deeply
rooted in one's upbringing. It is hoped that the awareness of the respondents will be heightened through the process of answering the questions.

The questions in Part II concentrate on the features of conversational management such as turn-taking, interruption, pauses, and topic-initiation. This reflects some of the results from the pilot study on interruption and pauses, which are also supported by a previous survey (Murata 1986).

The first three questions were set in order to gauge people's attitude towards interruption (Questions 1 & 3) and their actual experience of being interrupted (Question 2). They were included since turn-taking and interruption as part of turn-taking phenomena seem to be closely related. It is often the case that, in English, a turn changes in the middle of an utterance without arriving at its completion: this can be called unwarranted turn-taking. Those people whose cultural background leads them to believe that interruption is very rude and that one has to listen very carefully until the end of each utterance, will find it very difficult to change their attitude when they communicate with people from different cultural backgrounds where interruption is acceptable or even encouraged to show cooperation with a conversational partner (see Tannen 1984, 1986, and where, otherwise, turn-taking is difficult. Thus, if those who are from different cultural backgrounds utilise opposing strategies in the same situation, the group of people who are familiar with the strategies which are commonly practised by the people in that specific society always tend to have an advantage.
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It would be interesting to see whether the Japanese respondents' awareness of interruption differ between Japanese-Japanese interaction and English-Japanese interaction since they will be asked to answer the question in these two different situations.

Question 2 inquires into the actual experience of both respondents of being interrupted in the middle of a conversation with native-speaking conversational partner in their mother tongue: for native speakers of English, interactions in English and for native speakers of Japanese, interactions in Japanese. Japanese respondents are also asked the same question in the situation of communicating in English with a native speaker of English. Here again it is hoped to be able to detect any difference between the experience of the Japanese respondents of being interrupted in conversation with a Japanese-speaking partner and with an English-speaking partner. However, it has to be borne in mind that although the Japanese respondents might experience more interruption in communication with native speakers of English, this could be because of their lack of linguistic competence and not necessarily because of the difference in conversational style between the two languages. This problem will also be partially solved by the fact that the same question will be asked of the respondents concerning mother tongue interaction. Thus, a comparison is hoped to be made between Japanese and English interactions.

Question 3 asks respondents to imagine their behaviour in a situation where they are interrupted in the middle of a conversation: it asks them how they think they will cope with the situation and to what
extent they will try to adjust their behaviour to that of their conversational partner in different situations. Here, again the Japanese respondents are asked the same question in two different situations.

Questions 4-6 are related to topic initiation. Question 4 deals directly with turn-taking, asking about the respondents' awareness of turn-taking habits, whereas Question 5 asks about each respondent's role as listener in a conversation. This was constructed specifically to observe differences/ similarities between the tendencies of both Japanese and British respondents when communicating in their own mother tongues.

Question 6 inquires into the respondents' general attitudes towards topic initiation. This question reflects one of the native speakers' comments on Japanese difficulties (Murata 1986), stating that Japanese speakers of English have a 'tendency not to initiate a conversation'. It seems worth investigating whether other native speakers have ever had the same feeling in communicating with Japanese speakers of English, whether Japanese speakers of English have ever had the same feeling in communicating with native speakers of English, and whether the same applies to the Japanese speakers speaking in Japanese.

Question 7 is concerned with the respondents' feeling about silence in a conversation. This question was constructed to examine the awareness of the respondents of the length of pause/silence they can allow in between turns. Concerning Question 7, 3), it was assumed that it would
be difficult for the respondents to measure the length of silence, mainly for two reasons: firstly, because it usually operates subconsciously, and secondly, because people's perception of the elapsing of time varies. Thus, two seconds for one person might seem to take five seconds for another person. Nonetheless, it was decided that it was still worth exploring the perception of the length of pause, although one cannot generalise from this data alone. Question 7 4) asked how both British and Japanese respondents cope with silence. It would be of interest to see what kind of strategies they use to avoid the awkwardness of silence or whether the Japanese respondents change their strategies in communication with English speakers as opposed to Japanese speakers.

Question 8 was constructed to inquire into favourite topic areas which two strangers tend to choose in their first encounter. It is closely related to Question 9, which, in contrast, concerns topic areas to be avoided between two strangers in the two language situations. These two questions may reveal whether there is any specific topic-avoidance in the two language situations. They were constructed on the basis of the comments of both Japanese and English respondents, stating that there are specific topic areas which Japanese speakers of English tend to avoid (Murata 1986). The comparison between the two language situations could give a clue to the understanding of this phenomenon.

Questions 10 and 11 are also related to topic choice. They ask the topic areas the respondents usually cover in ordinary talk. The Japanese respondents are again asked the same question in the two
language situations to identify whether there is any difference in topic coverage between Japanese-Japanese and English-Japanese interactions.

All the questions in Part II are directly related to the forthcoming experiment in that; firstly, the findings can directly be compared to those from the actual interactions, accordingly, any discrepancy between the respondents' awareness of their conversational and actual behaviours can be detected; and secondly, after filling in Part II, the awareness of the respondents in this area will be heightened through the process of answering the questionnaire.

6.2.3.3 Part III
In contrast to Parts I & II, the questions in Part III are mostly the same for both the Students' and the Native Speakers' Questionnaires except for the last question, Question 8, which asks the respondents' experience of miscommunication with native speakers of English (for Japanese speakers) and with Japanese speakers of English (for Native speakers of English) respectively.

As mentioned earlier, most of the questions (Questions 1-6) are quoted from Brown & Levinson (1987) and related to Japanese difficulties which emerged from the previous survey (Murata 1986) or from the pilot study of this research (see 6.1). Consequently, the questions cover a wide area of language use, involving formulaic expressions and expressions related to understatement in English which seem to cause difficulties in Japanese learners.
Question 1 derives from Brown & Levinson's (1978 & 1987) positive politeness strategies. Brown & Levinson (1987) divide the strategies of positive politeness into three 'broad mechanisms': firstly, 'Claim common ground', secondly, 'Convey that S and H are cooperators', and thirdly, 'Fulfil H's want (for some X)'. They identify eight different strategies under the first category. Question 1 relates to one of these strategies, Strategy 7: 'Presuppose/raise/assert common ground', which, incidentally, is divided into three categories: 'Gossip, small talk', 'Point-of-view operations', and 'Presupposition manipulations'. The usage of 'come' and 'go' in this question belongs to 'Point-of-view operations', and to 'place switch', one of the three different switch types. Brown and Levinson explain that:

English seems to encode a basic positive-politeness 'taking the role of other' point of view in the usage of come. (1987:121)

They compare this case with Japanese, quoting from Fillmore (1972), who introduces an example of a Japanese child called to table by Mother answering with 'I'm going' in Japanese instead of 'I'm coming', which is a common practice in English.

This is indeed true and I have also witnessed various difficulties Japanese learners encounter concerning the use of 'come' and 'go'. Their use in this question is more complicated because this is a case where 'the deictic spatial centre is located outside both S and H' (1987: 121). Brown and Levinson go on to say that:

in these cases where the deictic opposition between come and go is neutralized (i.e. where both are licensed by the situation), to use come is to convey participation and cooperation, to use go is to convey distance and less participation'. (1987: 122)
This question has therefore been constructed to observe how Japanese learners of English understand this feature and utilise 'come' and 'go' intentionally.

Question 2 also originates in Brown & Levinson (1987). This time, it comes under another category: that of positive-politeness strategies: 'Convey that S and H are cooperators'. This strategy, according to Brown & Levinson, 'derives from the want to convey that the speaker and the addressee are cooperatively involved in the relevant activity' (1987:125). Under this category come six different strategy types. Question 2 is related to Strategy 13: 'Give(or ask for) reasons, which is 'for S to give reasons as to why he wants what he wants' (1987:128). From this, Brown and Levinson develop their reasoning and state that 'indirect suggestions which demand rather than give reasons are a conventionalized positive-politeness form' (1987:128) and give some examples, one of them is:

(139) Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend? (1987:128),

on whose basis Question 2 has been created. Originally, the question was set as an answer to this (139); however, in the pilot study, some native speakers pointed out the oddity of this 'request' itself. Thus, instead of using this actual expression directly, which might be misleading for some respondents, a context for eliciting this request was introduced.
Questions 3-6 are concerned with the interpretation of indirect language use by Speaker B. Three different interpretations of B's response to each question are given in a multiple choice format. Questions 3 & 4 derive from what Brown & Levinson categorise as 'Off record', which is concerned with 'indirect use of language'. 'Off record' utterances can be realised either by inviting 'conversational implicatures' or by being 'vague or ambiguous'.

Brown & Levinson state that inviting conversational implicatures is possible 'by violating, in some way, the Gricean Maxims of efficient communication' (1987:213). Under this category come ten different types of strategy. Questions 3 & 4 are related to Strategy 4: understate, which, according to Brown & Levinson, is 'the speaker's violation of Quantity Maxim' in that 'understatements are one way of generating implicatures by saying less than is required' (1987:217).

They go on to say that if 'informationally inadequate utterances' are contextually marked and therefore on record, they are essentially positive-politeness devices, stressing shared knowledge and/or shared values' (1987:218) and give several examples. Questions 3 & 4 were selected from these examples. This is because understatement is particularly difficult for learners when they try to interpret the statements at face value, literally translating the meaning.

Question 5 was introduced as an example of 'particular styles of verbal interchange', which FTAs can construct Brown & Levinson 1987:235). It was constructed to check to what extent Japanese learners of English
are familiar with this 'formulaic' verbal exchange; with the fact that, 'in English one shouldn't admit that one is feeling too bad' (1987: 235).

Question 6 is drawn from the category of 'ironic composition and understatement' (Brown & Levinson 1987). Irony is one of the most difficult areas for learners, who tend to interpret utterances at their face value. Therefore, when it is combined with understatement, chances of learner misinterpretation increase. This question is an example of the use of 'the extreme polar opposite of what one means' (1987: 263) to make ironic statements. Brown and Levinson explain that while:

(6) John's not a friend.

could easily be used as understatement to implicate that John's an enemy (1987: 263),

(7) John's not an enemy.

cannot easily be used to imply that John's a friend. It means, rather, that he's neither friend nor enemy. (1987: 264)

They go on to explain that:

There is a good social motive (avoiding responsibility, etc) for saying much less than you mean when criticizing; this being mutual knowledge, the utterance 'John's not a friend' can easily be used to implicate that he's an enemy, whereas if you wanted to say that John is a friend, there would be no good motive for not saying it directly. Therefore, if you say that he's not an enemy, he's probably not a friend. (1987: 264)

This is an attempt to explain the relationship between linguistic structure and language usage in terms of social function; in this case, face saving.
Concerning Questions 3-6, the problem of intonation was raised in the pilot study. Since the context given is limited, it is possible that difference in intonation could change the meaning of B's responses here. However, I have decided to assume that the most general pattern of intonation would be used in the questions and this has been indicated in the questionnaire. It is hoped that respondents will imagine one general intonation pattern, given these contexts; thus, that it does not make significant difference in their responses.

Question 7 is slightly different from the other questions in Part III, which were taken from Brown and Levinson (1987). This question arises as a result of the pilot study and asks how a speaker structures information. It has often been pointed out that there exists a certain difference between the ways in which people organise information in discourse between native speakers of English and non-native speakers from a certain language background (see, for example, work by Gumperz (ed) (1982) and for written discourse, Kaplan (1972)). This tendency was observed in the pilot study and forms the basis of a question.

Finally, Question 8 of both questionnaires was constructed to elicit experience of miscommunication in interaction with native speakers of English (for Japanese respondents) and with Japanese speakers of English (for native speakers of English) respectively. It aims to elicit examples of miscommunication which neither the questionnaires nor the actual recordings of face-to-face interactions might be able to detect.
6.2.4 The Administration of the Questionnaires

6.2.4.1 The Subjects of the Questionnaires

As two different types of subjects were targeted, two slightly different types of questionnaires were administered: one aimed at Japanese learners of English studying in England; and the other at native speakers of English as a control group.

6.2.4.1.1 Japanese Learners of English

The Learners' Questionnaire was administered to 45 Japanese students of English, who were following a special one-year intermediate certificate course specifically for Japanese students at SOAS (School of Oriental and African Studies University of London).

Their age level ranged from 18 to early thirties but most of them were in their early twenties. Nearly one third (11 out of 45) joined the course after finishing upper secondary school in Japan and half (24 out of 45) were either junior college graduates or students at colleges and universities in Japan at the time of the administration. The rest had spent some years working after graduating from universities.

Most of the students, apart from those who had taken one year's leave from their universities in Japan and were going back to them after a year's study in Britain, were planning to enter university courses in Britain: some were intending to enter first degree courses, and others, post graduate courses. Their specialities varied and their language proficiency levels also differed a great deal according to their past learning experience.
The questionnaire was administered in the middle of their course, six months after most of them arrived in Britain (some had already lived in London for some time). This is because it was assumed that, after six months, the students had had enough experience in communicating with native speakers of English and thus, that their awareness of differences and similarities in conversational style between English and Japanese would be heightened. Moreover, it was assumed that they might have experienced various communication breakdowns themselves by that time.

The questionnaire was administered during the lesson, using the first twenty minutes. The aim of the questionnaire and the instruction on how to fill in the questionnaire were given by the researcher (myself) in Japanese. The respondents were also free to ask any questions about the questionnaire during the filling-in time. Although twenty minutes were allocated, less than 20 minutes were spent on actual filling-in because it took more time than originally planned in distributing of the questionnaire and explaining how to fill it in. Thus, some respondents complained of the lack of time. Considering the nature of the administrative situation, more time could have been allocated. Nonetheless, within the time available, most of the students completed the questionnaire.

6.2.4.1.2 Native-speaking Respondents

Native-speaking respondents served mainly as a control group. In order to obtain a group of people who have a fairly similar educational background, the PGCE students of the ESOL Department at the Institute
of Education were asked to fill in the questionnaire. The procedure for administration was, however, slightly different from that of the Japanese respondents. That is, although the researcher (myself) went into the classroom and explained the aim of the questionnaire and the method of completion, the respondents took it back home and filled it in at their leisure. Therefore, they had plenty of time to answer the questions. The completed questionnaires were collected in a box installed near the pigeon hole in ESOL Department so that everybody had easy access to it. In this way, 16 questionnaires (50%) were returned by the native-speaking respondents.

Among these 16, there were two respondents who had been to Japan and taught there for some years and eight respondents who had taught Japanese learners of English in Britain. These respondents were asked a specific question concerning their experience in miscommunication with the Japanese speakers of English at the end of Part III of the questionnaire.

6.2.4.1.3 Additional Administration of the Japanese Questionnaire to Another Group of Japanese Speakers of English

After the administration of Japanese Students' Questionnaire, the same questionnaire was administered to an additional group of Japanese speakers of English. This was originally planned in order to involve some Japanese businessmen/women working in Britain, who needed to negotiate with native speakers of English every day on business. It was supposed that they might have different attitudes towards conversational interactions with native speakers of English, being
accustomed to negotiating with them mostly in stressful situations. However, it turned out to be difficult to obtain a sufficient number of businessmen/women to fill in the questionnaire.

Instead, members of the London branch of the alumni group of a women's college in Tokyo were asked to be subjects. The majority came to Britain as wives of businessmen transferred to Britain. Their average length of stay in this country varied a great deal, from more than ten years to less than six months. Many of them had also experienced living in other English speaking countries. Their age varied from mid-twenties to fifties. The majority of them had read English language and literature at university in Japan.

The procedure for filling in the questionnaire was directly explained to the subjects concerned at a regular alumni meeting, I myself being a member of that group. It had been arranged that the questionnaire be taken home, to be filled in in their own time and sent back to the researcher later. Each person received two questionnaires, one for their spouse, though few of these were able to respond. Although the rate of returns from the members was high (13 out of 18), that of their spouses numbered only four.

6.2.4.2 The Problems with the Design of the Questionnaire

There were two main types of problem concerning the design of questionnaire; those of formatting and wording of the questions, and those arising from the question type itself.
6.2.4.2.1 'Fixed-alternative' or 'Open-ended' Items

Among the problems of formatting, one of the most important problems is whether questions should be formatted on the basis of 'fixed-alternative' or 'open-ended' questions. There are pros and cons regarding the use of both types. For example, the advantages in utilising 'fixed-alternative items' is, firstly, that it saves time for both researchers and respondents. This point might appear to be minor; however, when there are time constraints on both sides, particularly on the respondents' side, every effort must be made to lessen their workload. On the other hand, designing 'fixed-alternative items' usually takes more time than designing 'open-ended items' since carefully arranged response sets also need to be included in the questionnaire. For respondents as well, superficially the questionnaire itself might look much longer with response sets included, although it is much quicker to fill than the seemingly shorter questionnaire with 'open-ended items'.

Another advantage of the fixed-alternative type questionnaire is, as Kerlinger (1986) points out, it can achieve 'greater uniformity of measurement and thus greater reliability' (1986:442). It can force 'the respondents to answer in a way that fits the response categories previously set up' and be 'easily coded' (1986:442). It can also direct respondents towards the area of interest which researchers are working on.

On the other hand, it can 'force responses' (Kerlinger 1986:442). In other words, even when the respondents cannot find a suitable
alternative, they might be forced to choose one, or they might choose a response, either consciously or subconsciously, which is suitable from researcher's point of view or in terms of 'social desirability', but not according to their own feelings, attitudes, or knowledge. Therefore, we should always bear in mind that not all the answers reflect the true feelings of the respondents.

'Open-ended' questions are free from the restrictions mentioned above. This type of question gives a respondent 'freedom to decide the aspect, form, detail and length of his answer' (Moser & Kalton 1971:341) and 'supply a frame of reference for respondents' answers, but, put a minimum of restraint on the answers and their expression' (Kerlinger 1986:442).

However, 'open-ended' questions do entail problems as well. Firstly, they are time-consuming for researchers to analyse, and for respondents to answer. Secondly, it is also possible that because the respondents are free of constraints in answering, they may not address the specific point which the researcher was aiming at; moreover, the respondents may hesitate to spend a lot of time filling in the questionnaire in depth.

In the present research, the questionnaires have been formatted in the mixture of both 'fixed-alternative' and 'open-ended items'. Part I of both questionnaires is straightforward, asking just for factual personal background. Thus, it utilises 'fixed-alternative items'. Part II of both questionnaires utilises a mixture of both scale items and open-ended questions, which are optional and have been included to
compensate for the restriction of scale items: the respondents are invited to answer open-ended questions when they feel that they need to supplement their answers on the scale items. Part III consists mostly of fixed-alternative items, except for Question 2 and Question 8, which are open-ended.

Apart from the above problems with the type of question, there also exist problems with wording and phrasing. The questions need to be clear to every respondent concerned. Any possibility of alternative interpretation of the same question must be eliminated. This problem was solved, to a great extent, through the pilot study, in which three native speakers of English completed the Native Speakers' Questionnaire and three native speakers of Japanese completed the Japanese Learners' Questionnaire. The English translated version of the Japanese Students' Questionnaire was also checked with both the Japanese and the Native speakers of English participating in the pilot study. Therefore, it is hoped that any ambiguity and vagueness of phrasing and meaning were eliminated.

6.2.4.2.2 The Problems with the Types of Questions

In addition to those involved with formatting the questionnaire, some problems arose from the questions themselves. The majority of these emerged from Part II of the Japanese Students' Questionnaire. This is mostly because of the structure of the questions, which introduces two different situations for the same question. Three main problems were identified under this circumstance as follows:

Problem 1 Concerning Situation 2 of Part II of the Japanese
Questionnaire, it is possible that the Japanese respondents might answer the questions, trying to satisfy English norms/standards of expected responses, but not expressing what they actually thought and felt through their experiences.

**Problem 2:** The answers of the Japanese respondents might be influenced by their proficiency levels. In other words, for those with low language proficiency, the difference between Situations 1 & 2 might mainly arise from their lack of language competence but not necessarily from cross-cultural differences.

Secondly, those with a high proficiency might adjust to the British patterns of behaviour and this in turn might affect their Japanese patterns of behaviour. Finally, it must also be borne in mind that a confidence factor could also be involved in these situations. That is, the proficiency levels of the respondents might not be low, but their lack of confidence might inhibit them from certain behaviours.

**Problem 3:** This problem is closely related to Problem 1 above. That is, having two different situations for the same question, the respondents might presuppose that there should be certain differences and, either consciously or unconsciously, might try to differentiate between the responses required in the two situations.

All these points are very important because they could affect the validity of the result to a great extent. However, there is no clear indication to what extent the responses were influenced by these problems. It is useful to combine the questionnaire with actual recordings of the conversational behaviour, because the discrepancy between the respondents' awareness and their actual behaviours will then be detected. Thus, the result increases its reliability.

Of all the above major problems, Problem 3 in some cases actually obscured the result, leaving the interpretation extremely difficult. Also, it seems that in Questions 2, 4, 5, and 6, it was not the differences between Japanese and English discourse patterns which influenced the answers, but the fact that the Japanese speakers of
English might not have been proficient enough to initiate topics or to take turns. Most probably the answers were influenced by a mixture of both lack of proficiency and cultural differences. The clue to solving this problem may emerge from a detailed study of the recorded data. Therefore, I shall return to this later in the analysis.

