

Using Authentic Spoken Language Norms in Scripted Role Plays to Teach Register Awareness

C. J. Creighton (Faculty of Education, Okayama University)

This investigate teaching pragmatic competence, specifically the appropriate register. The subjects were 34 2nd year EFL students enrolled in "Basic Conversation", over one semester, at a Japanese national university. Students wrote and performed 4 scripted dialogues as part of an ABAB single case study where the intervention was focusing exercises of optimal features of the oral register in authentic NS dialogues. Comparison of the baseline and subsequent scripts using the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test (non-parametric) showed a significant increase in the use of spoken features. Student feedback and instructor observation also provided corroboration. The results point to the utility of authentic materials in the Japanese EFL classroom.

Keywords: pragmatic competence, oral register, authentic language, scripted dialogues, ABAB single case study

Introduction

Japanese English Learners Lack Pragmatic Knowledge

Communicative ability is made up of organizational and pragmatic competence, respectively defined as language knowledge and appropriate language use (Bachman, 1990). Neu(1990) researches why a Japanese male's English communicative ability was rated lower than that of another learner. Compared to another learner, Neu's Japanese English learner had greater syntactic and lexical ability, but worse nonverbal performance, ability to interpret figures of speech, gesture use, and understanding of backchannels and pauses. Neu's Japanese English learner had a high level of language knowledge and a low level of appropriate language use.

Japanese English Education is Restricted

A cause of the pragmatic weakness of English learners is found in the nature of L2 classrooms, which fail to teach appropriate language use for several reasons. L2 classrooms are restricted by their range of speech acts, shorter openings and closings, lack of discourse markers and politeness markings, and teacher monopolization (Kasper, 1997). Another is the representation of English. Much language learning material is over-simplified. The English modeled is not based on authentic language but the intuition of the textbook writer. Developing pragmatic competence with such material is unlikely (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, and Reynolds, 1991; Cathcart, 1989; Williams, 1988; Myers-Scotton and Bernstein, 1988). Japanese English classrooms have further limitations which prevent the development of pragmatic competence.

Japanese English classrooms are not oriented towards developing communicative ability. The curriculum is entrance exam oriented. Passing such tests requires a high level of reading with a

washback effect on the curriculum. In a survey of the six best-selling senior high school texts approved for use in Japan, reading is emphasized. Out of 42 sampled exercises, there are 36 reading and six speaking tasks where “Verbal language is represented as a contrived dialogue” (Gorsuch, 1999, p. 14). There were no tasks “...for students to exchange information, to use unscripted language, or to consider English from a larger-than-sentence-level point of view” (Gorsuch, 1999, p. 8). Junior high school is similar. In the popular text, *Sunshine 3* (1997), there are 11 listening and 15 speaking exercises, and 42 reading exercises. Next is the prevalence of *yakudoku*, grammar-translation, where lessons concentrate upon memorization and accurate translation of English phrases (Guest 2000). Guest suggests *yakudoku* prescriptively teaches only a part of grammar, the rules of syntax.

The above is not an authentic representation of English. It develops organizational competence but not pragmatic competence.

Last is the resistance to teaching pragmatic competence based upon Native Speaker (NS) standards. The aim of English education in Japan, apart from providing a subject for entrance tests and teaching English to Japanese translation, is to further cross-cultural understanding. Presumably as part of a concept of cross-cultural understanding based upon maintaining differences, a simplified “...Japanese variety of English...” is appropriate for Non Native Speakers (NNS) (Takatsuka, 1999, p. 131). Teaching Japanese English will not develop learners’ organizational or pragmatic competence in standard English. So because of the exam-oriented curriculum, *yakudoku*, and teacher resistance, Japanese L2 classrooms do not teach appropriate English use. Learners therefore do not achieve communicative ability.

Learners want ‘Real’ English

Many Japanese learners dislike English because they can’t communicate with NS. This is due to lack of pragmatic competence. An example is the NNS being asked for directions by a NS. The NNS, trained by textbook dialogues to expect a clear request, response and thanks, is surprised with fillers, tags and incomplete sentences (Myers-Scotton and Bernsten, 1988). The result is communication failure “I couldn’t understand what the foreigner wanted!”