6.3 MAJOR DATA COLLECTION

Major data collection was carried out to investigate the conversational behaviours of Japanese learners of English in communication with native speakers of English. It also aimed to examine any discrepancy between the learners' awareness of differences or similarities in conversational style between the two languages and their actual behaviours in communicative situations. It is assumed that awareness and actual behaviours do not necessarily coincide since the latter are deeply rooted and usually operate subconsciously; thus, they are difficult to control even if the subject is aware of the differences and consciously tries to adjust his/herself to the target norms. Once s/he is deeply involved in the conversational activities, it is natural that indigenous behaviours become most salient. Therefore, the use of recordings of actual conversational interaction can not only complement the results of the questionnaires but it may also provide information in its own right.
6.3.1 Background to the Major Data Collection

6.3.1.1 The Subjects

It was decided to select the Japanese speakers from the respondents to the questionnaire who fell into the following categories:

1. Advanced speakers of English
2. Those who had never spent a period of time abroad as a child (At least not more than a year)
3. Those who had not been introduced to communicative activities when learning English in Japan

Also, with reference to the responses to Part II of the questionnaire, it was decided to select:

1. Those who in Situations 1 & 2 (NSJ-NSJ and NSE-JSE interactions) showed a tendency towards Japanese conversational style
2. Those who showed awareness of the difference in the conversational style in Situation 2 (NSE-JSE interaction) that is, those who tended towards the typical answering pattern of a NSE.

It was originally intended to select the Japanese subjects according to the typical answering patterns represented above. That is, either those respondents who used a typical Japanese answering pattern in both Situation 1 & 2 or those who used a typical Japanese pattern in Situation 1 but a typical native speaker's pattern in Situation 2, were to be selected. In the end, however, it proved to be very difficult to find subjects who satisfied all the above conditions. Even satisfying the conditions of Part I turned out to be very difficult, since most of the advanced students had been abroad for more than a year, some for more than three years when they were still in their teens. This extended stay in English speaking countries at an early age may have influenced their behavioural patterns and discourse patterns;
therefore, the people in this category have been excluded from the entry. This decision affected the proficiency level of the subjects available and it fell slightly lower than originally planned, more than half of them being at an intermediate level.

Among those who met the requirement of Part I, the respondents who used typical answering patterns in Situation 1, and in Situation 2 of Part II; that is, those who used a similar answering pattern to a typical NSJ answer in Situation 1 and those who used quite a different answering pattern from that of the NSE respondents in Situation 2 received special attention and were asked whether they were willing to participate in the research. At the same time, the respondents who used a typical Japanese interaction pattern in Situation 1 and a typical NSE response pattern in Situation 2 were also asked for their participation. Some respondents volunteered to be subjects. Although not all of them necessarily satisfied all the conditions above mentioned, some of them have been included as subjects, in order to reach the required number. Although originally it was planned to include an equal number of male and female subjects, in the end, two male students and five female students were chosen to participate in the research. The imbalance of the number of male and female subjects is due to the original imbalance of the number: there were only 11 male respondents to the questionnaire while the female respondents numbered 34.

6.3.1.2 The Elicitation Method of the Major Study

The same elicitation method for the pilot study was utilised for the
major study, that is, a 'getting to know each other' situation. However, three main changes were made in the method, taking the result of the pilot study into consideration. Firstly, the place of recording remained constant in order to avoid variables arising from the change of places. Secondly, a video recording as well as an audio-tape recording was made. The importance of the use of video-recording will be discussed in this section in relation to the problems observed. Thirdly, the conversational partners of the Japanese participants were fixed. That is, two native speakers of Japanese and two native speakers of English (one male and one female respectively) were selected as conversational partners for seven Japanese learners of English. This was also to control variables arising from the individual differences of conversational partners: by fixing conversational partners it was hoped that the comparison of the conversational behaviours of the subjects would become easier. The arrangement of the conversational interactions of the subjects was as follows:

Japanese Subjects

Japanese Female Interactant ---- Jf1 ---- English Female Interactant

Japanese Female Interactant 2* ---- Jf5

Japanese Male Interactant ---- Jm1 ---- English Male Interactant

* In fact, two Japanese female interactants were involved since F2 took over the role of F1 when she was not available

Great efforts were also made to find Japanese and English partners whom
the subjects had not met before to satisfy the condition of a 'getting to know each other' situation.

6.3.1.3 The Procedure of the Major Study

The major study was carried out after the questionnaire was administered. This is related to the second purpose of the questionnaire: to prime the respondents for further study of conversational interactions by raising their awareness. However, since it had taken a certain amount of time to analyse the questionnaire, the major study took place a month after the questionnaire was administered.

Each Japanese subject had two conversational interactions, one with a native speaker of Japanese in Japanese and the other with a native speaker of English in English. Of the two, the Japanese interaction took place first and then the English followed. This is because the Japanese interaction is less stressful for Japanese speakers because of the familiarity with the language. To obtain as natural an interaction as possible, it was essential that less stressful interaction be allocated first.

The two types of interactions took place on different days. It was much simpler to record all the same types of interaction (either Japanese or English) on the same day, since the subjects or the conversational partner did not need to wait when another type of interaction was taking place. It seemed essential to minimise the time necessary for the subjects and their conversational partners.
6.3.2 The Implementation of the Major Study

6.3.2.1 The Implementation

The Japanese subjects were instructed before the interactions that all they needed to do was to introduce themselves to their interactant and then to have a chat with him/her on whatever topics they wished. Each subject was lead to the room where the conversational partner was waiting. The video recorder had been switched on and set before each subject came into the room so that the operation of the video would not distract attention. It had also been set so that the subjects would not see the monitor. These might appear minor points; however, they were important in order to decrease unnecessary tensions in the subjects.

Each subject went into the room on his/her own and started a conversation without being introduced. After 15 minutes, the researcher informed the subjects that their time limit had been reached. In most cases, the two interactants kept talking until they came to a natural TRP or topic boundary. Some pairs kept talking even longer until they were again reminded of the end of the allocated time. This seems to show that although at the beginning of the interaction, the two conversational partners might have felt a little awkward with a rather unnatural situation with both video and audio tape-recording machines operating, eventually they conquered the awkwardness and enjoyed an ongoing conversation. It could therefore be said that although the situation itself might have been slightly unnatural, the conversations which took place were natural enough to elicit communicative behaviours. Moreover, this 'getting to know each other'
situation seems to have brought about another effect: some of the participants made friends with each other during this interaction, as had happened in the pilot study.

About two to four weeks after both interactions, the Japanese subjects were invited to view the recording of their own conversational interactions. They were asked to give some comments on and explanation of their behaviours when necessary. This viewing session was set up on in a similar way to that of Erickson and Schultz (1982), who, by including a play-back session, introduced the emic view of the participants so that the interpretation became more objective, based not only on the researcher's analysis but also on the participants' view. However, not all the Japanese subjects managed to have this viewing session, mainly because of time constraints. In the end, all the five female Japanese subjects had viewing sessions while none of the male subjects did so. The opinions of the subjects in the viewing sessions will be referred to when interpreting their conversational behaviours. Most of the subjects just gave a general impression of their behaviours but they did not necessarily seem to be aware of actual communication breakdowns or difficulties they had.

These viewing sessions were also audio-taped. This was purely for future reference and no transcription has been made. The findings will be referred to, if the information from these sessions seem to be vital for the interpretation of the conversation.
6.3.2.2 The Problems Observed in the Major Study

Two main types of problem were perceived in the major study. The first problem was related to the technical setting of the conversational interaction. Secondly, there was a problem related to the effect of the system of fixed conversational partners.

The first problem has to do with the effect of the presence of video-recording equipment. The importance of video-recording conversational interaction was discussed earlier (see Chapter 6.1.2.1). It was pointed out that to study interactants' communicative behaviours comprehensively, it is necessary, also, to take into consideration such features as kinesics and proxemics, which play an important role in the interpretation of conversational data. This is made obvious in our foregoing discussion of communication, culture and communicative needs of learners.

However, even with the above justification of the presence of the video recorder, this definitely affects the conversational behaviours of the participants to a certain extent, in particular, at the beginning of interactions. However, as the participants get more involved with the conversation itself, they seem to forget the presence of the video recorder. Or even if they do not completely forget its presence, at least they seem to get used to having it in the room. This assumption appears to have been proved by the participants' eagerness to continue conversation even after the time was over as noted earlier and also by the comments of the participants themselves, who said that the presence of the video recorder did not matter very much.2
The second problem relates to the effect of the system of fixed conversational partners. I have stated in 6.3.1.2 that both the Japanese and English conversational partners of the Japanese subjects would remain constant in order to control variables which might arise because of the individual differences of the conversational partners. However, fixing conversational partners caused certain disadvantages. That is, both native English-speaking and Japanese-speaking conversational partners to the Japanese subjects became so used to the situation that in the end, conversational interactions became more like interviews rather than casual conversations. This was reinforced by the fixed conversational partner waiting for a Japanese subject in the room where a conversational interaction took place, just like an interviewer.

Another reason for conversational interactions becoming more like an interview was the slight age difference between the conversational partners and the Japanese subjects; while the average age of the former was mid-thirties, that of the latter was mid-twenties. Moreover, three out of four conversational partners were either teachers or ex-teachers; thus, they were more used to interviewing people.

With all these characteristics, the conversations tended to become more like interviews, particularly, during the beginning phase. This point needs to be borne in mind when interpreting the data.

6.3.3 Summary
I have, in this section, mainly discussed the research design of the
major recorded data collection, which includes the background to the major study, such as the selection of the subjects, the elicitation method, the procedure and the implementation of the method. I have also discussed some of the problems which emerged concerning the implementation of the major study. All these factors directly or indirectly influenced the interpretation of the data, which I shall examine in Chapter 8.

---

NOTES

1. There were also purely practical problems with administration of the questionnaires. The main problem with the administration of the questionnaires consisted of the constraints on time. In the present research, three different groups of subjects were involved, using two different types of questionnaire. As previously mentioned, the main group of subjects, i.e. the Japanese students at SOAS, filled in the questionnaires in class. This enabled the respondents to clarify any question they had concerning the intentions of the questions. On the other hand, the time for administration was limited to twenty minutes. On the whole the respondents seemed to be wanting to have more time for in-depth answers, in particular, for the open-ended items.

The two other groups had more time for administration since they had taken the questionnaire home and filled it in at their leisure. However, in contrast to mail questionnaires, they received direct explanations of the aim and the method of filling them in by the researcher (myself).

It emerged that the respondents who did not have to fill in the questionnaires on the spot answered the open-ended questions in more detail. Moser and Kalton (1971) also point out an advantage of mail questionnaires as being suitable for 'a considered rather than an immediate answer' (1971:258).

Also here, one of the six disadvantages of mail questionnaires raised by Moser and Kalton (1971) could be applied to the questionnaires of this research: because two groups of respondents took the questionnaires home, it is possible that the responses to the questionnaire were influenced 'by discussion with others' (1971:260). Therefore, this method of administration might not be reliable where it is important that the views of one person only are obtained' (1971:260). However, in the case of the present research it is believed that such a possibility will not threaten the result.
2. There also arose some purely technical problems in handling videotape recorders. A small maladjustment in the handling of the recording equipment made a great difference to the picture. Since the video recording was done on four different days, the condition of the resultant pictures varied a great deal according to the first adjustment of the day. Some pictures were so badly focussed that it was difficult to see, for example, a participant's detailed facial expression.

There also emerged a recording problem. On one occasion, the voice of the subject was too soft and it proved impossible to transcribe the recorded data. Thus, the total transcriptions of data in NSJ-NSE interactions were reduced from seven to six. It seems vital that when collecting data for research, the recording equipment be double checked beforehand, since without acceptable data, research cannot proceed.
CHAPTER 7 THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

The analysis of the questionnaire has two main objectives. First of all, it can reveal overall awareness, attitudes, and tendencies of the different groups of respondents in conversational management and other conversational style. Secondly, it can give invaluable information on individual respondents. This was particularly important for the Japanese respondents among whom the subjects for the further empirical study were selected according to the information they provided. In this section, the analysis of the questionnaires will concentrate on the former aspect.

Of the three parts of the questionnaires, I shall concentrate on the analysis of Parts II and III. This is because Part I elicits personal background information; therefore, reference will be made to it in this section only when information on the background of the subjects as a group is needed to interpret the data.

7.1 THE ANALYSIS OF PART II OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Questions 1-3 are questions on various aspects of 'interruptions'. They attempt to find out whether Japanese respondents are aware of any difference or similarity in this habit between Japanese and English interactions.
With regard to Question 1, the question on attitudes towards interruption, nearly seventy percent (69%) of the total Japanese respondents regard interruption as impolite in conversation with Japanese speakers in Japanese, whereas in conversation with English speakers in English, they regard it as less impolite (52%). If we look at this figure in more detail, we notice a slight difference between the two different groups of Japanese subjects. A higher proportion of the respondents from the alumni group (82%—14 out of 17) agreed that it is impolite to interrupt in Japanese interaction, compared to the SOAS group, whose ratio is 62% (28 out of 45). Moreover, all the male respondents from the alumni group (4 out of 4) unanimously agreed that interruption is impolite in Japanese situations and they do not very much change this opinion in English interactions (3 out of 4). In total, a high proportion of the alumni group thought that interruption was impolite even in English-speaking situations (71%—12 out of 17).

The difference between the two Japanese groups may have arisen from the difference in their age, social role and experience. The average age of the alumni group is 10-20 years older than that of the SOAS group, which mostly consists of students straight from school or university. This fact relates directly to the second aspect, that is, while most of the SOAS group were students in both Japan and Britain, the respondents in the alumni group were mostly either businessmen or their wives, most of whom had also some experience of working in the past. These had a variety of social experience accompanying their husband's postings abroad. Thus, they may have been more aware of social constraints, and besides, their social relationships were probably more formal than
those of the students. This may also have been true of their social relationships in Britain. Thus, even if they were aware of a certain difference they probably did not change their basic attitudes drastically.

In the SOAS group, fewer people think that interruption in English interaction is impolite (44%--20 out of 45). This is, interestingly, similar to the answer by the native speakers of English (38%--6 out of 16). It could be explained by the possibility that the Japanese respondents from SOAS perceived that interruption is more tolerated in an English conversation. Whether they actually behave in this manner in a real communicative situation, however, is subject to further research based on natural data, which I shall discuss in the next chapter (Chapter 8) in relation to the recorded data from the conversational interactions.

Question 2 asked the respondents' experience of being interrupted in the middle of conversation. While the majority of English speakers answered that they sometimes tended to be interrupted in the middle of conversation (88%) only 52% of the Japanese respondents chose the same alternative in the Japanese situation. Moreover, 40% of them answered that they were seldom interrupted in the middle of conversation in Japanese while only six percent of the British respondents answered similarly. This may indicate a basic difference in conversational mechanisms between English and Japanese, Japanese being less familiar with interruption.
Here, there is again a slight difference between the two Japanese groups. The members of the alumni group, who thought interruption more impolite than the SOAS group, had less experience of being interrupted in Japanese (53% --- 9 out of 17 said that they had seldom been interrupted) compared to the SOAS group, whose total is 36% (16 out of 45).

More interestingly, in the English-speaking situation, both groups showed more discrepancy; the SOAS group who answered that they were seldom interrupted in the middle of conversation decreased in total to 24% (11 out of 45), while the alumni group increased to 65% (11 out of 17). This seems consistent with the result of Question 1; that is, the SOAS respondents, who think interruption is less impolite in English, themselves experienced more interruption in English than in Japanese interaction. However, the alumni group, who showed only a little change of attitude towards interruption in their Japanese and English interactions experienced less interruption in English; moreover, all the male respondents of the alumni group reported that they were seldom interrupted in English. The explanation for this appears difficult. However, here again the same explanation as for Question 1 is applicable. That is, due to their difference in age, social role and experience, their types of interaction and interactants may have been different. The SOAS respondents, being students, tended to have casual interaction with native speakers of English, who were also students. In these situations, interruption may be more tolerated, whereas the members of the alumni group may have had more formal interactions with more politeness involved, and thus, less interruption.
Another conceivable cause is that since interaction is reciprocal, the same phenomenon as 'foreigner talk' might occur in conversational management as well. More specifically, native speakers of English may slow down their rate of speech and turn-taking, adjusting to their conversational partner, thus interrupting less than when they are communicating with their native-speaking partners. This could be explored in more detail later with the actual conversational data, where we can compare NSE-NSE, NSE-JSE, and NSJ-NSJ interactions.

Nonetheless, judging only from the answers of both the Japanese and British respondents regarding their own mother tongue, their actual experience shows that English allows more interruption in the midst of conversation.

Question 3 asked the respondents their probable behaviours when interrupted. In this, the results of the Japanese and the British respondents also showed a slight difference; i.e. the Japanese in a Japanese conversation showed a tendency to 'stop & listen' more (61%), while their English counterparts did less so (38%). Interestingly enough, the attitude of the Japanese respondents in English interaction was no different from that in Japanese interaction. This might be explained in that this attitude has been formed throughout their upbringing; thus, it is deeply related to their sense of value and thus, they probably would not change it even in different language situations.
However, if we observe the result in more detail, again, we notice a slight difference between the two different groups of Japanese respondents. The alumni group again showed a higher ratio for 'stop & listen' in Japanese-speaking situations (76% --- 13 out of 17) while the SOAS group indicated a smaller percentage (53% --- 24 out of 45). In the English-speaking situation, both groups superficially rated the same (SOAS 60%, Alumni 59%).

Here, we have to examine the different tendencies. That is, while the percentage of the SOAS students increased slightly, the respondents of the alumni group who would 'stop & listen' decreased to 59%. The result of the SOAS group here seems to be contradictory compared to those of Questions 1 & 2. If the Japanese respondents had been aware of the difference in conversational style as they showed in their answers to Questions 1 & 2, the total should have fallen; however, instead it rose. Whether the lack of proficiency led them to choose more 'stop & listen' alternatives is not clear from these data alone. Checking with the actual data of conversation seems to be necessary. This will be referred to again in Chapter 8 in comparison with actual data.

As for the alumni group, the explanation also seems to be difficult. The decrease in percentage might show that although they basically thought that interruption was impolite, they were aware of the difference in interactional style between English and Japanese and were ready to modify their attitude when necessary.
Another interesting feature worth mentioning on Question 3 is that there seem to be male and female differences in attitude. This is because in both the Japanese and English-speaking situations, Japanese male respondents from the two different groups reported less 'stop & listen' and more 'continue' compared to female respondents (see Appendix 5-a). This was also true of the NSE respondents: less male respondents said that they would 'stop & listen' and more reported that they would 'continue'. Does this mean that men are more aggressive in conversational management universally?

This is far too big an issue to elaborate with these limited data; it will not be specifically pursued in further conversational data although reference will be made to it when it appears to be a salient feature. Otherwise, further exploration of this area needs another study planned specifically for this purpose.

Question 4 does not yield any significant difference between Japanese & English conversation (the results of the Japanese respondents in a Japanese-speaking situation and native English-speaking respondents in English show a similar pattern) apart from the fact when the Japanese respondents were asked whether they could obtain chances to speak at will, lack of proficiency seems to have increased the salience of learner characteristics: i.e., the number of the Japanese respondents who chose 'often' rose to 39% in Situation 2 (English) compared to three percent in Situation 1 (Japanese). Moreover, there were even 3% (2 out of 62) who chose 'always'.
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Thus, the most prominent factor seems to be learners' lack of proficiency. However, we also have to bear in mind that there are other possible causes. For example, that arising from difference in conversational style, in which the Japanese speakers, in spite of having linguistic competence, are not accustomed to the turn-taking system in English. Or there may be a psychological cause, whereby learners feel inhibited from giving opinions. Therefore, we should try to see the responses from a multidimensional perspective, considering cultural and individual differences, and avoid drawing conclusions exclusively from the result of the questionnaires. This will also be borne in mind when discussing the data from conversational interactions in the following chapter.

In Question 5, the same tendency appeared as that in Question 4 when the number of respondents who tended to play the role of listener increased in Situation 2 (English version, JSE & NSE interaction). However, in contrast to Question 4, there is a slight difference between the answers of the Japanese respondents in the Japanese-speaking situation and the British respondents in the English-speaking situation: while 13% of all the Japanese respondents answered that they 'always' tended to play the role of listener even when talking in Japanese, no British respondents chose the same alternative in English interaction. This might be attributed to the fact that in Japanese conversational style, being a good listener plays a very important role and people sometimes value it more than being a good speaker. However, it then becomes difficult to explain the phenomenon of the percentage
of the Japanese respondents choosing 'seldom' in Japanese interaction while no British respondents chose this alternative.

Naturally, in the English-speaking situation the listenership of the Japanese respondents increases, 'always' totalling 27%(16 out of 62) and 'often' rating 50%(30 out of 62). This seems to be for the same reason as that in Question 4; mainly because of the Japanese speakers' lack of proficiency, but also due to cultural differences and individual psychological differences.

Concerning topic initiation (Question 6), more Japanese respondents in Situation 1 (Japanese Interaction) answered that they would 'often' follow topics which their conversational partner initiated(21%). This compares with six percent of English speakers in English interaction. Although this difference may be slight, Japanese people show less of a tendency to initiate topics even when communicating in their mother tongue, compared to their English-speaking counterparts in English.

On the other hand, the answers of Japanese speakers in Situation 2 indicate that the ratio who follow the initiation of topic by their English conversational partners increases. This slight increase in Situation 2 again seems to reflect their low proficiency level, since, if they had been aware of the difference and if they had been proficient enough, they would have adjusted their responses, and thus the ratio would have decreased.
However, again, we also have to bear in mind other possibilities. Even if the Japanese respondents were aware of the difference, they may have been reluctant to modify their behaviours for certain reasons, e.g. to keep their cultural identity. However, if we take another result, which indicates that 23% (14 out of 62) of the Japanese respondents chose 'seldom' in Japanese interaction while 25% (4 out of 16) of their English counterparts in English interaction have chosen 'seldom', it is strange, if the Japanese respondents want to maintain the same attitude, that they do not at least maintain the same ratio in their English interactions. Therefore, the most probable reason here seems to be the learners' lack of proficiency.

When we turn to the topic of silence in a conversation, the answers of the Japanese respondents in Japanese interactions do not differ greatly from those of the British respondents in English interactions. Eight percent of the Japanese respondents (5 out of 62) and 7% of British respondents (1 out of 16) reported that they 'always' felt uneasy when there was silence in a conversation. However, there is a certain difference in the ratio who chose 'seldom', i.e. the Japanese respondents in Japanese totalled 32% (20 out of 62) while the British respondents in English interactions amounted to 12% (3 out of 16) (see Appendix 5-a).

Judging from these results, the Japanese respondents are more tolerant towards silence compared to their British counterparts. This attitude remains roughly the same in their English interaction: 23% (14 out of 62) of the Japanese respondents 'seldom' feel uneasy when there is
silence in a conversation with their English partners. However, the slight decrease may indicate that some of them are aware of the difference and have adjusted to English interactional patterns or they may have subconsciously adjusted to them, while others still remained unchanged. Alternatively, another explanation could be that lack of linguistic competence may have made the Japanese respondents feel a little uneasy towards silence, which their British counterparts who were not aware of any difference might have ascribed to their conversational partners' lack of competence or even to an unwillingness to participate in the conversation.

Lastly, on the subject of uneasiness with silence, many respondents added comments on the circumstances in which they feel this unease (Question 7.2). Most respondents reported that this depends on who they are talking to, and what kind of situation they are in. Many people pointed out that they would feel uneasy about silence 'when meeting somebody for the first time', 'when you don't know someone well', 'when you are talking to your seniors, i.e. boss or tutor, or when you are in a position to be responsible for the meeting'.

Next, in Question 7 (3), those respondents who had in 7 (3) chosen between three alternatives of 'always', 'often' and 'sometimes' were asked to specify the actual length of silence which made them feel uneasy. This was a difficult question to answer because people were not usually aware of the length of their silence. Even during the pilot study, it was pointed out by some of the participants that this was an impossible question because they had never measured the length
of silence. In spite of this, I have decided to include this question for two reasons. Firstly, it can lead the respondents to a certain level of awareness. Secondly, it enables the researcher to compare it with actual conversational data, detecting any discrepancy between the awareness and the actual behaviours of the respondents.

The result of this question shows how the sense of timing differs from one person to another. The shortest time before uneasiness occurred, five seconds, was reported by both Japanese and British respondents, while the longest, two to three minutes, was reported by a Japanese respondent. As one second for one person might be experienced as five seconds by another, it may not be very accurate to merely calculate the average length of silence. Nonetheless, I believe that it provides us with some insights into the attitudes of the Japanese and British respondents towards silence.

One great difference which was observed between the Japanese speakers in Japanese interaction and the British speakers in English interaction was in the length of silence which was sufficient to make the respondents feel uneasy: the former group reported an average 18.5 seconds of silence, in contrast to the latter, who reported 9.1 seconds. The tolerance of the Japanese to silence when speaking English becomes slightly shorter, averaging 16.9 seconds. This may indicate that the Japanese speakers of English are aware that in English interaction it is shorter than in Japanese-Japanese interaction and they might subconsciously have adjusted to English interactions. To examine whether their behaviour corresponds to this awareness, we
have to wait for actual conversational data; however, the results of the pilot study show that the average length of silence in English-English interaction was 0.5 seconds while that of Japanese-Japanese interaction was 2.0 seconds. Thus, even at this stage we can say that the impression of time-span differs greatly from the actual length of time. Also the results of the pilot study show that the awareness of the Japanese respondents toward the length of silence in English interaction is correct. I shall further explore this aspect in the next chapter in discussing actual conversational data.

Concerning Question 7 (3), some respondents commented on the circumstances in which they might change their judgement on the length of silence. Most of the comments are similar to those given in Question 7 (2), i.e., most of the respondents pointed out that it depends on 'the familiarity of the situation and the conversational partners'. Other comments were that length of silence might be related to topic or situation. For example, when the topic is serious, it requires a certain amount of thinking or in the case of a telephone conversation, longer silences will ensue. However, it is reported that, in telephone conversation, the length for pause/silence is even shorter than in face-to-face conversation (Ervin-Tripp 1979) (see Appendix 5-b).

Question 7 (4) asked what strategies the respondents might utilise in such a condition of uneasiness. The native speakers of English listed various concrete strategies, including 'making jokes, small talk', 'returning to an earlier topic', 'asking a question on the background
of the partner', 'talking about mutual acquaintances and the immediate environment and weather'. On the other hand, most Japanese speakers did not list specific strategies. They merely stated that they would try to introduce new topics (23 out of 62 respondents just said that they would try to introduce topics) or change topic (4 out of 62). These strategies are common to both their Japanese and English interactions and nearly half the respondents are willing to adopt either of these strategies; however, they do not specify what kind of topics they would introduce, with the exception of a few, who mentioned that they would introduce, for example, 'topics of interests to the partner' or 'topics on the immediate environment' (see Appendix 5-b for more detail).

Nevertheless, there are certain strategies which appear to be unique to Japanese respondents. They are mostly observed with the respondents from the SOAS group and consist mainly of some kind of non-verbal strategy such as smiling (5 respondents), eating or drinking something (5 respondents), smoking (4 respondents), clearing their throat (2 respondents) or even evading eye-contact, looking out of the window, touching one's hair or leaving the room.

The use of these strategies is also interesting in another sense. They are not positive strategies which may resolve the uneasiness arising from silence by introducing new topics or continuing conversation, but rather they are receptive in that they are not intended to break the silence but rather to earn some time by doing other things and to change the immediate focus of attention. Most of the Japanese
respondents who listed these strategies stated that they would use them in both Japanese and English interactions. None of the British respondents listed this non-verbal type of time-earning strategy. Their strategies are positive ones, which revitalise the conversation.

If Japanese speakers of English actually utilise these strategies in conversation, they may perplex native speakers of English. Worse, their use may lead to some more serious misunderstanding, with native speakers of English misinterpreting the attitudes of Japanese speakers of English, e.g. as lacking interest in the conversation.

Another strategy (or non-strategy) unique to Japanese respondents in their English interactions is one that quite a few of them (5 respondents) reported: they would do nothing, but wait for their partners to introduce new topics. This seems to coincide with the comment of some of the native speakers of English in my previous survey, which says that Japanese respondents never initiate topics (Murata 1986). Since only one respondent stated that she would use this strategy in Japanese interactions while others specifically stated that they would use them in English interactions, it is not clear whether this originates from lack of confidence in their English proficiency. Some respondents stated that they would do nothing because usually their partner started talking about something. These statements do seem to show a certain tendency in learners, but further research based on actual conversation is also needed to draw any conclusion.
Question B asked what kind of topics the respondents were most likely to bring up in conversation with somebody they had just met. The topics which were listed by several of the NSE respondents include job, weather, where they live/come from, politics, travel and so on. Others include current affairs, special interests, hobbies, sports, music, books, and languages. This choice of topics may reflect the background of the respondents. As mentioned earlier, they were all PGCE students in ESOL Department (a few weeks after they had started the course). All of them had some teaching experience; thus, ‘job’ is an important topic (see Appendix 5-b for a detailed list).

The Japanese respondents were again asked the same question in two different language situations, i.e. in Japanese and in English. In a Japanese-speaking situation, some of the most popular topics were hobbies, each other’s backgrounds, i.e. where they come from, family, weather, work, and school/university life. Of these, the one which did not appear in the NSE’s responses is ‘family’, which in a Japanese speaking situation, was listed by all types of respondents irrespective of their sex or age. This is maintained in their English interaction, where the ‘family’ is still listed as one of the most popular topics, while only one native speaker of English listed it.

Conversely, the topic which was listed frequently by NSEs but which did not attract very much attention in Japanese-Japanese conversation was politics (6 out of 16 NSE listed this topic while only two of 62 Japanese respondents listed this in a Japanese situation). However, the percentage of Japanese respondents who listed politics in their
English interaction rose slightly (4 out of 62): this may have been influenced by their NSE conversational partners, judging from the result of the former two situations.

In English interaction, the popular topics listed by the Japanese respondents were almost the same as those listed in their Japanese interactions: apart from family, hobbies, weather, personal background, i.e., where they come from, were listed as some of the most popular topics. In particular, weather increased drastically in popularity; almost one in three respondents (22 out of 62 Japanese respondents) listed this topic.

Other topics listed by the Japanese respondents in English interaction seem to be characteristic of native - non-native interactions. These include, for example, the culture of both countries, life in Britain and Japan, and languages.

In conclusion, as to the topics preferred after the first encounters there does not seem to be any drastic difference between NSE-NSE and NSJ-NSJ interactions apart from 'family'.

In contrast to Question 8, Question 9 asked what kind of topic we would avoid with somebody whom we have just met. Nearly half of the native speakers of English stated that there were no such topics to be avoided. However, it is difficult to tell whether we should believe this at face value because people might subconsciously avoid certain topics although they might not be aware of it. Specific topics, which
were fairly frequently listed, include politics (7 out of 16) and personal/private topics (5 out of 16) (see Appendix 5-b). This seems to be contradictory to the result of Question 8, where politics was listed as one of the most popular topics. This may be partly explained by the comment of one of the NSE respondents, who listed it as a topic to be avoided in Question 9 but commented that it is all right in a peer group because 'there is a fundamental political air of agreement'.

These two topics were also frequently listed by the Japanese respondents both in Japanese and English interactions. Other topics included were religion, age, academic background. In the case of Japanese-Japanese interactions, some of the respondents listed parents' or husband's job or the name of company as topics to be avoided. In the English interactions, three of the Japanese respondents answered that they would avoid criticism of the partner's country.

The number of Japanese respondents who stated that there were no topics to be avoided was lower than that of native speakers of English (11 out of 62 in Japanese and 14 out of 62 in English interactions). This points to the conclusion that there are more restrictions on topic choice in English situations. However, again more research is needed to draw any conclusion on this matter.

Question 10 in both questionnaires asked what kind of topics they usually talk about in their mother tongues. Among the topics frequently listed by the NSE respondents are politics, current affairs, travel, hobbies & interests, jobs, and friends. There is not a drastic
difference between these answers and those of Question 8. There were three respondents who stated that topics varied according to the person they were talking to (see Appendix 5-b).

This is also true of Japanese interactions: since the respondents are from a wider range of social groups, i.e., students, housewives, and businessmen/women, there is a greater variety of topics listed compared with those mentioned by the NSE respondents. The topics popular among the SOAS respondents were, for example, friends, or school/university life, which reflected their present status as students. The alumni female group tended to list topics such as family, or children's education, while the male respondents from the alumni group listed such topics as 'economics'. It appears that in mother tongue interactions, topics of conversation vary according to the participants although personal interests/hobbies and travelling seem to be popular with all age groups irrespective of sex difference (Appendix 5-b).

A slight difference was observed concerning the topic 'politics': although 9 of 16 NSE respondents listed politics, only 6 out of 62 NSJ respondents did so even in their mother tongue interaction. This may confirm the often-heard comment by NSEs that Japanese people avoid political discussions (see Murata 1986). Does this mean that the Japanese are apolitical?

Question 11 asked the Japanese respondents the same question in their English interaction. The result again does not seem to differ
drastically from that of Question 8. Like the respondents in the Japanese interaction in Question 8, there seem to be topics specific to native - non-native interaction, such as 'about Japan', 'about Britain', and topics related to comparisons between the two cultures (see Appendix 5-b).

In Questions 8-11, I have concentrated on conversational topics. Although the questions were designed to point to tendencies in the respondents towards certain topics, it seems that drawing any conclusion at this stage is impossible.

7.2 THE ANALYSIS OF PART III OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Part III of the questionnaire is not necessarily directly comparable with the data of conversation. As opposed to the features of conversational management, which exist in all conversations, these features may not necessarily be observed in every conversation. They are mostly features of discourse, which are directly related to utterance interpretation. Some are almost formulaic in their nature, but are difficult for non-native speakers of English who are not used to this type of expression to interpret appropriately. The questions have mostly been quoted or modified on the basis of Brown & Levinson's(1978, 1987) politeness features.

Question 1 attempted to examine whether Japanese speakers of English understand what Brown & Levinson(1978, 1987) call 'point of view
operations' as one of the features of positive politeness. According to Brown and Levinson's explanation, the respondents are supposed to choose 'come', which conveys the meaning of 'participation and cooperation' (see 6.2.3.3). The results show that 75% of the Japanese respondents (46 out of 62 respondents) chose 'come' while the answers of the native-speaking control group varied. That is, while 59% (10 out of 17 respondents) chose 'come', 41% (7 out of 17) chose 'go'. Since they are native speakers of English, we may say that their answers are correct. This leaves the possibility that the context given for this expression may not have been well enough defined to obtain the desired answer. However, in Brown & Levinson's (1978, 1987) original version, no contextual explanation was given for this utterance; Question 1 has, in a sense, more contextual information. The fact that even with this extra information the answer of the native-speaking respondents varied could cast doubt on Brown & Levinson's hypothesis; otherwise it could be said that those who chose 'go' were trying to 'convey distance and less participation'. This might be because of the difference between American and British English. However, since no comparison between the two was specifically intended in this research, further comment is not possible in this regard at the moment. Also as the result of the NSE control group varies, we can not make any particular comment on that of the Japanese respondents, although their result coincides more with the explanation by Brown and Levinson.

Question 2 is a discourse-eliciting type of question, in which the respondents were given a context and by reading this they were required
to create an utterance which they thought appropriate in that situation. As explained earlier (see 6.2.3.3), this question was also drawn from one of Brown & Levinson's positive strategies: 'Convey that S and H are cooperators'. The example, which this question is directly related to is:

Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend? (1987: 128)

The situation was set up to examine how many respondents actually utilised this positive politeness in this context. All the native-speaking respondents (except two who did not answer this question) used negative politeness strategies although each varied in degree. Some of the examples of the negative politeness strategies start with the following idiomatic expressions:

Would you mind if I -----?
Do you think I could-----?
Could I possibly-----?
Would there be any chance of-----?
I was wondering if I could-----?
How would you feel if I asked you whether it would be alright if I--?

Two of the least loaded negative politeness strategies are:

Is it O.K. if I -----?
Can I -----?

Thus, nobody utilised positive politeness strategies in this situation (see Appendix 6-a for details).

Most of the Japanese respondents also chose negative politeness strategies although compared to the native-speaking respondents there were more who chose less elaborate polite expressions (see Appendix 6-
a). This may be because they were not accustomed to the various formulaic polite expressions. Besides this, a few less formal expressions of requests were also observed. These were:

(1) I'll look after your flat!
(2) Do you want me to look after your flat while you are away?

These were given by young respondents from SOAS, who might be expected to be less formal. (1) & (2) could be said to be features of positive politeness, conveying that 'S and H are cooperators' (1987: 125). They seem to belong to Brown & Levinson's Strategy 10, 'Offer promise'.

There was another response by a respondent from the alumni group, which seems to belong to this category; it is:

Shall I be on watch?

Thus, although the number is small compared to the whole number of the respondents (3 out of 62), at least some positive strategies were observed while no native speakers of English utilised positive strategies in this context. This may imply that if NSJs utilise less elaborate negative politeness strategies or even positive politeness strategies when NSEs utilise more elaborate negative politeness strategies, NSJs could cause misunderstanding or offense to the NSEs.

In summary, it could be said that although most of the Japanese respondents utilise negative politeness, they seem to be using less elaborate and polite 'negative politeness' strategies compared to their native-speaking counterparts. It seems necessary for JSEs to become familiar with these expressions in the context of their use.
Questions 3 & 4 are examples of understatement. For both questions, the respondents were asked to choose one alternative which they think to be the interpretation of B's utterance.

As to Question 3, according to Brown & Levinson, B's 'Nothing wrong with him' means (I) 'I don't think he's very good', B 'saying less than is required' (1987:217); avoiding giving 'the lower points of the scale' (1987:218). The result of the respondents contradicts this explanation, 88% of the native-speaking respondents (14 out of 17) choosing (3) "I think he's just an ordinary person". Moreover, no native-speaking respondents chose (1). This would invalidate Brown & Levinson's claim. However, we have to be careful to avoid hasty conclusions. The question may lack contextual explanation. It is true that no contextual explanation is given apart from this exchange set itself in the original text. However, it is also true that in the original text of Brown & Levinson no more than this exchange itself was given.

Another possible reason is the arrangement of this question form. In Brown & Levinson's original text, they merely give this exchange and B's interpretation, 'I don't think he's good'; no other alternative is given, whereas in this question two more alternatives are given to make the question closed. Thus, lacking satisfactory contextual information, the respondents may have made a safe choice.

The answer of Japanese respondents follows this tendency of native-speaking respondents. However, one phenomenon to be noted is the fact
that while only 6% (one out of 17) native-speaking respondents chose (2) 'I think he's very good', 26% (16 out of 62) of the JSE respondents chose this answer. It is possible that this choice is also correct depending on the context and the intonation which accompanies B's utterance. However, within the limits of this contextual information, the slight discrepancy between the result of NSE's and that of JSE's shows that some JSEs may have some difficulty in interpreting this type of understatement.

Question 4 also concerns understatement. According to Brown & Levinson, in the following exchange:

A: How do you like Josephine's new hair cut?
B: It's all right. (1987:218)

B means 'I don't particularly like it'. However, the result from the respondents tell a different story. More than eighty percent of the respondents (88% of the NSE respondents and 82% of the JSE respondents) chose (3) 'I don't particularly like it or dislike it'. This again seems to cast doubt on Brown & Levinson's explanation of understatement, because the respondents seem to have chosen the answers at their face value. Again, without more detailed contextual explanation or lacking intonation, the respondents may have chosen the safest and most neutral answer available.

Questions 3 & 4 on understatement have left us with the need for further research, with more contextual information, including intonation. It does not seem plausible to invalidate Brown &
Levinson's hypothesis with these limited data. However, they can at least show us that we cannot easily generalise and theorise about this phenomenon of understatement.

Question 5 is an example of the relationship between FTAs and conversational structure. According to Brown & Levinson, 'in English one shouldn't admit that one is feeling too bad'. Based on this, I set up three different interpretations for the respondents to choose from. Originally, I intended 3) 'I'm not really very well' to be an appropriate answer according to the explanation of the original text.

The result shows that 75% of the NSE respondents (12 out of 17) chose (2), 'I'm fine but I have a little problem' and 69% of the JSEs (42 out of 62) also chose the same interpretation. Only 19% (3 out of 17) of the NSE respondents and 28% of the JSE respondents (17 out of 62) chose 3), 'I'm not really very well'. This phenomenon seems to be similar to those observed in Questions 3 & 4; the respondents tend to choose a literal and neutral interpretation within this text. Another problem is that there is no very clear line between alternatives 2) and 3): their meaning may overlap to a certain extent according to the interpretation of the respondents. We could again say that the interpretation of the FTAs in conversational structure is not as clear-cut as Brown & Levinson think.

Question 6 is another example of understatement, this time combined with 'irony'. According to Brown & Levinson, while 'John's not a friend' can easily be used as an understatement to imply that he's an
enemy' (1987:264, also see 6.2.3.3), 'John's not an enemy' cannot mean that 'John's a friend' because on such an occasion, 'there would be no good motive for not saying it directly' (1987:264). Thus, here it means "John's neither a friend nor an enemy". Therefore, in Question 6, 2) is an appropriate answer. The respondents' responses mostly coincided with the explanation of Brown & Levinson: 88 % of the NSE respondents (14 out of 17) and 77 % of the JSE respondents (47 out of 62) chose 2) as the right interpretation. However, while no NSE respondent chose 1), 'Bill is a friend', 20 % of the JSE respondents (12 out of 62) chose 1). This may be because they interpreted the utterance literally, misinterpreting the use of 'polar opposite of what one means' in an ironic statement. If this result was due to their lack of exposure to this type of ironic understatement, it may be necessary for them to be made aware of these expressions.

Question 7 differs from the previous three question in that it does not deal with interpretation but with the structuring of information. This question, in a very limited way, attempts to discover whether NSE and JSE respondents differ in their way of structuring information. The example originated from the result of the pilot study, where a NSE respondent and a JSE respondent showed a different way of structuring information in their narratives while explaining a similar thing. It was assumed that JSE respondents might use more circumlocution before coming to the point, thus, in this question, starting with 1) and moving to 2).
The result told a different story. That is, 93% of the Japanese respondents (57 out of 62) in fact chose (2), 'It was just by chance', as an appropriate answer; as the starting sentence, while only 56% of the NSE respondents (9 out of 17) chose this alternative. This appears to contradict the result of the pilot study. However, here we may suppose the JSE respondents may have been trying to adjust their answer to 'desirable', i.e. not what they would actually say while the NSE respondents could choose whatever alternatives they like since, being NSEs, they were free of those constraints. Therefore, their different choices simply show their different style of conversation. Here, we need to refer to the actual conversational behaviours of the JSE to examine whether they actually did what they thought they would do.

Lastly, Question 8 in both Questionnaires asked the respondents to list actual examples of miscommunication they had experienced with native speakers of English (JSE Questionnaire) and Japanese speakers of English (NSE Questionnaire). The JSE respondents were asked to list other difficulties which were not dealt with in this questionnaire but which they always faced in communication with native speakers. The full lists of these comments will be available in Appendix 6-b.

As to the comments by the NSE respondents: since there were only two respondents who had actually been in Japan and six more who had taught Japanese learners to varying extents, not many comments were made. The points which were listed by more than two respondents mentioned, for example, the overpoliteness of Japanese speakers and the difficulty of
understanding whether JSE had understood or not. Other problems listed vary and a full listing is given in Appendix 6-b.