As a result, students want to develop their pragmatic competence through authentic English. One person related to a meeting of English university professors her confusion at first hearing authentic English during her homestay in the United States. She referred to the importance of pragmatic competence and asked “Why didn’t you teach me this stuff?” (personal communication). The plethora of English conversation schools, cram schools, English radio and TV programs, English journals, and homestay programs found in Japan also suggests the desire to develop pragmatic competence and communicative ability through authentic English.

A Role for Authentic Language

Authentic Language is Necessary

NS and NNS teachers can advance Japanese learners communicative ability by using authentic language in the classroom. For one “Language is so complex, and our understanding of it so far from complete, that perhaps authentic language is the only safe starting point for teaching” (Williams, 1988, p. 53). Additionally “...authentic native speaker input is indispensable...” to impart

pragmatic knowledge (Kasper, 1997, p. 9).

There have been studies using authentic language for L2 pragmatic learning. Researchers have collected samples of natural language, noted gaps between concurrent teaching material and actual language use, and made suggestions for more effective teaching. Williams(1988) gives a demonstration in an English for Specific Purposes context, where authentic language for business meetings was collected, analyzed, and the main characteristics identified for teaching. Likewise, actual language use patterns have been taught for ending a conversation (Bardovi-Harlig, et al. 1991), apologies (Cohen and Olshtain, 1981), doctor's consultations (Cathcart, 1989), and directions (Myers-Scotton and Bernsten, 1988).

Distinguishing the Oral Register

Teaching the characteristics of the oral register is another area where authentic language could increase learners' pragmatic knowledge. Many Japanese students treat written and spoken language as the same. For instance student writing has oral features such as conjunctions beginning sentences. L2 speech has instances of writing features. For example students use the full forms of verbs in speaking "I am" instead of "I'm". The full verb form in speech is unusual. In NS speech, 75% of the occurrences of 'be' are contracted (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 1999). There are other examples of written features in students' speaking such as: oddly stressed monotone pronunciation; overspecific language; unawareness of tags, discourse marking and backchannelling; and, over-correct language. Having such a jumble of written and oral features creates marked language which leads to pragmatic failure. As nearly all Japanese L2 learner input has been written, including the textbook dialogues, this is hardly surprising. Because Japanese students do not seem to know there are characteristics of spoken English, the following will examine how to increase learners' pragmatic awareness of the characteristics of the oral register. The written register will not be considered.

Spoken English

Characteristics

Both NNS and NS teachers, therefore, need to know the characteristics of 'real' spoken English for competent presentation of the features of the spoken register. Identifying these is difficult. NS cannot accurately discuss the characteristics of their natural speech. Some aspects of spoken discourse are automatic, so "...not all is accessible to consciousness"(Schmidt, 1993, p. 23). NNS teachers, despite the depth of their consciously learned English, are sometimes at a loss, too.

With the development of computerized corpora of spoken English, NS and NNS teachers can now examine the spoken language as it is used. For example, The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English in a functional survey finds conversational grammar is:

- spoken;
- in a shared context;
- vague and inexact;
- interactive;
- expressive of emotion and attitude;
- conducted real time with normal dysfluency;
- restricted and repetitive;

vernacular; and,
sometimes without functional explanation

This is a description of the spoken register based upon NS norms that could serve as a reference for NS and NNS teachers.

There is concern over the appropriateness of teaching NS norms to NNS voiced by Aston(1993) and Cohen and Olshtain(1981). Aston(1993) questions learners only "...acquiring nativelike sociolinguistic competence in the attempt to mimic the behavior of a native speaker,..."(p. 245). Aston suggests NNS be trained to use comity strategies to expand the utility of their interlanguage. Cohen and Olshtain(1981) also question the validity of judging NNS, particularly in EFL situations, by NS norms. Yoshimi(1999), however, points out how the language socialization of NNS leads to a widening cycle of "...affective and epistemic functions in learner L2 production"(p. 1523). Additionally we saw that students want to increase their communicative ability. A resolution is for teachers to develop student awareness of the features of spoken NS English. The degree of adoption is for students to decide (Bardovi-Harlig, et al., 1991). Therefore, teachers can present the features of NS spoken discourse.

Focusing Attention

Next NS and NNS English teachers need to consider how to raise students awareness. It would appear the key is to focus students on the input's target features (Schmidt, 1993,). Schmidt(1983 and 1993) were examples of L2 immersion where focusing and learning were implicit and largely initiated by an expert learner. For the teaching of pragmatic features, it has been usually found "...explicitly taught students did better than the implicit groups"(Kasper, 1997, p. 6). For EFL an explicit identification of features would seem necessary. To make learners aware of the characteristics of oral discourse, explicit learning tasks based upon authentic native conversations are needed.