From the JSE side, two main types of problems were perceived: one, more linguistically orientated and the other, both linguistically and culturally orientated. The former type of problem involved difficulty in answering negative questions, pronunciation problems, lack of vocabulary and so on. The latter involved difficulties in understanding indirect expressions, in the use of back channels, and in keeping up with the speed of conversation etc (see Appendix 6-b). These comments by the NSE and JSE respondents on Japanese learners' difficulties are mainly used for reference, particularly when analysing conversational data in the following chapter.

7.3 SUMMARY

This chapter has concentrated on the analysis of the questionnaires. The results have revealed certain attitudes and levels of awareness of the respondents in the area of conversational management (Part II) and of various language uses (Part III). The results of Part II are directly related to the further investigation of conversational behaviours in the following chapter. Similarities and differences in attitudes towards conversational management of Japanese and English respondents observed via the questionnaires will be further examined and will be contrasted in the analysis of the recorded data to explore whether there is any discrepancy between the awareness of the
respondents and their actual behaviours. Part III dealt more with questions related to acceptability in communication, mostly on the basis of the notions of 'positive' and 'negative' politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987). This is because 'acceptability' is another important aspect of communication along with 'accessibility', to which conversational management is related, and is closely related to the notion of strategic capacity as well. The results of Part III do not necessarily validate Brown and Levinson's claim, judging from the variety of the native speakers' answers. Further investigation concerning the types of questions dealt with in Part III seems vital.

It also has to be borne in mind that the results of Part III are not to be directly compared with the recorded data. However, the questions have been included in order to cover a wider area of pragmatic phenomena than might be observed in the actual recorded data.
CHAPTER 8 DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

8.0 THE FOCUS OF ANALYSIS

In examining learner needs for communication in Chapter 2, I stressed the importance of the notion of strategic capacity. This may be observed in the use of communicative conventions, particularly at Transition Relevance Places (TRPs) (Sacks et al. 1974). Communicative conventions are considered to be signals for conversational management and include paralinguistic and prosodic features such as intonation, pitch, amplitude, pacing, rate of speech, pausing, and rate of turn-taking. They are, at the same time, cultural conventions in that the activation of these features may vary cross-culturally. The study of communicative conventions therefore integrates the study of both language and culture in communication as discussed in Chapter 3. It also involves the notions of 'accessibility' and 'acceptability'. Communicative conventions are basically conventions for 'accessibility' in that they are signals for conversational management. However, they are also deeply related to 'acceptability' in that their use is culture-specific. For example, conventions which are accessible and acceptable in one culture might be inaccessible and unacceptable in another.

From the above perspective, the study of communicative conventions satisfies the points raised in the foregoing chapters (Chapters 2 & 3). At the same time the description and analysis of these conventions necessitate the utilization of the frameworks of both DA and CNA,
because these are observed most notably at TRPs or topic boundaries. Therefore, I shall start this chapter with the discussion of an operational definition of topic boundaries, where various communicative conventions are most frequently observed, expanding on the preceding discussion of topic boundaries (see 4.3.4.4.1). I shall then move on to discuss some examples of communicative conventions, including pause/silence, overlapping, interruption and repetition.

8.1 THE PROCEDURES FOR ANALYSIS

8.1.1 Identification of Topic Boundaries

In examining various definitions of topic previously, I noted that the identification of topic boundaries is a difficult task. There does not yet seem to be a single satisfactory definition. Having said that, in this section I would like to formulate an operational definition of topic and topic boundaries for the purpose of the analysis.

To identify TRPs or topic boundaries, discourse analysts have introduced the concept of discourse markers (see Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). However, TRPs and topic boundaries are signalled in more complicated ways (see Gumperz 1984). Also TRPs do not necessarily coincide with topic boundaries. Topic boundaries sometimes consist of several TRPs if we define them not according to linguistic-structural units of exchange level systems such as IR(F), as most discourse analysts do, but according to the larger units of what Labov
and Fanshel (1977) call 'episodes', which are 'based on a radical shift in the overt topic or reference of the conversation' (1977).

In the following section, different ways of identifying topic boundaries will be discussed in more detail and particular attention will be given to contextualization cues (Gumperz 1982a).

8.1.1.1 Sequence-Transaction

Discourse analysts mostly concentrate on exchange structures, as Stubbs (1981) points out, stating that 'the concept of exchange' 'seems most amenable to linguistic-structural analysis' (1981: 109). From the perspective of identifying topic boundaries, where most topic changes take place, the identification of an exchange structure, which is represented by the structure of IR(F), is not satisfactory, since the end of one exchange does not necessarily signify the place of topic change or shift. Nor does the concept of 'adjacency pair' solve this problem. As has been widely claimed, 'the concept of exchange is primarily applicable to relatively formal situations in which a central aim is to formulate and transmit pieces of information' (Stubbs 1981: 119), whereas the purpose of casual conversation is more to establish rapport than to transmit information (see Aston 1989).

Therefore, we need to look at a higher level in the organizational scale. In reference to classroom discourse structure, Coulthard, Montgomery and Brazil (1981) propose transactions as 'co-terminous with topic boundaries' (1981: 16). They regard transactions as an 'unordered series of teaching exchanges, preceded and optionally followed by a
boundary exchange' (1981:27) and further note the existence of an additional structure between exchange and transaction (1981:27). They call this a 'sequence'.

They claim two ways of identifying sequence boundaries: one, negatively, by breaks in surface cohesion' (1981:28) and another, positively, by 'several positive boundary markers' of which, in the specific situation of data from committee meetings, they identify the three most common types of preface. Although I shall not try to explain the details of these prefaces, the important point here is that we may also find in this research the same types of indicators as the markers of topic boundaries.

Coulthard, Montgomery and Brazil (1981) admit that they had come to identify these indicators partly by intuition (1981:28-9), but they introduce some cohesive features which seem to 'be associated with the unit sequence'. They are as follows:

(1) Lexico-referential cohesion: i.e. repetition of 'content' words as opposed to grammatical words. Repetition of phrases or longer strings of words makes for more obvious cohesion, because it is one type of syntactic parallelism (see 6 below)
(2) Occurrence of synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and words from the same semantic field (e.g. numerals, or different forms of a single root word).
(3) Anaphora.
(4) Ellipsis and expansion, i.e. utterances which, by definition, are non-initial.
(5) Sentence-continuations and completions.
(6) Parallelism of syntax and intonation.
(7) Logical connectors. (Coulthard, Montgomery and Brazil 1981: 29)

They further claim that it is 'even possible to isolate sequences
mechanically from the data using only such surface cues as these' (1981:29).

However, here we have to remember that topic shift can take place even with the existence of cohesive markers as discussed in Chapter 4 (see 4.3.4.4.2). Thus, we must bear in mind that we cannot depend solely on 'breaks in surface cohesion', when defining topic boundaries. Although Coulthard et al (1981) point out the co-occurrence of the 'positive boundary markers' with this phenomenon of 'breaks in surface', topic shift may also take place without any 'breaks in surface structures' or the 'positive boundary markers'. This phenomenon is actually exemplified in the data for this research: coherence does not necessarily coincide with cohesive links nor is it necessarily marked by boundary markers.

Exchange structure then does not necessarily help to identify topic boundaries since it is often the case that a topic continues over a single exchange structure. Therefore, the concept of 'sequence structure' as an intermediate level to bridge the gap between exchange and transaction seems plausible and could be identified with topic structure. In the present research, the same ways of identifying sequence boundaries will be utilised for the identification of topic boundaries. However, as noted above, apart from the two ways of identifying boundaries suggested by Coulthard et al (1981), we also have to take into consideration the occurrence of topic shift without any specific breaks in cohesive links or any boundary markers.
This unit of topic division would seem to parallel the division by 'episode', which was introduced by Labov & Fanshel (1977).

8.1.1.2 Episode and Subepisode

Labov and Fanshel (1977) in interpreting a 15 minute-long therapeutic interview, introduce the unit of 'episode', which they define as 'based on radical shifts in the overt topic or reference of the conversation' (1977:38). They go on to say that episodes 'simply provide the gross framework in which the interaction takes place'. However, they provide no more explanation of how these radical topic shifts are identified. In fact, their unit of episode resembles the concept of 'transaction', although transaction in a hierarchical rank organization comes at the second level of the hierarchy, while 'episode' for Labov and Fanshel is the largest unit they have identified.

It might be worth mentioning that Chafe (1979) also introduces the notion of 'episode' in his 'hierarchical model for the verbalization of recalled experience'. He equates 'episodes' in spoken language with 'paragraphs' in written language, stating that they are identifiable 'through the occurrence of major hesitations' (1979:162). This definition of 'episodes' seems at least a step forward from that of Labov & Fanshel (1977), who do not provide any specific clue as to the ways in which to identify an 'episode'. I shall refer to the phenomenon of these 'major hesitations' in the analysis of the recorded data (see 8.2.1.1).
Labov and Fanshel (1977) also introduce the unit of 'subepisode', again without any means of identification. Their purpose in introducing units is to 'locate units manageable enough to be subjected to analysis' (1977:38), but they are not interested in the problem of segmentation, pointing out the arbitrary nature of the decisions of segmentation. This also applies to the present research to some extent. That is, although it seeks a way of identifying topic boundaries, its main purpose is not to establish a rigid set of rank scale categories on the basis of linguistic structural analysis. Therefore, although Labov and Fanshel's division appears to be too general, it may still be applicable to the present study. Thus, the unit of 'subepisode' will also be utilised as a subtopic for an operational purpose, especially when a slight topic shift has taken place within a topic boundary.

However, the above two definitions of 'topic' do depend on intuition. In order to introduce a certain objectivity, an emic view will also be introduced by asking some of the participants to divide interactions into units of topic. Although this may also be subjective, at least it allows the incorporation of a participant's view into the analyst's etic view.

8.1.1.3 Summary

An operational definition of topic boundaries in this research will be carried out by referring to several criteria. First, a conversational interaction will be divided into topics based on the general notion of topic: 'what is being talked about' (Brown & Yule 1983) or according to
'radical shifts in the overt topic or reference of the conversation' (Labov & Fanshel 1977:38). In addition to that, the unit of subtopic will also be introduced, when a slight topic shift is observed within a topic boundary. This is based on Labov & Fanshel's 'subepisode'. However, in doing so, special attention will be paid to the coherence and cohesion of topic development. Cohesive links will receive special attention in finding topic boundaries although we have to bear in mind that topic shift is possible even without any 'breaks in cohesive links'. Secondly, all the frequent topic boundary indicators will be listed and those with high frequency will be examined in particular detail. Finally, an emic view will be introduced to make the analysis a little more objective and to include a participant's perspective. I shall now investigate some features of communicative conventions which were salient at topic boundaries in the data.

8.2 OBSERVATION OF TOPIC BOUNDARIES

This section concentrates on the data. In so doing, I shall first focus attention on communicative conventions utilised at topic boundaries and then some salient features will be observed in detail. They are also discussed in terms of the value differences attached to the frequent use of certain features. In particular, I will discuss extensively how they are interpreted from the perspective of the 'territorial' or the 'cooperative' imperative (Widdowson 1983) or 'solidarity' or 'deference' (Scollon & Scollon 1983).
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8.2.1 Discourse Cues Used at Topic Boundaries

The topic boundaries in both NSE-NSE and NSJ-NSJ interactions were identified in the manner explained in the previous sections for operational purposes. In the process of analysis, it emerged that there are certain features which are frequently observed at topic boundaries. They are pause/silence, overlapping, interruption, repetition, laughter, and so on. Some features are more salient than others.

8.2.1.1 Pause/ Silence

This is a feature which has revealed a certain difference in the NSE-NSE and the NSJ-NSJ interactions in the pilot study. That is, the topic boundaries of the Japanese versions are marked more frequently with the presence of pauses than the two English versions (see 6.1.2.2). Moreover, the difference is not only in the frequency of occurrence but also in the length of pauses.

8.2.1.1.1 The Frequency of Pause

All the seven NSJ-NSJ interactions are marked by the existence of at least one pause on average at a topic or subtopic boundary in their interactions. The rate of incidence of pause at boundaries in each interaction can be illustrated as follows:
Table 8.1: Frequency of Pause in the NSJ-NSJ Interactions

As can be seen from the table, nearly half of the topic or subtopic boundaries of more than half of the interactions were marked by pause (Conversations 2', 3', 4', 5'). Moreover, pauses are usually accompanied by some other kind of boundaries, which together with pause constitute 'hesitation phenomena' (Chafe 1979) at topic boundaries.

Although it is difficult to calculate the average length of pause exactly, it is still possible to obtain a certain indication as to how long a pause is. In the NSJ-NSJ interactions it was 1.3 seconds, without including hesitation phenomena.

This length of pause, 1.3 seconds, falls into the category of what Brown & Yule call 'long pauses' (1983:162-3). However, their definition of the length is based on a contrived one-way information transfer task; moreover, they include all the pauses which occurred in the course of the task, not necessarily concentrating on the pauses which appear at boundaries. They claim that 'extended and long pauses might be proposed as unit boundaries' (1983:163). According to them, extended pauses 'extend from between 3.2 to 16 seconds' (1983:162) and 'occur at points where the speaker has provided sufficient information.
for the hearer to draw or write what has been described' (1983:162).

In natural conversation, it is unlikely that extended pauses appear regularly at unit or topic boundaries. Since Brown & Yule's (1983) experiment involves a certain task to be achieved while the interaction is taking place, there may be more extended pauses and also long pauses, 'which range from 1.0-1.9 seconds' (1983:162). They propose that short pauses should be regarded as 'unit internal'.

According to Brown & Yule's (1983) definition, the pauses observed at topic boundaries in the NSJ-NSJ interactions mostly fall into the category of long pauses, except for some prolonged hesitation phenomena which combine some long pauses together in between expressions like 'Uhm's and 'ah's at a boundary.

Chafe (1979), in explaining the role of pauses in narratives, calls these phenomena 'major hesitations' (1979:162). He observes a major hesitation in the following extract:

'And as he's holding onto the handlebars he takes off with them. (1.1) Um---(.7) then (.4) uh---(2.1) a girl--- on a bicycle, (1 15) comes rthing towards him, ... in the opposite direction.' (1979:162)

and goes on to explain as follows:

Um--and uh-- are lengthened pronunciations of those "pause fillers." The total amount of time spent hesitating between the end of the first sentence and the beginning of 'a girl on a bicycle' was 6.25 sec. We have here clear evidence of some important and time-consuming mental processing.

(Chafe 1979 162)

In the light of this, consider the following example:

[Example 1]
168 N: dakara jibun no yaritai koto o yatte soide dekitara kaeritai natte omoun desu kedo ne

169 H: Uhm Uhm(1.4) so desu ka(1.8) ah(1.4) ja muko ichinen mata ninen gurai kakari masu kashira

170 N: so desu ne:

171 H: ne: uh: m

172 N: Uh: m(2.0)

173 H: (so desu ka)---so iu imi dewa ano nante iu ka imamade ohanashi o ukagatta katagata mo so desu kedo eigo de iroiro na koto o benkyo dekiru desho imano ko: su ha---

(Extract from Conversation 2')

168 N: - so I'd like to go back(to Japan) after I have completed what I want to do-

169 H: uhm uhm(1.4) Is that so?(1.8) ah(1.4) Then, it will take another year or two, won't it)

170 N: probably, ye:: s

171 H: Won't it, yes

172 N: uh: m(2.0)

173 H: (Well then?)---in that sense, you could study various subjects in English as other people on your course do---

(Extract from Conversation 2' translated by the present writer)

Here, hesitations in 169, that is, 'Uhm's and 'so desu ka' (Is that so?) combined with two pauses appear to be similar to what Chafe calls, "pause fillers". According to him, this means 'evidence of some important and time-consuming mental processing'. Here, after N's remark that she would like to stay in Britain until she finishes her study, H first shows her acknowledgement by saying 'uhm uhm' twice, followed by 1.4 seconds of pause. Then she acknowledges again by saying 'so desu ka' (Is that so?), followed by 1.8 seconds' pause and then by 1.4 seconds' pause after 'ah'. Eventually after 'ja' (then), she presents a prospective new topic. However, this is more a
summarization of what N said previously rather than the presentation of a brand new topic. Therefore, H does not succeed in eliciting talk from N. N just agrees with what H says by answering 'so desu ne:::' (Perhaps, yes) with elongated pronunciation of 'e'. H, by overlapping N's final 'ne:::', seems to be showing some kind of solidarity on her part. However, even here, H waits for N's next response and when she is sure that N has no intention of presenting her own new topic, hesitantly starts formulating her topic from a different perspective, after producing another 'so desu ka' (well then?).

The prolonged process of the turn-taking also explains the face-saving which seems to be working in this case. That is to say, both interactants seem to be paying more respect to the 'territorial imperative', by taking time so as not to threaten each other's face by hasty turn-taking. The prolonged hesitations before a new topic show a great contrast to the kind of turn-taking characterised by what Tannen (1981) calls a 'machine-gun' question, which 'is spoken at a rapid rate and is timed to come either as an overlap or a latch' (1981:387), and which seems to defer more to the 'co-operative imperative' (Widdowson 1983) or 'involvement' (Tannen 1984a).

These hesitation phenomena were observed frequently at topic boundaries of Japanese interactions. However, here it has to be borne in mind that while Chafe's 'major hesitations' occur in the context of narratives, in the present study they occur in dyadic face-to-face interactions. Another point to be made here is that the phenomena have been observed to be taking place over exchanges between the two
participants, not limited to an utterance of one person. That is, both conversational participants formulate hesitation phenomena as a kind of co-operative work between the two at topic boundaries.

No hesitation phenomena have been observed in the NSE-NSE interactions. Moreover, the number of topic boundaries marked with pauses was very small. In fact, of the two NSE-NSE interactions, one has only one topic boundary marked by a 0.9 second pause out of nine topics. This pause marks a big topic change within an utterance by the same person as can be seen in the following:

[Example 2]

94 Su: =programme at all to use it]  Yes] and err ] not too bad (then---)
95 Sa: Oh gosh(0.9) I don't know( I haven't- I haven't) being in London is- is quite strange actually shopping- so expensive=
96 Su: Uhm
95'Sa: =at the moment (Extract from Conversation 8)

Here, in 94, Su is talking about the use of the computer for her research. They have been talking on this topic for some time now and the topic is becoming more specialised. For some time Su has been explaining her research to Sa. In 95, Sa actually cuts in Su’s explanation when Su is hesitating, saying ‘er’ to find the next word. Here, after acknowledging what Su has said, Sa holds the floor, murmuring something, and then saying 'Oh gosh' as if this is a trigger for a change of topic. After this remark, a 0.9 second pause follows and then with a little hesitation in search of words or phrases, she repeats some phrases and then moves on to a new topic. All these have been mentioned in a very quick tempo. Apart from this pause at a very
noticeable topic boundary, no pause is detected either at nine topic boundaries or at 26 subtopic boundaries.

In another NSE-NSE interaction, a very short pause (0.5) at a topic boundary and a 0.9 second pause at a subtopic boundary are only two of the pauses found among a total of ten topic and 23 subtopic boundaries. But these two pauses appeared at a very early phase in the interaction when the two interactants were still introducing themselves and trying to establish common ground.

Judging from these two NSE-NSE interactions and the pilot study, we may say that in NSE-NSE interactions, the existence of pauses at topic boundaries are far fewer than that of NSJ-NSJ interactions and that the average length of pause itself is shorter.

Concerning the different results of pause phenomena in the NSJ-NSJ and the NSE-NSE interactions, there may exist different attitudes towards pauses in both cultures; one trying to avoid them, while the other being relatively tolerant of them. This could be related to the notions of the 'co-operative' and 'territorial' imperative: one showing more respect for the former and the other for the latter. Thus, the value system towards pauses in conversational interactions could be said to be different. It is worth noting here that in Japan the concept of 'ma' (space) has a very important meaning. 'Ma o toru' could literally mean 'take enough space between two people or things', although nowadays it is increasingly used to mean 'take an appropriate length of pause between utterances'. It is important to have a certain
'ma' in Japanese conversation and it is even encouraged to take 'ma' (pause). People who do not take enough 'ma' are often told to take more 'ma'. Therefore, in Japanese, 'ma o toru' (have a pause) is a positive concept, whereas in English it does not seem to be appreciated to have pauses between utterances. Moreover, the existence of pauses in conversation tends to be judged negatively. This seems to be an example of the ways in which the same feature is valued differently across cultures.

Avoidance of pauses may take place mostly by the fast method of turn-taking (as with Tannen's 'machine-gun question'), sometimes even resulting in overlapping and interruption. Some kind of repetition also seems to be used to avoid pauses. These particular features, overlapping, interruption, and repetition will be discussed later as examples of features at boundaries. Meanwhile, I shall now examine differences of frequency and length of pause in the interactions.

The frequency of pause per topic and subtopic is as follows in comparison with that in the NSJ-NSJ interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation number</th>
<th>1 (R&amp;S)</th>
<th>2 (N&amp;S)</th>
<th>3 (M&amp;D)</th>
<th>4 (F&amp;D)</th>
<th>5 (A&amp;S)</th>
<th>6 (H&amp;S)</th>
<th>7 (speakers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occurrence of pause/</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>3(5)</td>
<td>7(2)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>2(0)</td>
<td>0(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of topics</td>
<td>7(7)</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>8(7)</td>
<td>9(4)</td>
<td>7(5)</td>
<td>10(7)</td>
<td>7(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occurrence of pause/</td>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>8(6)</td>
<td>4(7)</td>
<td>10(7)</td>
<td>7(5)</td>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>2(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of subtopics</td>
<td>15(12)</td>
<td>14(13)</td>
<td>18(14)</td>
<td>18(9)</td>
<td>13(12)</td>
<td>14(14)</td>
<td>11(15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- the results of NSJ-NSJ interactions

Table 8.2: The Frequency of Pause in the NSE-JSE Interactions
The result shows that four out of six Japanese respondents actually increased the number of pauses at topic boundaries compared to that in Japanese interactions. Even at subtopic-level boundaries, half of them increased the use of pauses.

This is significant, bearing in mind the fact that the NSE-NSE interactions showed very little occurrence of pause, and considering the fact that the Japanese speakers of English increased the number of pauses in English interactions, widening the gap with the NSE interactions.

In the questionnaire, the Japanese speakers' tolerance towards silence in conversation remains almost the same in their English interaction. Therefore, the results of the questionnaire and the recorded data do not seem to contradict each other very much. The increase of the occurrence of pauses at topic boundaries in the NSE-JSE interactions, then, appears to be due to the lack of language proficiency. However, language proficiency again does not seem to be the sole reason for the increase in pauses. This is because the two Japanese subjects who conversely decreased the occurrence of pause do not necessarily have high language proficiency compared to other participants. In fact, in terms of proficiency level, one is the lowest of the seven participants, being at an early intermediate and the other, being at an intermediate level.
A characteristic common to these two subjects is that they utilise overlapping quite often compared to other Japanese subjects who rarely do so. For example, on three occasions, E succeeded in taking turns and changing topics by virtually interrupting her native-speaking conversational partner as follows:

[Example 3]

22 S: -----which is er perhaps an abbreviation of (     )  
→23 E: LWh-what's your name?  
(Extract from Conversation 7)

By using this interruption strategy, E manages to achieve no pause at topic boundaries and even including subtopic boundaries, there are only two occurrences of pause in her English interaction. Therefore, in terms of the frequency of pause, her style is nearer to that of NSEs.

It is worth mentioning here that E has a tendency to overlap even in her Japanese conversational interaction although overlapping usually takes place towards the very end of her partner's utterance as in the following:

[Example 4]

106 H: =jibun mo dokidoki suru desho(You feel excited, don't you?)  
→107 E: te iu ka watashi nan ka demo ko watashi wa juhassai nan desu kedo  
(Or what shall I say I am- well- I am 18 years old---)  
(Extract from Conversation 7')

Thus, it might be the case that E's conversational style in terms of rate of turn-taking is fast compared to that of other Japanese subjects. Therefore, the occurrence of the pauses in the English interaction might not only be a case of adjustment to English
conversational style on E’s part. However, it is also conceivable that since E is the youngest of all the subjects (18 years old), she is quicker to adjust naturally to the conversational style of the target language. Further research on acquisition of this feature is necessary before any conclusion can be drawn.

I have so far concentrated on discussing the frequency of the occurrence of pause in the NSE-JSE interactions. I shall now compare the length of pause in Japanese and English interactions.

8.2.1.1.2 The Length of Pause
The average length of pause observed at topic boundaries in the NSE-JSE interactions is 1.4 seconds. This is just 0.1 second's increase from that of their Japanese interactions; therefore, the Japanese speakers of English seem to maintain the same behaviour towards the length of pause even in their English interaction. Thus, it emerged that the Japanese subjects maintain almost the same behaviours towards pause in terms of both its frequency of occurrence and its length in their English interaction. These results mostly coincide with the result of the questionnaire.

The data also show how people's perception of the length of silence differs from the actual length of time they feel uneasy since, as discussed before, the average length of silence the respondents reported in the questionnaire is more than ten times longer than that of the actual length observed in the recorded data.
However, the most important feature which emerged is the difference in the length and the frequency of pause between the NSE-NSE and the NSJ-NSJ interactions, which suggests a certain difference between the conversational style of NSEs and that of NSJs. Moreover, it has been noted that NSJs tend to maintain this style in their English interactions. The difference is significant for two reasons: first, this feature seems to be automatically controlled, being formulated in the process of language acquisition in a particular cultural climate. Thus, once a certain style is established, it will work almost subconsciously on all occasions. For example, even if people switch code and speak a different language, it is most likely that the conversational style remains the same as that of their mother tongue. Moreover, people are usually not aware of the fact that there are differences in conversational styles. Thus, any difference from their own conversational style tends to be associated with the partner's 'ability' or 'personality' (see Tannen 1985a:101). This relates to the second point. That is, this difference in conversational style could reflect the particular value system of that society.

Tannen(1985a), for example, in an article on the study of silence, states that silence can be interpreted with the binary distinction of positive and negative politeness (Brown & Levinson 1978 and 1987); or 'presentational' and 'avoidance rituals' (Goffman:1967) or Lakoff's(1979) 'command' and 'deference'. It has a 'positive value as a way of securing negative politeness', 'not imposing on others' (1985a:98). Tannen goes on to say that this tendency is 'unmarked' in
cultures which may be characterised as relatively "silent" (1985a: 98) such as Finns and Athabaskan and Warm Springs Indians.

Silence can also have a 'negative value when it is seen as the failure of positive politeness—the need to be involved with others' (1985a: 98) and this tendency is 'unmarked' in cultures which may be characterised as relatively "noisy" such as Italians, the Igbo, and New York Jews' (1985a: 98).

Silence/pause can also be discussed in terms of the 'territorial' and 'co-operative imperative' (Widdowson 1983). That is, pause/silence might be received relatively positively in a society where people pay more attention to 'territorial imperative', respecting a conversational partner's territory by leaving a certain pause at topic boundaries and by not imposing on their partners. On the other hand, in a society where 'co-operative imperative' is thought to be more important than 'territorial imperative', the presence of silence/pause in conversational interaction could be judged negatively, for example, as a lack of interest or involvement or cooperation on the part of a conversational partner.

Thus, the difference in the value placed on pause/silence in conversational interaction in different cultures could cause serious misunderstandings.
8.2.1.2 Overlap

8.2.1.2.1 Two Types of Overlap: Turn-competing and Response Oriented

I have discussed 'overlapping' briefly in 4.3.4.1.1 in relation to Sacks et al (1974) regarding turn-taking rules. In this section, I should like to develop the discussion further and classify overlap in preparation for the description of the empirical data. It has been noted that overlaps take place in relation to Rule 1(b) of Sacks et al (see 4.3.4.1.1) 'by competing self-selectors for a next turn, when each projects his start to be the earliest possible start at some possible transition relevance place, producing simultaneous starts' (Sacks et al 1974:706-7) as follows:

J: Twelve pounds I think wasn't it. =
D: =?Can you believe it?
L: Twelve pounds on the Weight Watchers' scale.

I would call this type of overlap by simultaneous starts a turn-competing overlap and would argue that it takes place not only in relation to Rule 1(b) but also to Rule 1(c) (see 4.3.4.1) if we also consider dyadic conversational interaction. That is, assuming that conversational interaction is reciprocal, if, at a TRP, the partner for some reason is late to take a turn, the present speaker may continue or present a new topic and this may take place simultaneously with the partner's delayed response.

In contrast to turn-competing overlap, I would call the second type of overlap 'response-oriented'; this is again subdivided into two; misprojection and back-channel overlap. It is characterised by quick
response and involvement of conversational partners. Sacks et al. (1974) list 'the projectability of possible completion or transition-relevance places' (1974:707) as another cause of overlap as in the following examples:

(4) A: Well if you knew my argument why did you bother to ask
B: Because I'd like to defend my argument

(Sacks et al 1974: 707)

They also list the use of such features as 'terms of address and etiquette' which can specifically go after the first possible completion, without intending continuation (1974:707) as a possible cause of overlaps. The examples are as follows:

(10) P: Yeh alright dear
J: Okay

(Sacks et al 1974:708)

I would call these overlaps misprojection overlaps. Another type of response-oriented overlap is back-channel overlap. This is a type of overlap which simulates the role of back-channel as follows:

[Example 5]

200 M: And since it's very difficult to plan and every time you want to turn right you can't turn right
201 S: Oh terrible
202 M: =to turn right you can't turn right

(Extract from Conversation 9)

Here, S's 'oh terrible' is a response to M's utterance and shows her listenership or involvement in the conversation; however, she does not have any intention of changing topics or gaining the conversational floor. She simply shows her sympathy towards the utterance. Therefore, I shall call this type of overlap 'back-channel' overlap.
Both misprojection and back-channel types of response-oriented overlap can therefore be seen as 'co-operative' as compared with 'turn-competing' which is 'intrusive'.

8.2.1.2.2 Overlap in the Data

On the whole, what I have named 'turn-competing overlap' occurred only in a NSE-JSE interaction in the present data.

[Example 6]

23 D: Oh yes I lived there for some time
24 S: ha-ha
25 D: Uh...
26 S: (1.5) Ah so you know— where Nagoya University actually is

→27 D: \textbf{But---(} \texttt{oh yes but it takes about er one hour on the train from Kyoto ( Extract from Conversation 4)}

As shown in the above, it is a very short overlap and takes place after a long pause of 1.5 seconds. S starts slightly earlier, but D soon starts and then quickly drops out, waiting for the next TRP, where he slightly overlaps again because of misprojection.

The small occurrence of turn-competing overlap in the data is due to the fact that all the data come from dyadic conversation; thus, although I claimed earlier that this type of overlap takes place not only in relation to Rule 1(b) of Sacks et al (1974) but also to Rule 1(c) (see 4.3.4.1), it seems that it is more frequent in relation to the former.

However, the above example proves that overlaps take place also in relation to Rule 1(c), since the above overlap occurs when S is late to
take his turn. D, after waiting for S's start for some time, tries to take his turn again although he has just finished his major turn in 23. It appears that when turn-competing overlaps take place in a dyadic conversation, a certain kind of pause tends to occur before an overlap.

As to response-oriented overlap, misprojection overlaps occur more frequently in all three different interactions. In the NSE-NSE interactions, an average of 5.5 misprojection overlaps per conversation occur while in the NSJ-NSJ interaction an average of 2.9 take place. This result is noteworthy in that it clearly indicates that overlaps do take place in NSJ-NSJ interactions though the number of occurrences is small. This fact is often little observed or discussed.

It is also noteworthy that the average occurrence of overlaps in NSE-JSE interaction is almost the same as that in NSJ-NSJ interaction, scoring 3.0 overlaps per conversation. If we simply analyse this result, we could say that it indicates that the Japanese subjects show the same tendency to overlapping behaviour in their English interactions as in their Japanese-Japanese interactions. However, it is clear that the comparison becomes more complex, if we consider the variation which arises from the individual differences of conversational partners.

If we examine each interaction in detail, the same tendency can be seen at an individual level as well. For example, those who seem to overlap in Japanese interactions tend to overlap in their English interactions also (see Conversations 1 and 7 in Appendix 9). However, there are
exceptions. For example, in the case of Conversation 2, although N overlaps quite often in the Japanese interaction, no misprojection overlap is detected in her English interaction. The opposite is also observed. That is, in Conversation 3, M does not overlap at all in the Japanese interaction, although his Japanese conversational partner does overlap once, whereas in English interaction, M overlaps three times. We could say, therefore, overlap does not just result from transfer of mother-tongue interaction patterns to those of the target-language. Various other factors such as overgeneralization of target conversational interaction seem to exist here.

Also the occurrence of misprojection overlaps does not coincide with the language proficiency level of the subjects. This is because those who tend to use overlaps relatively frequently in the NSE-JSE interaction are not necessarily proficient speakers, for example, H in Conversation 7 is at an early intermediate level and M in Conversation 7 is at an intermediate level. Yet, those who utilise more misprojection overlaps appear superficially to be more fluent. This might be because the frequent use of misprojection overlaps seems to be one of the features of English conversational patterns.

A relatively frequent occurrence of misprojection overlap in Japanese interaction takes place mostly when the Japanese equivalent of English tag question occurs as follows:

[Example 7]

106 H: jibun mo dokidoki suru desho (You feel excited, don't you?)
107 E: ite iu ka watashi nan ka demo ko watashi wa juhassai nan desu kedo
(Or what shall I say I am— well— I am 18 years old—)

(Extract from Conversation 7)

[Example 8]

173 E: onna no hito no ho ga ooi desho (There are more female students, aren't there?)

174 H: ooi desu ne mite iruto (Yes, according to my observation)

(Extract from Conversation 7')

As can be observed in the above examples, most other overlaps appear towards the end of an utterance, after the utterance is marked with an end marker such as 'desho'. Or they appear in the middle of an utterance where the rest of the utterance can be omitted because the meaning is clear as can be seen in the following example.

[Example 9]

60 K: nan no oshigoto o (nasatte itan desu ka)

61 H: watashi wa ano chugaku de- to-tokyo den=

(60'K: what kind of job did you do?)
(61'H: I— well (teach) at a secondary school in To-Tokyo)

(Extract from Conversation 6')

Here, it is quite common in Japanese discourse that a speaker ends the question after 'nan no oshigoto o' (what kind of job), making it sound more indirect; thus, more polite rather than asking directly in a full sentence. The conversational partner understands the intention of the speaker clearly after the first half of the utterance, and thus, cuts in in the middle. Although this might appear as interruptive in the middle of utterances, it could be considered to have taken place in another type of TRP. This is because both parties know that overlaps are allowed in these situations.
In NSE-NSE interaction, the same kind of overlap through the misprojection of a tag question takes place, for example, as follows:

[Example 10]

116-8 M: I think SOAS is opposite, isn't it? and then--- UCL is to the —-119 S: 
                        [Yes it's through that bit
                        (Extract from Conversation 9)

Here, after M's 'isn't it', S starts talking, assuming that M's turn has finished; however, M continues her talk by using a conjunction 'and'; thus, an overlap results. Just as was observed in the Japanese interaction, misprojection overlaps also take place in NSE interactions where the rest of the meaning is clear without listening to the end as follows:

[Example 11]

139 S: It's King's Cross station —140 M: 
                     [Yeah— yeah no I don't think Euston Station is quite
                     (Extract from Conversation 9)

Here, it is clear for M when she hears King's Cross that it means the station; thus, without listening to the end, she overlaps. However, it is sometimes difficult to demarcate exactly between a misprojection and turn-competing overlap as follows:

[Example 12]

255 Su: and I found that they just don't do that=
256 Sa: Uhm
257 Su: =unless they— you know— want to sell you something or buy something off you— but — they didn't— no I think the Moscow—
         —258 Sa: [But then—
259 Su: If you actually get to know them as individuals— uhm— then they're very friendly
               (Extract from Conversation 8)
Here, observing that Sa starts talking after Su's 'they didn't', we could regard this as a misprojection overlap. However, it is also possible to think that this is also a kind of turn-competing overlap, considering that Su self-selects her turn after the completion of her utterance in 257, judging that Sa is not taking her turn after a very short pause, thus, continuing her talk. On the other hand, Sa, after starting her utterance with a brief overlap, realises that Su has not finished her utterance yet and immediately withdraws, whereas Su, on her part, realising that Sa has something to say, stops; however, by that time Sa had also already withdrawn; thus, Su starts her utterance again in 259.

Thus, although it is sometimes difficult to demarcate between misprojection and turn-competing overlaps, the former seem to be the most frequent types of overlap in both NSE-NSE and NSJ-NSJ interactions.

The occurrence of another type of response-oriented overlap, i.e. back-channel overlap, is also frequent in NSE-NSE interactions, scoring an average occurrence of 3.5 overlaps per interaction. However, it needs to be noted that most of the back-channel overlaps which were introduced into NSE interactions were made by the fixed conversational partner Sa and only one occurrence was introduced by Su. Although the number of interactions examined is too small to draw any definite conclusion, it may be the case that the occurrence of back-channel overlaps depends very much on the conversational style of individuals.
The occurrence of back-channel overlap is very small in both NSJ-NSJ and NSE-JSE interactions, the former scoring 0.6 and the latter, 0.3 per interaction. Moreover, as mentioned in relation to the NSE-NSE interaction, here again there seem to be individual differences in the use of these overlaps, since they occurred only in two different interactions in the NSJ-NSJ interactions and one in the NSE-JSE interactions. In addition to this, one Japanese subject utilised this back-channel overlap in both her Japanese and English interactions. To give an example from her Japanese interaction:

[Example 13]

74 H: eeh sono kata mo [onna no kata datta to omoi masu kere do
75 N: [ah so desu ka

(74' H: I think that was a female teacher as well)
(75' N: [Is that so?)

(Extract from Conversation 2')

Thus, again it might be the case that the use of back-channel overlap is variable, depending on individuals. Further research is needed here.

According to the results of this data, it seems that the most frequent overlaps detected in all three dyadic conversations (NSE-NSE, NSJ-NSJ, and NSE-JSE) are those caused by misprojection of some kind. However, there is a certain difference in frequency of occurrence between NSE-NSE and NSJ-NSJ interactions, the former showing a slightly higher occurrence of overlaps. The Japanese subjects in English interactions seem in general to maintain the same tendency of overlapping in NSE-JSE as in NSJ-NSJ interactions.
This may have a significant implication for Japanese speakers of English. That is to say, bearing in mind that NSEs tend to use more overlapping in conversation than NSJs in their mother tongue interaction, if JSEs retain the mother tongue conversational style in English interactions, they are likely to have difficulties, for example, in obtaining the conversational floor, and thus, may not be as prompt in gaining a conversational turn as NSEs. Or they might be judged as uncooperative, since they do not utilise enough overlapping which tends to show solidarity with conversational partners in certain cultures. The same might be said about interruption, to which I now turn.

8.2.1.3 Interruption

8.2.1.3.1 Two Types of Interruption: Cooperative and Intrusive

Apart from the obvious overlaps I have presented in the preceding section, I have shown in 4.3.4.1.1 that there is 'interruption' which is sometimes difficult to differentiate from overlaps. Levinson distinguishes 'inadvertent overlap' and 'violative interruption' and gives an example of the latter as follows:

C: Well I wrote what I thought was a a-a reasonable explanation

F: I: think it was a very rude letter

(Levinson 1983: 299)

However, this interruption does not differ very much from response-oriented overlaps introduced earlier. The only difference seems that the latter are briefer since they usually appear at transition relevance places, whereas interruptions seem to take place at non-TRPs.
as well. Hence, they constitute interruptions. This is because TRPs are places where conversational partners are entitled to take turns but non-TRPs are not. However, when interruption occurs near TRPs as in the above example, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the two.

Although it may be the case that the exact demarcation between the different types of interruption is difficult, it is still possible to detect a certain tendency. Here I shall introduce two types of interruption: cooperative and intrusive.

a) Cooperative Interruption

Cooperative interruption takes place when a conversational partner joins the speaker's utterance by saying a word or a phrase or even completing the speaker's present utterance by interrupting the speaker. The example is as follows:

[Example 14]

28 Sa: Um well I'm not- I'm not [fro- London I've come down from H.
29 Su: London

(Extract from Conversation 8)

This more like back-channel, in which the listener encourages the speaker's continuation of talk by showing her own interest, revealing her listenership and participation. It can, therefore, be said to be a cooperative interruption. Here, there is no intention on the interrupter's side to change topics or tresspass on the speaker's territoriality, she is just cooperating with the speaker in making the conversation flow. Another example can be seen in the following:
[Example 15]

86 Su: But um I-I stopped- stopped going because it's time consuming=
—87 Sa: =Yeah and er the need for it disappeared
88 Su: it's time=Yeah and er the need for it disappeared

(Extract from Conversation 8)

Here, there is no actual overlap; therefore, it does not seem to be an interruption. However, if we consider that Su's utterance in 86 has not completed when Sa cuts in to contribute to it, and that her utterance in 88 is actually a part of the same utterance continuing from 86, we could conclude that Sa's utterance in 87 is theoretically interrupting Su's continuous statement. However, in terms of its role in this whole exchange of 86-88, her interruption in 87 is not meant to be an interruption at all but rather cooperation, showing her interest and actual participation in the conversation. She is sustaining Su's conversational topic, not introducing her own.

Thus, interruption can take place without any actual overlapping or any threat to the speaker's ongoing conversational topic: it can show solidarity or cooperation on the listener's side. However, it has to be borne in mind that even this cooperative interruption could be interpreted as threatening in different cultures. I shall come back to this point again in relation to the data.

b) Intrusive Interruption

I shall now move to another type of interruption, that is, intrusive interruption. This is subdivided into three types: topic-changing, floor-taking, and disagreement interruptions.
Before moving into the actual study of each type of interruption, it is worth noting that the term 'intrusive' here does not convey any evaluative meaning as to the type of interruption made. It is meant to be purely descriptive in distinguishing different types of interruption. The term 'intrusive' is used in comparison with 'cooperative', because its nature is superficially more aggressive than 'cooperative' interruption, aiming at either topic-changing, floor-taking or disagreement, thus, threatening the 'territory' of the present speaker. The intention of some interrupters, however, may not be aggressive. Moreover, intrusive interruption could be used to show solidarity, depending on differing interpretations across cultures. I shall explore the possibility of this aspect as well, in relation to each of the three different types of intrusive interruption, starting with topic-changing interruption.

b) - 1) Topic-changing Interruption

Topic-changing interruption changes the present speaker's topic to the interrupter's topic. The following is part of a series of utterances by Su, who is explaining her experience with the computer:

[Example 16]

88 Su: and I found another=
89 Sa: Uhm
90 Su: =way of doing what I wanted by using another type of=
91 Sa: 
92 Su: =language which basically er is very simple no need to=
93 Sa: 
94 Su: =know how to programme at all to use it and er and er---
95 Sa: (then---) oh gosh(0.9) I don't know (I haven't- I haven't)
      being in London is-is quite strange

(Extract from Conversation 8)
Here, in 95 Sa changes the topic of conversation from the detail of the use of computer in Su's research to the life in London by means of interruption. In so doing, she first cuts into Su's speech when Su hesitates, saying, 'and er-' twice, giving a comment 'not too bad then--'. Sa then keeps her turn, putting in the interjection 'Oh gosh'. At this point she has not yet decided which topic to introduce, and thus, further hesitates by putting a 0.9 second pause. She then repeats phrases, such as 'I don't know' 'I haven't-', which we could interpret as, based on Chafe(1979), a time for formulating her own thinking, until eventually, she introduces a new topic.