Student Performance

Last, student performance needs to be considered. Learning requires cycles of observation, noticing, hypothesizing, and experimentation. In light of the EFL setting and the limited amount of class time, the ideal learner-centered activity is role play. Role plays are where participants take a specified part in a short performance. A role play with partners lends itself to the demonstration of many of the functional features of conversation. It is spoken, there is shared information, it is interactive, and it takes place in real time. Role plays also appear to elicit more natural levels of interaction from learners (Eisenstein and Bodman, 1993). Role plays, because they elicit longer turns and a wider range of expressions, have more validity in showing "...true pragmatic competence"(Sasaki, 1997, p. 479). Last, role plays are a method to demonstrate student thinking and experimentation.

Role plays have drawbacks. Achieving a successful performance is demanding imaginatively and cognitively, so they possibly overtax learners (Kasper, 1999). There are other considerations. Preparation often requires students to work with their classmates outside of class time, so there are problems coordinating meetings. There are some students who are shy. Some partners dislike each other. Next student role plays often degenerate into slapstick routines because they have no "...effective social consequences"(Aston, 1993, p. 229). Last is the length of time required of the researcher/teacher to make a reliable transcription for evaluation. To overcome these the teacher needs to devote class time to

preparation. Students could write their role plays ("scripted dialogue" (Sasaki, 1997, p. 479)). Scripted dialogues would both reduce the difficulty both for students, and the researcher who would have a ready-made transcript. Last students should agree to the use of role plays, and those too shy could be excused from performing.

To conclude, students wish to develop their communicative ability by increasing their pragmatic competence through learning authentic English. Informing students of the NS norms for spoken discourse is valuable pedagogically. With computerized corpora, we can select representative features, and design explicit-learning tasks to focus student attention on authentic examples of NS speech. Finally, teachers and student can benefit from scripted dialogues.

Research Question and Hypothesis

From the foregoing, the following research question has been developed, 'Can NNS acquire awareness of the features of NS oral discourse?' The operational hypothesis holds that after explicit instruction of the features of oral discourse, based upon authentic NS dialogues, scripted dialogues by NNS will show a significant increase in the use of the features over initially determined baseline values. The null hypothesis holds there will be no significant performance difference in the use of oral discourse features before and after instruction.

Method

The method was chosen to show the longitudinal development of participant awareness of the features in question. Design

The research design is based upon the ABAB Single Case Research of four scripted dialogues respectively Baseline, Intervention, Baseline, and Intervention (Nunan, 1992). The first finds students' baseline knowledge of the spoken features of authentic NS speech as determined by the checklist below. Intervention involves presenting the students with an authentic NS dialogue, and having them complete noticing exercises of the features of NS speech. The students then write and perform the second dialogue. Their awareness of the spoken features of authentic NS speech is determined by the checklist. Next the students write and perform a third dialogue and their awareness is measured with the checklist. The fourth is the final intervention. The participants awareness of the spoken features of NS oral discourse is evaluated according to the checklist.

Outline of the Study Design

Scripted Dialogue (SD)

SD1 Baseline knowledge

SD2 Intervention, focusing exercises-authentic NS dialogue

SD3 Baseline knowledge

SD4 Intervention, focusing exercises-authentic NS dialogue

The language function of the authentic NS input and the students' scripted output is transactional.

Test Instrument

The test instrument is modified from the list of the characteristics of spoken discourse (pp. 8-9). There are five changes to account for the circumstances of the study. First is the limitation of 14, 90 minute classes. Only representative features of the respective characteristics of spoken language were chosen. Next the students had learned in previous courses about the Spoken features of stress, tone, tempo and elision. It was assumed student awareness would remain, so the features would be found from the start. Next Vernacular English and Restricted and Repetitive categories would not be assessed because the students are L2 learners with limited vocabulary derived from standard English. Finally Lack of functional explanation would be skipped.