This interruption has resulted in a complete abolition of the present speaker's topic and in the introduction of a new topic by the interrupter. It could, therefore, be called 'intrusive' in that it leads to an unwarranted topic change on the present speaker's side, threatening her own conversational floor. Conversely, we could interpret this as another manifestation of cooperation, being an effort on the part of a conversational partner to hold her own conversational floor for the purpose of reciprocation. It depends entirely on the interpretation of the interruptee whether she chooses to consider this, either as intrusive or as cooperative. If she chooses the former interpretation, it shows that she pays respect to the 'territorial' more than the 'cooperative imperative' and vice versa. Therefore, it is possible that an interruption which has been classified as 'intrusive' could be interpreted as 'co-operative' in different situations.
b) -ii) Floor-taking Interruption

Floor-taking interruption is somewhat similar to topic-changing interruption. However, it does not entail a complete change of topic by an interrupter. Its main objective is to obtain the conversational floor in order to keep a balance of turn-taking, but not to change the conversational topic completely. However, it often leads to a development of the ongoing conversational topic. An example can be seen in the following:

[Example 17]

247 Su: and it was very interesting because it=
248 Sa: [Uhm]
249 Su: was a place which um wasn't really meant for tourists any=
250 Sa: [laughs]
251 Su: other—there weren't any other Western Europeans apart from=
252 Sa: 
253 Su: students] and um it was
254 Sa: [Uhm] were people friendly—did they shy
away from you or did they come up to you?
255 Su: [They— they
(Extract from Conversation 8)

Here, Su's long explanation of her Russian experience starts in 241 and continues up to 253. Sa's contribution is mainly by means of back-channel. In 254, Sa, in the middle of Su's explanation, cuts in, utilising Su's short hesitation, 'um'. But this interruption does not lead to a complete change of topic as in Example 16. Sa & Su are still talking about Su's Russian experience after 254. Although Sa diverts the topic slightly to the Russian people, the flow of topic itself is coherent from Su's foregoing talk.

This interruption again could be interpreted from the perspective of 'co-operative' and 'territorial imperative'. That is to say, although
I have classified floor-taking interruption under the category of 'intrusive' interruption, it could perfectly well be a demonstration of cooperation, showing listenership, participation and solidarity. On the other hand, in different cultural settings, it is also possible that the interruptee may not regard the interrupter's behaviour thus, but in the opposite way. In other words, the interrupter could be interpreted as not showing enough respect for the territory of others, thus, as being intrusive and rude.

b) -iii) Disagreement Interruption

Intrusive interruption occurs not only when the next speaker changes the topic or wants to take the conversational floor but also when s/he would like to disagree with what the present speaker says, as follows:

[Example 18]

119 S: and that's where [you are now [Ah] but I'm not there] I'm near Euston
   (Extract from Conversation 9)

Here, M and S are talking about the location of UCL, looking out of the window and pointing out the building. M's interruption takes place when S mistook a different building for that of UCL, where M works. Thus, M's correction takes place instantly, resulting in an interruption. I shall call this type of interruption 'disagreement interruption'.

Disagreement interruption does not convey any negative meaning concerning the content of utterance itself, but it is based on disagreement with the fact of the previous utterance. Therefore, it is
again possible that this interruption could be interpreted in terms of cooperativeness, showing willingness in supplying the correct information to conversational partners although it may superficially be associated with 'intrusiveness' because of its threat to the territory of the present speaker.

I shall now compare the occurrence of these different types of interruption in the data.

8.2.1.3.2 Interruption Observed in the Data

a) The Average Occurrence of Different Types of Interruption in the Data

The average number of interruptions in NSJ-NSJ interactions totalled 1.57 per conversation, while that in NSE-NSE interaction totalled 7.0. In NSE-JSE interactions, it totalled 3.43 per conversation, scoring between the two mother tongue interactions. Thus, it may be said that interruption is more frequent in English than in Japanese conversations (see Table 8.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
<th>Number of Interruptions per Conversation</th>
<th>Number of Interruptions by the Subjects per Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSJ - NSJ</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE - NSE</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE - JSE</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3: Occurrence of Interruptions in Three Types of Interaction

We may also conclude that the Japanese interactants seem slightly to have changed their actual behavioural pattern regarding interruption in the NSE-JSE interactions, increasing the frequency of interruption.
This is also indicated by a comparison of the number of interruptions by the subjects only, excluding the interruptions made by the fixed conversational partners, who tended to play the role of interviewers, and thus, whose conversational style may be slightly different from that of ordinary respondents. Also there may be a difference arising from the inequality of the role-relationship between the two parties. In fact, in the NSJ-NSJ interactions, the number of interruptions by the Japanese subjects fell to 0.29 per conversation, and in the NSE-NSE interaction, that by the English subjects fell to 2.5 per conversation, while in the NSE-JSE interactions, the number totalled 2.43 per conversation (see Table 8.3).

Thus, the result from all three different interactions show that the subjects in general interrupted much less than their fixed conversational partners. However, in case of the NSE-JSE interactions, the figure did not change drastically.

This considerable increase of interruption in the NSE-JSE interactions by the Japanese subjects compared to that in the NSJ-NSJ interactions indicates that they have somehow adjusted their conversational style to that of English - either intentionally or unintentionally. However, it is too early to generalise at this stage, since there might be other explanations for this phenomenon. I shall come back to this problem later. Meanwhile, in the following section, different types of interruption will be discussed in more detail, starting with intrusive interruption.
b) Intrusive Interruption in the Data

It was shown that the occurrence of intrusive interruption is very rare in the Japanese interactions, averaging 0.43 per conversation. Even within this category, a slight difference was detected: no topic-changing or disagreement interruptions were detected. The total number of intrusive interruptions equals the number of floor-taking interruptions in the NSJ-NSJ interactions (see Tables 8.4 & 8.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
<th>No. of Intrusive Interruptions per Conversation</th>
<th>No. of Co-operative Interruptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSJ - NSJ</td>
<td>0.43 (0.14)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE - NSE</td>
<td>3.5 (2.0)</td>
<td>3.5 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE - JSE</td>
<td>2.57 (1.86)</td>
<td>0.86 (0.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*() --- Number of interruptions by the subjects per conversation

Table 8.4: Occurrence of Intrusive and Co-operative Interruptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
<th>Types of Intrusive Interruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic-changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSJ - NSJ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE - NSE</td>
<td>1.5 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE - JSE</td>
<td>0.86 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*() --- Number of interruptions by the subjects per conversation

Table 8.5: Occurrence of Three Types of Intrusive Interruptions

On the other hand, in the NSE-NSE interactions, both cooperative and intrusive interruptions took place equally. There were on average 3.5 cooperative and intrusive interruptions respectively. Judging from this data, the difference between the NSJ-NSJ and the NSE-NSE interactions seems obvious (see Table 8.4).
The very rare occurrence of intrusive interruption in the NSJ-NSJ interactions does not seem to be a coincidence. It seems to confirm an often-heard observation that the Japanese rarely interrupt. Even within the three interruptions which took place in all the seven Japanese conversations each of 15 minutes length, two were committed by a fixed conversational interactant who had been in Britain for more than two years at the time of recording. Thus there is a possibility that her Japanese conversational style might have been unconsciously influenced by that of English. Apart from these two interruptions, there was only one floor-taking interruption made by a Japanese subject as follows:

[Example 19]

158 U: =sore wa nanda tte minna kiku desho
159 F: eeh
160 U: de sore o (atode) wakarimasu yo ne (kore wa nandatte iu)
161 F:  ↓sore o kodomo-kodomoga kore wa- kore wa nandatte
162 U: yappari ( )

(Extract from Conversation 4')

158 U: =Everybody asks what that is, doesn't he?
159 F: yes
160 U: then he will understand what that is later, won't he?
161 F: The children-children ask what that- what that is
162 U: surely ( )

(Extract from Conversation 4' translated by the present writer)

Here, U's utterance actually starts in 152, and up to 159, F shows his participation only through back-channel 'eeh', which literally means 'yes', but which shows F's listnership and encourages U to continue his talk. In 161, F cuts in when U for some reason decreases the volume, repeating U's preceding phrase 'sore o'(that - object marker), and then repeating the following two phrases respectively; that is, 'kodomo-kodomo ga'(children - children - subject marker) and 'kore wa -
Kore wa' (this - subject marker). This is the only example of intrusive interruption by a Japanese subject detected in the NSJ-NSJ interactions.

The average occurrence of intrusive interruption by the Japanese subjects is only 0.14 per conversation. This shows a great contrast with the NSE-NSE interactions, in which an average of 2 intrusive interruptions by the subjects took place per conversation. If we simply compare the total number, we could say that NSEs utilise over ten times more intrusive interruptions than NSJs do in their respective mother tongues.

This difference is significant, since the use of intrusive interruption could be differently perceived across cultures. As discussed earlier, it could be interpreted positively, as showing interlocuters' involvement and cooperation in conversation. This is particularly true in a society where the 'co-operative imperative' ('solidarity') is highly valued.

On the other hand, in a society where the 'territorial imperative' or 'deference' is more valued, intrusive interruptions by a conversational partner will not be appreciated; conversely, the interrupters may be considered rude or too aggressive. We may then assume that this difference in value may have influenced the conversational style of the people in each society.
Of the three different types of intrusive interruption, the occurrence of floor-taking interruptions was most frequent in NSE-NSE interactions, scoring an average of 2 per conversation. More interestingly, this interruption was utilised not only by the fixed conversational partner but also by the subjects, totalling 1.5 occurrence per conversation. This may indicate that in English interactions, balanced turn-taking is expected and that both parties need to pay attention to ensuring an equal amount of floor-taking.

The occurrence of topic-changing interruption is also quite frequent in NSE-NSE interactions, averaging 1.5 per conversation. However, all the topic-changing interruptions took place in only one of the NSE-NSE interactions; and moreover, they were all interruptions by the fixed conversational partner Sa. This might be because Su tended to hold longer turns, explaining details of her research; thus, Sa, in order to hold the balance of the conversational floor, interrupted to change topics.

Only one disagreement interruption occurred in the NSE-NSE interactions. Judging from the result of both NSJ-NSJ and NSE-NSE interactions, it could be said that the occurrence of disagreement interruption itself is very low.

Two instances of disagreement interruption were detected in the NSE-JSE interactions, one by a NSE interactant and the other by a JSE. The example by a JSE is as follows.
[Example 20]

283 S: Are you missing a boyfriend or \( \text{anything like that (laughs)} \)
\[ \rightarrow 284 \text{ A: } \]
\[ \text{Ah no-no-no-no-no-no (laughs)} \]

(Extract from Conversation 5)

Here, S has been asking A about homesickness and when she asks A about her boyfriend, A instantly denies this, cutting in after S's 'or'. This could be interpreted as misprojection overlap as well. However, A's denial does not stop after the utterance of the first 'no'. In fact she repeats 'no' five times while S is still asking the question. Eventually the overlapping is dissolved by both participants laughing. A secures her turn and presents her topic. Assuming that misprojection overlaps tend to be solved by one party instantly dropping his/her utterance when s/he notices overlapping, and bearing in mind that this interruption took place to give a negative answer to S's question, it could be interpreted as disagreement interruption.

If we look at the number of intrusive interruptions in the NSE-JSE interactions, it totals an average of 2.57 per conversation. Although this is smaller than that of the NSE-NSE interactions (3.5 per conversation), it is almost six times greater than that of the NSJ-NSJ interactions. Moreover, the total number of intrusive interruptions made by the Japanese subjects is also relatively high considering that of the NSJ-NSJ and NSE-NSE interactions (see Table 8.4).

There is no definite clue to explain this phenomenon. If the Japanese subjects utilise their Japanese conversational habits, it is most likely that the number of intrusive interruptions will remain at the
same level even in the NSE-JSE interactions. There may be several explanations.

First, in the knowledge that interruptions are more acceptable in English conversational style, the Japanese subjects may have intentionally adjusted their conversational style to that of English. This positive adjustment to the target norms seems to be noticeable in R's interaction. R utilises both topic-changing and floor-taking interruptions. An example of floor-taking interruption by her can be seen in the following:

[Example 21]

178 S: Yeah some- but I think it different there's a difference in food isn't there? I mean if]

—179 R: specially hall foods are very fattening

(Extract from Conversation 1)

Here, it seems obvious that this is a floor-taking interruption since R cuts in at non-TRP and also since this interruption does not lead to a topic change. Apart from this explanation, there may be another reason for this interruption: it might have occurred because R's expected response at TRP's; i.e. after S's 'isn't there', was delayed. After S's 'isn't there' there was hardly any pause; thus, R could not catch up with S's quick tempo. Accordingly, when she responded it was already in the middle of S's next utterance. On the other hand, S here seems to be trying to paraphrase what she previously said since there was no response from R at TRP. We could therefore also interpret R's interruption here as delayed turn-taking, but not as an intentional floor-taking interruption.
It might be worth mentioning that R is a relatively advanced speaker of English compared to the other participants. Even so, her conversational tempo, including the length of pause, was much slower than the NSEs observed. Therefore, more interruptions caused by delayed responses could be observed in other NSE-JSE interactions.

Another example of apparent floor-taking interruption, but whose real occurrence seems to be due to a delayed response is observed in the conversation between D & S as follows:

[Example 22]

128 D: =Yeah so it introduces you to another course afterwards does it?
129 S: Erm=
130 D: =In other words you do this course to--
→131 S: [After (this) they don't] yes
132 D: I mean it's designed to improve your English so that you can take another course afterwards I see=
133 S: [Yes so] (Extract from Conversation 4)

Here, the nature of delay is more obvious than the previous example. The interruption has taken place, since D starts paraphrasing, trying to help S's understanding and also wanting to avoid any silence while S is still trying to find his answer to D's question. S does not seem to be hearing what D says in 130, but concentrates on finding his answers to D's question in 128, and eventually answers it in 131, ignoring what D is currently saying. This seems to be proved by S's use of words, 'after' and 'introduce', which were originally included in D's utterance in 128 but not in 130, which S interrupts. Accordingly, we could say that S's apparently floor-taking interruption in 131 is, in fact, due to a delayed response.
These instances of delayed responses, which are superficially classified as floor-taking interruptions, seem very much learner-specific. We could say that the increase in intrusive interruptions in NSE-JSE interactions might be partly due to delayed responses. For example, the average occurrence of floor-taking interruption (FTI) in the NSE-JSE interactions totalled 1.43 per conversation and it totalled one per conversation among the JSEs. Here, if we deduct the number of FTIs which may be affected because of delay, the average numbers become 0.71 and 0.29 respectively. The total figure for intrusive interruption itself is reduced from 2.57 to 1.86 and that of the JSE's averages from 1.86 to 1.14. This seems to indicate that these delayed responses are to some extent the cause of the increase in intrusive interruption.

Another factor which explains the phenomena of interruption in the NSE-JSE interactions is that people who tended to interrupt in the Japanese interaction seems to have utilised that style in the English interaction as well. This was observed in N's interactions. N was one of the two Japanese subjects who utilised interruption in the NSJ-NSJ interactions. She utilised cooperative interruption in the NSJ-NSJ interaction and topic-changing and floor-taking interruptions in the NSE-JSE interactions respectively. Thus, it could be said that conversationalists may bring the individual conversational style of their mother tongue to the target language interaction.

I have so far explored some reasons for the increase of intrusive interruptions in NSE-JSE interactions compared to those in NSJ-NSJ.
interactions, and have presented three conceivable reasons for this: adjustment of the Japanese speakers of English to the norms of the target conversational style, the delayed responses of the JSEs, which eventually become interruptions, and the transfer of individual conversational style to the target language, that is, individual differences in conversational style, rather than learner-specific or culture-specific differences. I shall now examine the occurrence of cooperative interruptions.

c) Cooperative Interruption in the Data

In NSE-NSE interactions, the average number of cooperative interruptions is the same as that of intrusive interruptions, totalling 3.5 per conversation respectively. In NSJ-NSJ conversations, the number is much larger than that of intrusive interruptions (1.14 and 0.43 per conversation respectively). Though the total number is still small, it is interesting to note that certain interruptions do take place in the Japanese interactions as well.

However, most of the interruptions which took place in the NSJ-NSJ interactions were made by the fixed conversational partners (7 out of 8 occurrences), who unintentionally tended to play the role of interviewer rather than that of conversational partner. This phenomenon also applies to NSE-NSE interactions, where six out of seven interruptions were committed by the fixed native speaker interactant.

This is partly because of the nature of cooperative interruption, which aims to help and cooperate with a speaker by supplying words and
phrases which s/he is trying to find or by completing an utterance on his/her behalf. Thus, the initiative is apt to be taken by a conversationalist who is in a supportive position to the speaker. It is conceivable that the fixed conversational partners, because of their familiarity with the situation, tended to behave in this initiative-taking supportive role. It might also be worth noting that four out of five fixed conversational partners were teachers or ex-teachers of English; thus, they were used to leading a conversation.

Apart from these factors common to both English and Japanese interactions, there seems to be another reason why cooperative interruptions are more often used than intrusive interruptions in Japanese interactions.

Mizutani (1988) states that in Japanese two interactants converse cooperatively, even completing an utterance between two of them, and that this characteristic of Japanese co-operative conversation may be called 'kyowa', which means 'co-produced conversation' or 'co-operative conversation'. He uses the term 'kyowa' as a superordinate term for 'aizuchi' (back-channel) and states its effects in Japanese conversation as follows:

The use of 'aizuchi' indicates that the listener is strongly united with the speaker psychologically, and when the speaker hesitates to continue speaking or when the speaker cannot find words, s/he (=the listener) is ready to help the speaker. This shows the cooperative nature of Japanese conversational style, which proceeds conversation, helping each other symbolically. (Mizutani 1988:60, translated by the present writer)

This explanation of 'aizuchi', or back-channel shows that it manifests
exactly the same characteristics as cooperative interruption. The similarity between back-channel and cooperative interruption can be identified in the study of 'Aizuchi' by LoCastro (1987) as well, where she defines back-channel cues also as 'sentence completions such as when the listener provides a word the speaker is searching for' (1987:103). However, cooperative interruption in my definition differs from back-channel overlap in that the latter is a relatively short utterance, which often overlaps with that of the speaker and which is usually dissolved within the same speaker's utterance and does not warrant a change of speaker. Nevertheless, since Japanese conversational style is characterised by this 'aizuchi', which seems to encompass both cooperative interruption and back-channel overlap as in my definition, a relatively large number of occurrences of cooperative interruption may be expected as a result of the transfer of mother tongue conversational style.

Concerning cooperative interruption, another point needs to be noted. Although, as discussed earlier, in both NSJ-NSJ and NSE-NSE interactions, cooperative interruptions were mostly utilised by the fixed conversational partners (88% in the Japanese interactions and 86% in the English interactions), the result of the NSE-JSE conversations tells a slightly different story, 4 out of 6 cooperative interruptions being made by the Japanese subjects. This phenomenon is difficult to explain, because if Japanese subjects maintain a Japanese conversational style, they are bound to use less interruption than the native-speaking fixed conversational partners.
However, if we look at the interactions in detail, we notice that two of the four cooperative interruptions were made by the same Japanese subject, R, who also utilised intrusive interruptions quite often. As we stated earlier, this might be due to R’s willingness to adjust to an English conversational style (or even stem from over-adjustment). An example of R’s cooperative interruption is as follows:

[Example 23]

56 S: Are you— are you in a—
   —>57 R: I'm in a hall— do you know the Hughes Parry Hall? --- it's about er two minutes' walk from here
   (Extract from Conversation 1)

Here, R cuts in, supplementing S’s utterance when she hesitates. It is also interesting to note that R did not utilise any interruption at all in the NSJ-NSJ interaction. This seems to imply that R is differentiating her conversational style between English and Japanese. The reason she does not utilise interruption in the Japanese interaction might be due to the recognition of the role relationship of Japanese interactions, which varies according to the age or the status differences of the interactants. Thus, R might have been constrained by these unstated rules of Japanese conversational style. Therefore, we may also have to consider the influence of individual differences concerning the use of cooperative interruption.

8.2.1.3.3 Summary

Throughout the discussion on interruptions, I noted that Japanese speakers rarely utilise intrusive interruptions in their mother tongue interactions. This seems to prove an often-heard observation that the
Japanese have respect for the 'territoriality' of the conversational partners, not imposing on others. However, it was observed that more people utilised intrusive interruptions in their English interaction with native speakers of English. Three possible reasons for this have been presented: adjustment or overadjustment to the target conversational style; the transferring of an individual's mother tongue conversational style to that of the target language, that is, personal differences; and interruption originating from delayed responses.

I have also shown cooperative interruption is used to a certain extent in the NSJ-NSJ interactions, while other interruptions are rarely used. However, all but one of the cooperative interruptions were made by the fixed conversational partners. The same phenomenon is also observed in the NSE-NSE interactions; therefore, I would argue its occurrence is more to do with the nature of cooperative interruption itself.

The relationship between cooperative interruption and one of the features of the Japanese conversational style, 'aizuchi', has also been discussed to explain the relatively more frequent use of co-operative interruption, compared to intrusive interruption in the NSJ-NSJ interactions. Finally, the relative increase in use of cooperative interruption by the Japanese subjects in NSE-JSE interactions was also discussed in terms of the adjustment of the subject to the target conversational style.

8.2.1.4 Repetition

Another salient feature apart from pause/silence and
overlap/interruption observed around topic boundaries in both Japanese and English interactions is repetition of words and phrases. Tannen (1989) recently compiled a comprehensive study of repetition and has classified functions of repetition into nine examples, as follows:

Repetition as participatory listenership
Ratifying listenership
Humor
Savoring
Stalling
Expanding
Repetition as participation
Evaluation through patterned rhythm
Bounding episodes

(Tannen 1989: 59-71)

Although I will not discuss each of Tannen's categories in detail, some of the functions seem to have been identified in the data of the present study as well; therefore, reference will be made to them when necessary. Another point which needs to be made concerning the difference between Tannen's approach to repetition and that of the present study is that the latter concentrates solely on the use of repetition at topic boundaries, while Tannen deals with all the repetitions which occur in conversation as a whole. Thus, there may be certain differences in the types of repetition observed in the present study compared to that of Tannen.

In general, more repetitions have been observed in the English interactions (both in the NSE-NSE and the NSE-JSE interactions) than in the Japanese interactions. Repetitions can be divided into two types in terms of the number of people who produce them: on the one hand, there is repetition which is repeated by the speaker him/herself (self-repetition), and on the other, there is repetition which is produced as
cooperative work between the current speaker and the conversational partner (two-party repetition).

Self-repetition was observed in the English interactions but no example was observed at the topic boundaries of the Japanese interactions in the present data. Some of the English examples can be seen in the following:

[Example 24]
18 S: Oh- it's- it's- nice to talk to you. (Extract from Conversation 1)

[Example 25]
78 Su: It's quite- quite easy I was-- (Extract from Conversation 8)

Two-party repetition mostly consists of the repetition of the words and phrases of the preceding speaker by the conversational partner as follows:

[Example 26]
132 Su: (The South West is nice) 133 Sa: South West is getting expensive too--- (Extract from Conversation 8)

[Example 27]
132 E: I'm one of them 133 S: =You're one of them(laughs) (Extract from Conversation 7)

These are examples from the English interactions; one from a NSE-NSE interaction (Conversation 8) and the other from a NSE-JSE interaction (Conversation 7). This two-party repetition was also identified in the Japanese interactions. In fact, most of the repetitions observed at topic boundaries of the Japanese interactions fell into this category.
as shown in the following examples:

[Example 28]
188 M: yonjuku de ne (laughs) (taihen na mon desu)
189 U: (laughs) yonjuku nan desu ka

(Extract from Conversation 3')

188 M: I've been suffering from four-fold difficulty (it's hard)
189 U: (laughs) You've been suffering from four-fold difficulty, have you?

(Extract from Conversation 3' translated by the present writer)

8.2.1.4.1 Five Functions of Repetition

Repetitions can be classified not only by the number of people involved in them but also by their function. Here I shall introduce five different functions of repetition: interruption-oriented, hesitation, reformulation, silence-avoidance, and solidarity repetitions. However, it has to be borne in mind that each function of repetition is not always clearly demarcated; some instances of repetition could fall into more than two categories.

a) Interruption-oriented repetition

Interruption-oriented repetitions are utilised when a conversational interactant would like to interrupt the speaker and take turns. They are usually self-repetitions which are utilised emphatically either to obtain conversational floors or to change topic by interrupting as can be seen in the following examples:

[Example 29]
22 S: ---an abbreviation of ( )
→23 E: WH what's your name?

(Extract from Conversation 7)
Although interruption-oriented repetition has not been observed elsewhere at topic boundaries in the present data, this repetition seems to have taken place for a similar reason to that given by Levinson (1983) to explain the resolution system of overlapping. In other words, the repetition occurred as a recycling of 'the part of the turn obscured by the overlap' (1983:300). Here E repeated 'wh', because it overlapped with S's 'of'. In fact, E utilised another type of resolution system, 'upgrading' by increasing amplitude when she interrupted. This seemed to have been required in particular because E's interruption was so abrupt that she needed to strengthen her utterance to take turns successfully; hence, she utilised two types of resolution system simultaneously. Interruption-oriented repetition was not observed in the Japanese interaction, at least in this data.

b) Solidarity Repetition

Many examples of solidarity repetitions were observed. Solidarity repetitions are two-party repetitions. I call them solidarity repetitions since it seems that people demonstrate their cooperativeness or involvement by repeating the preceding speaker's words and phrases, showing their listenership, participation in the conversation, and solidarity with the speaker. Some examples can be observed in the following:

[Example 30]
124 H: kaette shimau kaettara mo
       — 125 N: mo kaette shimattara
          (Extract from Conversation 2')

124 H: Once you go back to (Japan)
125 N: Once I go back to Japan
       (Extract from Conversation 2' translated by the present writer)
These examples are also very akin to cooperative interruptions; however, here conversationalists are just repeating what the previous speakers said and are not helping the speakers to complete the preceding utterances. As observed in the examples of floor-taking interruption as well, we could say that repetition is closely related to interruption.

This category of repetition includes special solidarity repetitions, which seem to be characteristic of Japanese interactions and constitute part of the hesitation phenomena (see Chapter 8.2.1.1, discussion on silence/pause). An example can be seen in the following:

[Example 32]

46 M: ah: so desu ka heee(0.5) (Is that so?)
47 U: ah: so desu ka ne: (Well is that so?)

(Extract from Conversation 3')

Here although superficially U is repeating what M says, this repetition is meaningless because M's 'Is that so?' is a response to what U said in 45. Therefore, it is strange for U to repeat what M says. The repetition here seems to exist purely for an interactional purpose, showing solidarity to M by repeating what he says. At the same time it appears to play the role of avoiding silence while seeking a new topic;
I shall come back to a discussion of the avoidance of silence repetition later.

There is another example of solidarity repetition, which seems to be specific to Japanese interactions, and which seems to be used to enhance the solidarity between the speaker and the conversational partner as can be seen in the following example.

[Example 33]

— 124 H: kayoe nai deho] um chotto ne [NE:
  125 K:

(Extract from Conversation 6')

124 H: I can't commute, can I?  
125 K: no, you can't

Here, 'NE' is thought to be an equivalent to a tag question in English. The repetition of 'ne' is one of the characteristics of Japanese conversational style although its use varies according to individuals. It is utilised to show the conversational partner's understanding of the speaker's utterance or even an agreement with what the speaker says. At the same time it is also used by the current speaker to attract the conversational partners' agreement. Thus, it is used to show solidarity or to establish rapport (Aston 1988).

Mizutani (1985) also refers to the frequent use of 'ne' in Japanese conversation. Quoting from data from the National Institute of Japanese Language (NIJL) (Kokuritu Kokugo Kenkyujo), she states that there is a high frequency of the use of 'ne' in actual communicative situations (1985:209). According to the data of NIJL, the frequency in
private is nearly double that in communicative situations in public. This shows that 'ne' is characteristically used to establish rapport in informal conversational situations. She also places 'ne' in her category of 'friendship expressions' (Shin'ai Hyogen).

In addition to this, Mizutani (1985) refers to the relationship of the use of 'ne' and schematic knowledge: 'ne' can only be used when the two parties share the same knowledge (1985:209). The use of 'ne' takes place when the two parties come to an agreement concerning a certain topic and when after conversing with each other, they have established a certain kind of common ground. In this respect as well, the use of 'ne' can be said to show the 'solidarity' of co-conversationalists.

Another point to be made here is the fact that the repetition of 'ne' as an expression of rapport seems partly to contribute to hesitation phenomena, which have been frequently observed in Japanese interactions. For example, conversational interactants can elongate the vowel sound of 'e' in 'ne', extending hesitation. Moreover, this 'ne' is often combined with other hesitation phenomena including pause as discussed earlier (see Chapter 8.2.1.1) and can constitute a long topic boundary. An example of this can be seen in the following:

[Example 34]

170 N: so desu ne:: (yes, I think so)
171 H: ne: uhm (won't it, yes)
172 N: uhm(2.0)
173 H: (so desu ka)---so iu imi dewa ano(is that so--in that sense--)

(Extract from Conversation 2')
Thus, 'ne' can also constitute a hesitation phenomenon together with other aspects.

It is interesting to note that in Japanese interactions, both parties leave plenty of time for each other to initiate a new topic, showing solidarity by utilising hesitation phenomena; whereas in English interactions, solidarity seems to be shown by leaving as little silence and as few pauses as possible, sometimes resulting in overlapping and interruption (see Tannen 1984a). This contrast may again show a cross-cultural difference in attitude to territorial and cooperative imperatives. So, the way people express their solidarity varies across cultures.

I have so far concentrated on solidarity repetitions in Japanese interactions. They are also found in English interactions as in:

[Example 35]

132 Su: (The South West is nice)
→133 Sa: South West is expensive, too
(Extract from Conversation 8)

132 E: I'm one of them
→133 S: =You're one of them(laughs)
(Extract from Conversation 7)

There is a solidarity repetition in the NSE-JSE interaction which seems to be similar to Japanese interactional style as follows:

[Example 36]

100 Y: Yes---isn't it (1.0)
→101 S: Ah it's funny isn't it you came to H as well
(Extract from Conversation 2)
S's repetition of 'isn't it' here seems to be influenced by Y's preceding utterance, 'isn't it', and to show her solidarity to Y. It might be worth noting here that the native speaker of English, S, had been in Japan for three years. She might therefore have been influenced by Japanese conversational style or could adjust to it when talking to the Japanese.

Another example of repetition from the English interactions seems to confirm the point that repetition and interruption are closely related as noted earlier.

[Example 37]

143 S: --but erm actually I came here for just improving my English=
144 D: Yeah
145 S: =so=—
146 D: =so afterwards would you---what would you do?

(Extract from Conversation 4)

Here, an NSE, D, interrupts S, by repeating S's word 'so', showing his listenership and participation or solidarity. At the same time, it seems that D is compensating for the threat of interruption, which could be threatening to the conversational partner by using this repetition.

Tannen(1989) classifies what I call solidarity repetition into the category of 'repetition as participatory listenership' (1989: 59-62). She defines this as 'the exact or slightly varied repetition of a previous speaker's utterance', but in which 'no information is added, and no perceptible contribution' is made to the development of a story, theme, or idea' (1989: 59). This explanation coincides directly with my
definition of solidarity repetition, since, as observed in the examples
given, the repetition of words and phrases in solidarity repetition
does not add any new information to aid the development of topic or a
story.

c) Silence-avoidance Repetition

The third type of repetition, which I would like to designate a
silence-avoidance repetition, looks superficially similar to
solidarity repetition. However, because of the nature of the
repetition and the role it plays in the whole interaction, that is, the
avoidance of silence by repeating words while the conversationalists
are searching for a new topic, it would be better to differentiate this
from solidarity repetition. An example of this repetition can be seen
in the following:

[Example 38]

57 Sa: You came straight on after it | Yes | Yes
58 Su: Yes
59 Sa: So what's going to happen at the end--Will you teach Russian?

(Extract from Conversation 8)

This is an extract from a conversation between two native speakers. In
58, Su gives a short answer to Sa's question. Sa, in her turn, repeats
Su's 'yes', not taking over a new turn immediately. Su then repeats
'yes' again. Eventually, Sa starts her new topic.

Here the repetition of 'yes' seems to play a role of monitoring some
kind of sound in order to avoid silence, which is considered to be
against the co-operative nature of English interactions. Tannen (1989)
sets up the category of 'stalling' in her classification of repetition, which serves to 'slow down' a conversation (1989:64-5). Although her category of 'stalling' is limited to repeating 'a question transferring second to first person' (1989:64-5), the function she applies to this repetition appears to be similar to silence avoidance repetition.

Silence avoidance repetitions seem to be closely related to what Tannen calls 'involvement' (1984a) and to solidarity and the co-operative imperative again by showing quick turn-taking and avoiding any silence in between turns, which could, in a certain culture, mean lack of interest or cooperation. Thus, the use of this repetition is again value-laden.

Both solidarity and silence avoidance repetitions are cooperatively produced by both parties: they are two-party repetitions unlike interruption-oriented repetitions, which are self-repetitions.

d) Hesitation Repetition

Another example of self-repetition, hesitation repetition, has been exclusively found in the English interactions in this study. No example of this repetition has been observed in Japanese interactions.

Hesitation repetition takes place at the beginning of a new topic, or most frequently, where the speaker changes topics by asking his/her partner a question. It seems that the use of repetition here fulfils a kind of downplaying function in order to increase the indirectness of the question, thus, making it less imposing and face-threatening to the
conversational partner. This process is most likely to take place automatically, thus, unconsciously as in the following example.

[Example 39]

234 Sa: Where—where have you been in Russia then?  
(Extract from Conversation 8)

[Example 40]

46 M: Yes where—where are you actually teaching?  
(Extract from Conversation 9)

Although most examples of hesitation repetition have been observed in question forms, they can take other forms as can be seen in the following example.

[Example 41]

77 Sa: So I— you know I would have like to  
→78 Su: It’s quite—quite easy I was—
(Extract from Conversation 8)

It can also be noted that the use of hesitation repetition varies a great deal depending on individuals. For example, in the NSE-NSE interactions, although native-speaking subjects, M & Su, also utilise this repetition once respectively, the other repetitions were utilised only by a fixed conversational partner, Sa. She utilises hesitation repetition quite often in the NSE-JSE interactions as well.

On the other hand, it was observed that Japanese speakers of English also utilised this repetition as follows:

[Example 42]

→6 Y: what—what shall we ----  
7 D: =Well where do you come from?  (Extract from Conversation 3)
In these examples, a Japanese speaker, Y, utilises hesitation repetitions quite often when he asks his native-speaking conversational partner a question. However, since Y's proficiency level is intermediate, his use of hesitation repetition might not have derived from an unconscious effort to increase indirectness but from a lack of confidence. Further research is required to give this feature a more comprehensive explanation.

e) Reformulation Repetition

The last type of repetition to be introduced here is reformulation repetition. It is utilised when a speaker reformulates what s/he says by repeating the words and phrases s/he mentioned earlier as in:

[Example 44]

79 S: ---and what have you---are you--- are you living in university accommodation?  
(Extract from Conversation 9)

In fact, this is a mixture of reformulation and hesitation repetitions, starting with reformulation and later changing into hesitation repetition. Another example of reformulation repetition can be observed in the following example:

[Example 45]

179 D: ---so since you've been here what has-- what has been doing socially what do you do in the evenings--- do you go to Japanese restaurants  
(Extract from Conversation 3)
The above two reformulation repetitions are made by native speakers of English. There is a kind of reformulation repetition which seems to be specific to learners (learner-specific reformulation repetition). An example can be seen in the following

[Example 46]

200 Sn: So have you taught erm have you taught about- have you taught in Japan- Japanese universities?
   (Extract from Conversation 5)

Here, Sn repeats 'have you taught' three times, trying to formulate a 'correct' expression. As might have been noticed from the discussion, this reformulation repetition also comes under the category of self-repetition.

We may assume that reformulation repetition is found in native-nonnative (NS-NNS) interactions, either when native speakers utilise it, in order to reformulate questions so that they become more comprehensible to nonnative speakers, or when nonnative speakers use this repetition to make their utterance more understandable. In this respect, I assume that reformulation repetition occurs more frequently in NS-NNS interactions on both sides, although the first example of reformulation repetition given here, in fact, is found in a NSE-NSE interaction.

8.2.1.4.2 Summary

To summarise, I have introduced five different types of repetition in this section: interruption-oriented, solidarity, silence-avoidance, hesitation and reformulation repetitions. They are further divided
into two on the basis of the participation pattern; self and two-party repetitions. Interruption-oriented, hesitation, and reformulation repetitions fall into the category of self-repetition, while solidarity and silence-avoidance repetitions are two-party repetitions. In addition to this, some repetitions seem to be exclusively confined either to English or Japanese interactions. For example, most of the repetitions found in the Japanese interactions can be classified either into solidarity or learner-specific reformulation repetitions. Among these, the use of solidarity repetitions seems to be a characteristic of Japanese interactions and to characterise their topic boundaries. That is, the frequent use of solidarity repetitions seems to cause some of the hesitation phenomena which are frequently observed at the topic boundaries of Japanese interactions.

The use of solidarity repetition seems to satisfy both the cooperative and the territorial imperatives. This is because, first, its use may show solidarity to a speaker by repeating his/her words/phrases, showing listenership and participation in the conversation; and secondly, by using solidarity repetition one can lessen intrusiveness, lengthening the transition from one topic to another; and consequently, showing a respect for the territoriality of the speaker by allowing ample time to take turns.

Hesitation repetition, as opposed to solidarity repetition, seems to be utilised exclusively in English interactions, although there seem to be certain individual differences among the speakers. Its use may compensate for the quick turn-taking in English interaction. Quick-
turn-taking sometimes appears to be too aggressive and intrusive; thus, by using hesitation repetition, the speaker tries to lessen intrusiveness, showing respect for the territoriality of the conversational partner.

Silence-avoidance repetition also seems to be related to the quick turn-taking of English interactions. Quick turn-taking results from the fear of the presence of pause/silence at topic boundaries. Therefore, when conversationalists cannot introduce a new topic quickly enough, they tend to repeat what their conversational partner says in order to avoid any pause or silence. Silence-avoidance repetition, then, originates in respect for the cooperative imperative or solidarity which encourages quick turn-taking in order to show participation, whereas hesitation repetition seems to originate in a mixture of both. That is, in order to show respect for the high involvement in conversation, interactants take turns quickly. On the other hand, in order to show respect for territoriality, conversationalists tend to use hesitation repetitions, making their statements appear less intrusive and aggressive. This seems to prove conversationalists' concern for the 'double bind' (Tannen 1986) of human communication; they show cooperation or solidarity by the use of quick turns, while at the same time showing respect for other parties' territory by using hesitation repetition, trying not to threaten conversational partners.
8.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This chapter has concentrated on an analysis of the recorded data on the basis of the theoretical and research framework discussed in the foregoing chapters. Each conversational interaction has been divided into units of topics and subtopics. Then both topic and subtopic boundaries have been examined, focussing attention on boundary markers which are prominent. In particular, salient features such as pause/silence, overlap, interruption, and repetition have been explored extensively. It has been indicated that the frequency of the use of these features varies between English and Japanese interactions. For example, pause/silence seems to be more frequently used in Japanese interactions; moreover, the average length of pause itself seems to be longer.

Overlaps are classified into two; turn-competing and response-oriented. Response-oriented overlaps are further classified into misprojection and back-channel overlaps. It has also been argued that the frequent use of different types of overlap seems to indicate the different value the interactants attached to them.

Interruptions are also classified into two types; co-operative and intrusive. Intrusive interruptions are subclassified into three; topic-changing, floor-taking and disagreement interruptions. It was observed that both cooperative and intrusive interruptions are equally utilised in English interactions, whereas the use of interruption itself is very low in Japanese interactions. This phenomenon has also
been discussed in relation to value differences attached by the conversational interactants.

Finally, five functions of repetition have been introduced: interruption-oriented, solidarity, silence-avoidance, hesitation and reformulation. They are also divided into two types according to the participation pattern: self and two-party repetitions. The former includes interruption-oriented, hesitation and reformulation repetitions, while the latter includes solidarity and silence-avoidance repetitions. It has been indicated that the use of repetition is also closely related to a turn-taking system. That is, repetition is sometimes used to lessen the face-threatening effect of quick turn-taking (hesitation repetition) or to secure turn-taking with no gap (silence-avoidance), while it can also be utilised to show cooperation or solidarity (solidarity repetition).

Thus, all the above mentioned features of conversational style are directly or indirectly related to differing values in a cross-cultural context. They are specifically discussed from the perspective of the binary values of the 'cooperative' and the 'territorial imperative' (Widdowson 1983) or 'solidarity' and 'deference' (Scollon & Scollon 1983) or Tannen's (1984a) 'involvement' and 'independence'. Moreover, it has been pointed out that it is possible to interpret the same feature from the perspective of both values simultaneously. It has to be borne in mind that the interpretation of communicative behaviours, in particular, in a cross-cultural context, is a delicate matter and
that every effort must be made not to draw any hasty conclusions or
stereotyped views.

In the final chapter of this study, I shall explore how the exploration
of these features can be applied in the field of pedagogy.

NOTE

1 Interruption is also related to insertion sequence at a different
level. This is because the insertion sequence can be interpreted
at one level as an interruption of the ongoing topic. Moreover, it
is often the case that actual insertion sequences start with one of
the kinds of interruption discussed above, most notably with a
topic-changing or floor-taking interruption. I have also examined
insertion sequences and have classified them into three types:
clarification, topic interruption, and typical insertion sequences.
Of these, clarification insertion sequence is further divided into
two: non-understanding and reformulation clarification insertion
sequences. Both types are used by both native and non-native
speakers. Topic interruption insertion sequences are subclassified
into two: the third party topic interruption insertion sequence and
topic interruption insertion sequence by conversational partners.
According to the result of the present data, the former always
leads to a topic change, whereas the latter does not necessarily
entail this. In relation to topic change and resumption,
conversationalists seem to pay special attention to topical cohesion
and coherence after the insertion sequences.
CHAPTER 9 IMPLICATIONS

9.0 INTRODUCTION

In Chapters 2-4, I prepared the theoretical ground for the formulation, in Chapter 5, of a research framework capable of discussing aspects of communication related to learner needs. Chapter 6 was devoted to the description of the research design. Chapters 7 and 8 analysed the empirical data, testing and utilising the framework which was set up in Chapter 5, and checking its operationability. This chapter discusses what kinds of implication the results have for language teaching. In so doing, I do not intend to prescribe what or how to teach. When one thinks of actual teaching situations, an integrated perspective is required. Therefore, I do not think that the teaching of conversational style can be separated from any other learner need in communication. What I am trying to do is just to demonstrate one aspect of learner needs in communication. I am hoping to highlight the need to establish language improvement courses and to develop language teaching materials which take this aspect of communication into consideration. It is an area which has been neglected for long time.

One thing to be remembered in presenting such implications is the fact that this is the very area where generalisations can easily be formulated on the basis of a simple interpretation of the data. For example, presenting all the different features observed in the data simply as characteristics of a certain culture is likely to strengthen stereotyped views. It is also important to bear in mind problems of individual as well as cross-cultural differences.
The bottom-up approach does not seem to offer much help in the teaching of conversational style. This might best be dealt with in an integrated way within a course. It is also of vital importance to present a solid framework for its study. Here, a task-based problem-solving approach is suitable in that it can heighten the awareness of the participants without imposing prescribed views. Moreover, it is also appropriate from another perspective. That is, since the features of conversational style dealt with in this study themselves operate at a subconscious level, it is in a double sense meaningful to introduce an approach which emphasises the heightening of awareness.

9.1 CONVERSATIONAL STYLE——INTRODUCTION OF DESCRIPTIVE MODEL

In discussing learner needs in communication, I have emphasised the importance of communicative capacity, which comprises various competencies as well as strategic capacity, which is the 'procedural ability of the participants in the ongoing negotiation process' (see Chapter 2 for details). The latter can, as previously shown, be observed in the use of communicative conventions as signals for conversational management; thus, they are primarily concerned with 'accessibility' (Widdowson 1983). The study of communicative conventions is also closely related to the notion of culture, since the ways in which these conventions are utilised can vary cross-culturally. They are at the same time, related to the notion of 'acceptability', since what is acceptable is culture specific; hence, the ways in which these conventions are utilised may be acceptable in one culture but not in another. The study of communicative conventions could, therefore,
satisfy the requirement for learner needs in communication, encompassing the notions of communicative capacity, culture, accessibility and acceptability.

On the basis of the discussion in Chapters 2-5, Chapters 6 to 8 explored how the framework for learner needs in communication operates in empirical data. Here, the features of communicative conventions are further explored and classified in detail through an analysis of the data. In particular, such features as pause/silence, overlapping, interruption and repetition are examined from the perspective of turn-taking, and detailed classification and subclassification are presented. Since the data which were used to produce this classification are limited, further study of these features, based on the study of empirical data is to be encouraged.

Nonetheless, given these limitations, certain tendencies in the use of these features, which emerged from three different interactions, were indicated in the present data. It is hoped that the descriptive model developed and utilised in this study is used in other types of interaction between people with different language and cultural backgrounds so that a cross-cultural comparative study of this area is possible.

So far I have emphasised the usefulness of the descriptive model as a framework for analysis. It also has to be remembered that the model has direct implications for pedagogy. In the following sections, I will discuss its implications in two fields: in the development of
9.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR PEDAGOGY

9.2.1 Implications for Language Teaching Materials

The discussion in this section proceeds on the assumption that the research methods and the techniques utilised in the present study can be developed and utilised in the field of teaching and materials development. I shall start with a discussion of the use of recorded data and then move on to that of written data.

9.2.1.1 Recorded Materials—Video

One characteristic of recorded data is that they themselves can be utilised as teaching or awareness-heightening materials. Classroom teachers can simultaneously combine their research and actual teaching through the activation of the research data as teaching materials. Conversational data, collected through learner participation can be utilised in two ways. To start with, teachers as researchers can use them to analyse the conversational behaviours of their students. That is to say, the findings themselves are important. Then, on the basis of their analysis, they can utilise these data to heighten the awareness of the learners in the specific area of study which is found to be significant.

To cite an example from the present study, the data from three different interactions can be utilised in order to demonstrate the
similarities and differences of certain features of conversational style such as pause/silence, interruption, overlapping, and repetition. This could be presented, for example, as group work, one or two groups of four or five learners working together on one feature. As a group, they analyse the three different sets of data, concentrating on one feature. They could, for example, start with an analysis of the Japanese interaction and then move on to the English interaction, and finally, to an analysis of the NSE-JSE interactions. In the process of analysis, they will become more conscious of the features they are examining, and thus, their awareness will be heightened. At the same time, through the interaction they experience in the process of analysis, they will develop their communicative capacity, since this activity requires the participation of learners in discussion, listening to the tape, and transcribing, that is, writing. In addition to this, if a reporting session is combined with the analysis phase, the activity can involve yet more practice in speaking.

Another point to be made here is that learners can actually participate in making video-recorded materials by taking part in the interaction to be recorded. Thus, the participants experience interaction with a native speaker of English. In this way, both the recording of data and their production can play an important role in pedagogy.

I have so far concentrated on the use of data which have been produced in the process of research or specifically in classroom research, where a teacher is directly involved as a researcher. The results from this study could also be useful indirectly in the field of materials development which deals with the features of conversational style.
Video-recorded materials to facilitate an understanding of conversational style from a cross-cultural perspective can be developed independently for language awareness courses. One good example of this is *Crosstalk* (Gumperz et al. 1979). In *Crosstalk*, features such as amplitude, tone, intonation and the structure of information are dealt with. The present study, on the other hand, has concentrated on the analysis of such features as pause/silence, interruption, overlapping, and repetition. Each of these features can be handled either separately or within a string of interaction in order to heighten the learners' awareness. Since this area is of an unconscious nature, it is possible that the learners are also unaware of their conversational style in their mother tongue. It is therefore advisable that the learners firstly be shown a video recording of their mother tongue interaction in order to become aware of the ways in which they behave. After that they could be introduced to the conversational style of the target language. Then, teachers could ask learners to list similarities and differences of the conversational style of both languages, focusing on certain features. Upon completing that task, learners view yet another interaction, that is, an NSE-JSE interaction. They can thus learn how the conversational style of the mother tongue could affect or not affect their own conversational style.

Three different interactions can be put together as one set of materials, and further, these can be edited according to features of conversational style, focusing on one feature each time. However, it is important that each feature be viewed in the context of interaction but not as a discrete item. It also has to be borne in mind that the role of video recorded materials is not aimed to adjust learners'
mother tongue conversational behaviours to those of the target language. Its primary objective is to heighten the awareness of both the conversational participants.

9.2.1.2 Questionnaires—Written Materials

In the previous section, I discussed the use of video-recorded data in pedagogy in two ways: at one level, they can be used mainly for the purpose of analysis, that is, as a tool for research; at another, they can be used for teaching purposes, that is, as teaching materials for the purpose of awareness-heightening. In this section, I also want to examine the use of questionnaires from these two perspectives. As a tool for research, the results of the questionnaires not only indicate certain tendencies in learners' conversational behaviours but also support or strengthen the result of the recorded data from a different perspective. The use of the questionnaires in combination with recorded data makes the result more objective and comprehensive. As teaching materials, the questionnaires can directly be used in class to heighten the awareness of learners. It is also possible to involve learners in the actual designing of the questionnaires, enabling them to discover some problematic areas of studies. In the process of producing questionnaires, learners' awareness will greatly be heightened. Additionally, questionnaires can also be used to select subjects who satisfy the purpose of research.

From the perspective of questionnaires as teaching materials, the results can be utilised to develop materials which serve to heighten the awareness of learners in specific area of investigation. For example, Part II of the questionnaires is directly related to the
features focussed on in the video-recorded data. In the present study, it was utilised partly to prime the subjects for the area of study they were going to attend to. In class, the same system can be introduced to prepare the learners for the area of study they are going to be involved in. At the same time, it can also be used to compare how their awareness towards conversational behaviours both in the mother tongue and in the target language differ or agree with their actual behaviours recorded in the data. The discrepancy, if there is any, could stimulate further discussion on the significance of studying these features of communication in a cross-cultural context. Thus, the use of questionnaires as a pre-recording task could be a useful device for both heightening awareness of learners in this area and for stimulating further discussion on the subject apart from its primary role as a tool for collecting data.

Part III, which deals with the interpretation of illocutionary force and of formulaic expressions could be utilised in compiling a textbook which is specifically designed to cover this area. However, since the number of questions covered in the present study is limited, it is advisable that further research in this area, involving more expressions and questions, should be conducted. Meanwhile, the results from this study can be utilised as an indication of how this could be developed and expanded to encompass pragmatic features.

Finally, questionnaires can be compiled as complete texts to be used in an awareness-raising course. They could eventually be compiled as written texts to be used independently. However, it will be more effective if they are used together with video-recorded materials on
the same themes. In the following section, I shall discuss how these types of teaching materials and their accompanying methodology could fit into a language teaching syllabus.

9.2.1.3 Teaching Syllabus

This study explores the nature of some of those features of conversational style, which constitute an important part of communicative capacity and which tend to be neglected in language teaching. It proposes that these features also form an important component of communication and that they should be included as part of a syllabus specification for a comprehensive language course. However, it is not enough to teach and learn only the features which have been dealt with in this study. These have to be combined with others.

It has been pointed out that a structural syllabus which concentrates on the teaching of grammar on the basis of strict grading and which aims to develop learners' grammatical competence, is not satisfactory if learners are to be educated to become competent communicators.

With the development of the notion of competence from linguistic to communicative (see the discussion in Chapter 2), functional and notional syllabuses were introduced. However, these have been proved to be unsatisfactory as well. They were criticised mainly on two grounds: they place too much emphasis on functions and notions but ignore the grammatical aspect, and secondly, it was not specified how these syllabuses are to be introduced in class. It has been pointed out that there is not very much difference between the ways in which structural and notional/functional syllabuses are presented. What is
important, according to Widdowson (1990), is how a syllabus is 'actualized through classroom activity' (1990:39):

---a notional/functional syllabus is of itself no more communicative than is a 'structural' one. Communication is what may or not be achieved through classroom activity; it cannot be embodied in an abstract specification. (1990:130)

This criticism is partly related to the inadequacy of the notion of communicative competence, which remains static at the level of knowledge and does not address how that knowledge is activated. As discussed earlier (see Chapter 2), only possessing communicative competence, which still remains at the level of passive knowledge, is not satisfactory if learners are to be enabled to be competent communicators. We also have to enable them to activate their knowledge. To quote from Widdowson (1990) again:

I would argue that no syllabus, however conceived and designed, can produce a communicative competence. A syllabus is simply an inert specification. Only when it is actualized through classroom activity can it have an effect on learning. The syllabus is a scheme for teachers and its influence on learners is only indirect, mediated by methodology. (1990:39)

In this connection, Prabhu's procedural syllabus is a step forward in that although Prabhu himself states clearly that the project aims at developing learners' grammatical competence (1987), he at least demonstrates how to help learners to activate this knowledge by introducing the task-based procedural syllabus, thus, developing competence into a capacity.

However, it does not seem that there exists a comprehensive 'content' syllabus, which covers all the competencies, including pragmatic competence, which on its own consists of such competencies as
sociocultural, psychological, discourse and so on (see the discussion in Chapter 2). Nor is there any syllabus which covers the idea of strategic capacity, which plays an important role in activating various types of knowledge. It is hoped that a procedural syllabus can be developed, which aims to activate and develop not only grammatical but also pragmatic competence.

Here it seems worth referring to Candlin (1987b), who discusses the importance of task-based language learning in relation to the development of classroom syllabuses. He regards syllabuses as 'joint plans of the teachers' and learners' (1987b: 5) and considers that there exist three syllabuses of 'learning', 'content', and 'actions'. In the discussion of the implications of the present study for pedagogy, what Candlin calls a 'content' syllabus seems to be directly related to the features discussed, since he also points out the importance of the development of the interpretation of communicative competence from the level of knowledge to one that takes procedures into consideration. Besides, what he classifies as 'learning' and 'actions' syllabuses also seem to bear implications for the present study.

On the basis of the principles of syllabus accounts, Candlin proposes some 'conditions on task-based language learning', some of which seem to be directly applicable to the present study as criteria for a classroom method.

Criteria for 'Good' Language Learning Tasks

1. Should draw objectives from the communicative needs of learners.
2. Should allow for flexible approaches to the task, offering different routes, media, modes of participation, procedures.
3. Can allow for different solutions depending on the skills and strategies drawn on by learners.
4. Should involve learner contributions, attitudes and affects.
(5) Should require input from all learners in terms of knowledge, skills, participation.
(6) Should define a problem to be worked through by learners, centred on the learners but guided by the teacher.
(7) Should involve language use in the solving of the task.
(8) Should provide opportunities for metacommunication and metacognition.
(9) Should provide opportunities for language practice.
(10) Should promote learner-training for problem-sensing and problem-solving.
(11) Should promote sharing of information and expertise.
(12) Should heighten learners' consciousness of the process and be reflexive.
(13) Should promote a critical awareness about data and the processes of language learning.

(Quoted from Candlin (1987b: 9, List 2))

All the above listed conditions seem to support the idea of the kind of approach which I am proposing in the present study.

However, one thing needs to be stated clearly: if such a syllabus is to be devised, the features of conversational style discussed in the present study will necessarily have to be taken into consideration. This is because these conventions constitute strategic capacity, which plays an important role in activating various types of knowledge as discussed earlier (see Chapter 2). Although the features of conversational management listed here form very small proportion indeed of the constituents of communicative capacity, I would argue that any satisfactory syllabus should include these features as a component of the framework for learner needs in communication.

In the following section, I shall discuss the ways in which these features could be learned.

9.2.2 Implementation—Consciousness Raising Course

The features of conversational style which I have investigated in this
study are usually used subconsciously. This is because they are acquired in the process of mother tongue acquisition as part of linguistic conventions which accompany the actual use of language itself. They play a very important role in communication. However, in the formal study of language, they tend to be unnoticed because of their operation at a subconscious level. They are acquired in such a natural way that people tend not to notice how unnatural communication becomes if, when they learn to communicate in other languages, they concentrate only on the 'formal' properties of language, ignoring or remaining unaware of these aspects of communication.

These features are closely linked to the cultural identity or personality of conversationalists; consequently, there is no correct form for them. This is very different from the 'formal' properties of language, represented by grammar, which is usually prescribed objectively, enabling the achievement of learners to be judged on the basis of the prescribed rules of usage. On the other hand, teachers are not able to force the learners to adjust their communicative behaviours to those of the target language even if there are certain distinctive features in the use of communicative conventions which are different from those of learners' mother tongue. This is because, since these features constitute an important constituent of the learners' identity, to request them to change behaviours could mean telling them to change their cultural values. In the past this attitude which requires learners to adjust their cultural values to those of target culture was criticised. The tendency is now towards respect for the value of the learners' culture. The study of conversational style, or more specifically, that of communicative
conventions falls precisely in this area, since these are closely related to the learners' own culture. The ways in which they are utilised and the norms of appropriateness differ from one culture to another (see Chapter 3). Thus, this factor has to be taken into consideration when we think of the implications of the study.

We can conclude that the eventual objective of the study of conversational style is to raise the awareness of the participants in cross-cultural communication on both sides. In the next section, I shall explore how this is possible in actual teaching/learning situations.

9.2.2.1 Consciousness-Raising Methodology

In the earlier phase of the 'communicative' movement, great emphasis was placed on the study of the learning content, represented for example, by notional and functional syllabuses. However, this has been criticised as inadequate (see Widdowson 1990, Brindley 1984 cited in Nunan 1989) and the importance of methodology as well as language content has been emphasised.

Nunan (1989) suggests one way of promoting a learner-centred approach is 'by consulting and negotiating with learners on content and methodology, by encouraging learners to formulate their own communicative language objectives by training learners in self-assessment and course evaluation, and by including 'learning-how-to-learn' components in all language programmes' (1989:184). These aspects of learner-centredness seem to play an important role in heightening the awareness of learners.
Awareness-raising could be introduced at several levels. For example, in a pre-task activity, learners could watch a video programme of cross-cultural encounters, focussing on one feature of communicative behaviours each time. Then, they could raise questions and hypotheses on particular characteristics of the feature. In this way, learners' awareness will be heightened to a certain extent before they are actually involved in the task. Or, instead of previewing, a questionnaire which deals with questions related to the features of conversational style could be administered to the learners. Alternatively, both the questionnaire and the previewing can be utilised if necessary.

After these pre-task activities, learners could be divided into a group of four or five, and work on their own assigned task as discussed earlier (see 8.2.1.1). Before they start, the teacher needs to give clear instructions on what the students are supposed to do. Once the students have started working on their own task, the teacher could act as a facilitator, giving advice to each group when requested. This facilitative role of teacher has also been suggested by Dam (1985), cited in Candlin (1987b).

Each group needs to carry out various tasks. To start with, they have to view the video which is assigned to them. Then, they need to find a specific feature which demonstrates clearly a particular characteristic of conversational style. After the identification of these features, they are required to transcribe the data. They need to carry out this procedure both in NSJ-NSJ and NSE-NSE interactions. After completion of the transcription, they could, in groups, discuss and check whether
there are any similarities or differences between the two interaction
types.

After that they could view an NSE-JSE interaction and repeat the same
procedure as before. Then, they could discuss whether there is any
influence from the mother tongue on the target language behaviours or
whether there is any adjustment to the target language behaviours from
those of the mother tongue.

Finally, on the basis of the analysis, each group summarises its result
from the data and presents it to the class. Additionally, they could,
after the presentation, or even before that, summarise the findings in
written form.

This method could not only heighten the awareness of learners in
specific area of conversational behaviours but also involve them in
various language activities in the process of problem-solving. Thus,
it seems to satisfy the syllabus accounts which Candlin(1987b)
suggested, satisfying 'content', 'learning', and 'actions' syllabuses.
This is also closely connected to what Nunan(1989) states about the
importance of taking account of both 'the content (or ends of learning)
and the tasks (or means to those ends)' (1989:15) in designing a
comprehensive curriculum. The importance of the process of learning,
the ways in which learners are to be taught, and of a methodology to
activate knowledge, has been emphasised by Widdowson (1983, 1990).

According to him:

what teaching is concerned with is setting up conditions for
effective performance with the language on the assumption that
in learning how to perform pragmatically learners will somehow
be able to acquire knowledge of the language itself inferentially
It is hoped that an example of methodology presented here satisfies the above requirement by involving learners in task-based problem-solving activities. In order to participate in these activities, learners need to activate their knowledge. Thus, the process of enquiry itself plays an important role not only in terms of the findings from the enquiry but also of consciousness-raising and of the practice and the activation of various language skills and knowledge.

This section has demonstrated one possible method of activating the theory which I have presented. It has, however, to be borne in mind that there is no single methodology which ideally serves every teaching situation or language need of the learners (see Prabhu 1987). A methodology needs to be modified and adjusted according to the teaching situations and learner needs at the level of execution even if the theory underlying the methodology remains the same. What I wished to demonstrate here was that the study of conversational style could fit into an integrated course and that this could be done through a learner-centred task-based problem-solving methodology, putting a special emphasis on the procedures of learning.

9.2.3 Summary
In this section, I have concentrated on discussing the applicability of theory to the pedagogic field. In so doing, I have discussed the implications of the present study for pedagogy at two levels: at the level of developing language teaching materials, which is directly related to the findings of the present research, and that of classroom application/methodology, which is related to the procedures of the
enquiry itself. It seems that there is tremendous scope for the development of teaching materials in this specific area, in the fields of both video and audio-taped materials and of textbooks. At the same time, there needs to be further detailed study of other features of conversational behaviours. It must also be remembered that materials need to be designed to heighten the awareness of the conversational interactants on both sides.

From the perspective of the classroom, I have indicated that the present research methodology itself can be adopted as a methodology for language teaching/learning. Teachers themselves as researchers can apply this method as an enquiry device as well as using it for teaching purposes. Learners can be actively involved in the enquiry through designing questionnaires, planning and recording various interactions, analysing the data and correlating the results. By actively participating in the enquiry in this way, learners will not only be able to heighten their awareness in the specific field of investigation but also 'they will be able to acquire knowledge of the language itself inferentially by themselves' (Widdowson 1990:160). Thus, the process of enquiry itself plays a vital role in the kind of approach I have introduced in the present study in terms of both consciousness-raising and the activation of various language skills and knowledge.

9.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This final chapter has considered the implications of the present study for language pedagogy. First of all, I stressed the usefulness of the
descriptive model formulated in this study as a framework for analysis. I noted that the study of conversational style in a cross-cultural context encompasses the notions of communicative capacity, culture, accessibility and acceptability, all of which play a very important role in the framework. Secondly, I indicated how the findings from the study and the process of the enquiry itself can be adopted in language pedagogy. Particularly, I emphasised the relevance of introducing a task-based consciousness-raising methodology to the cross-cultural study of conversational style. This is because, since the features of conversational style themselves operate subconsciously, it is in a double sense meaningful to introduce an approach which emphasises the heightening of awareness. Secondly, because the features of conversational style are closely associated with the cultural identity of the conversationalists, it is important not to impose certain value-laden cultural norms on learners. In this respect as well, a non-imposing, awareness-heightening approach seems to be most suitable to the field.

NOTE

1. This chapter concentrates on the general implications of the present study for language pedagogy. The development of specific teaching materials will take more time and a further research project is necessary.
EPILOGUE

I had not heard the old man's voice for some time. Peace and quiet seemed to have returned to the area. Then, one day I heard unusual noises in the street. Out of curiosity, I looked out of the window and saw an ambulance and a stretcher outside the house next door. The front door seemed to be locked from inside and a fireman was climbing up the ladder to get in to the old man's first floor residence. Suddenly I understood what the absence of the man's ritual exchanges meant. After this I never heard his voice again.

Strangely enough, thereafter I quite often found myself expecting to hear the old man's voice asking the time of passers-by at night. On reflection, it seems to me that the exchanges were not merely the old man's search for rapport but also, or more, a cry for help. However, he did not (or perhaps could not) use the means of spoken communication, that of asking directly for help -- for a 'transactional' purpose -- towards the end of his life, but rather he kept using them only for an 'interactional' purpose.

I even came to think that somehow I might have received some comfort hearing the man's voice struggling to confirm his existence during the long solitary process of completing this thesis---the voice which I had once been so frightened to hear, but which gradually and unconsciously, had become a familiar sound and part of my everyday life.
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