Checklist of Features of Spoken English

1. Shared context:

(ellipsis)

2. Vague and inexact:

quality / quantity hedging

3. Interactive:

adjacency pairs

backchannel

tags

discourse markers

4. Expressive of emotion and attitude:

polite formula

interjections/exclamations

5. Real time:

normal dysfluency

[interruption]

error

hesitation

repeat

contractions

Procedure

The first script was based on a textbook dialogue. Students had the task as homework and then over half a class to rehearse. Students had been encouraged to memorize their lines, but during their performance they could refer to their notebooks. The audience were asked to evaluate their colleagues' performances based upon dramatic impact. The instructor tape recorded the results and observed the students' behavior.

The next stage introduced the model of an authentic NS dialogue. Students began by listening to a 5 minute recording of one NS asking advice from another in an unscripted, authentic conversation. They next did a number of exercises to focus their attention on the relevant features of NS spoken discourse using the checklist. They then made their own skit where one person seeks advice

from another. They were to use all of the NS oral English features identified in the focusing exercises. Each group was given a similar amount of preparation time to the first role play. Students had been encouraged to memorize their lines, but during their role play, they could refer to their notebooks. For further awareness-raising, role plays were evaluated by the audience using the checklist. The instructor tape recorded and made observations. Students were asked for their feedback.

The third stage had the students write and act without the stimulus of focusing upon authentic NS speech to find the features of spoken English. The fourth stage had the students write and act with the stimulus of focusing upon a 5 minute tape recording of authentic NS speech to find the features of spoken English. The goal for both was to make their dialogues as authentic seeming as possible. In other respects a similar procedure to role plays 1 and 2 was followed.

Participants

The participants were second year Faculty of Education students attending the local university. They had signed up for the instructor's 'Basic English Conversation' class. Class was 90 minutes once a week, for 14 weeks. 34 students had registered, but attendance varied between 26 and 32. There were 6 males. Grade levels were one fourth year, 11 third year, and 22 second year students. The majority were English majors. English level varied from several students who could translate into Japanese the instructor's explanations to those who were reluctant to say their names in English.

Based upon an *ad hoc* survey, it appears that students had a mixture of motivations. Student reasons (more than one per student possible) were around 75% selected the course from a pool of required subjects, 40% chose it out of interest, 15% because of usefulness for their future work, and 10% because they liked the teacher.

The basic class was chosen for the study as it had the largest number of lower level speakers. A common objection to using authentic conversation is that it overwhelms lower level learners. Choosing a class with the most, low level students provided a negative bias to the investigation's results.

The instructor consulted with the students about covering authentic spoken English. To encourage a best effort the course grading scheme was based upon performance of four scripted dialogues (Bachman and Palmer, 1996)

Evaluation

A checklist assists students to focus their attention on the relevant features in NS real dialogues. It also provides a reference for group work and self-study in preparation for students' own scripted dialogues. Last it provides a basis for student assessment. To illustrate a group's first scripted dialogue is checked. A customer complains and receives an apology from a shop manager.

An example of a scripted dialogue 1:

1. Shop manager (M): Good morning, madam [*polite formula*]. Can I help you? I heard you have a complaint.
2. Customer (C): Yes (I have a complaint [*ellipsis*]) I'd like to see manager, please. [*adjacency pair*]
3. M: Yes, I'm [*contraction*] the manager. Are you Miss Teramoto?
4. C: Yes. I've got a problem with this telephone.
5. M: I'm sorry to hear that. What's the trouble?
6. C: Well [*discourse marker*], I bought it yesterday. I'm afraid it's useless. One of the buttons is stuck.

7. M: I'm really sorry about that, madam.

8. C: Yesterday I tried to call my boss. I pushed the button no. 2 repeatedly but it didn't work. So, I couldn't call. I was severely scolded.

9. M: Well, I really am sorry about this, madam. I do apologize. We'll happy to replace the telephone for you.

10. C: It's a matter of course. But I prefer to refund.

11. M: Certainly, madam. Please come here.

Data Analysis and Results

Four sets of data were collected: the student scripts, the recordings of their performances, their feedback on the role-plays, and instructor observations. The data were examined to find if there was a difference between the performance of the students groups before and after their focusing on the presented features of authentic NS spoken English.

Tape Recordings and Instructor Observation

The tape recordings of all student performances supported the assumption that the features of the 'Spoken' category of oral discourse would appear from role play 1. Students used stress, tone, tempo and loudness, and elision throughout. Comparison of the scripts and recorded performances showed students followed their lines.

The instructor observed students enjoying giving and watching the performances. A skillful role play had an evident effect on subsequent performances. Many students modified their scripts based on what they had observed. Additionally students reacted to the performances by clapping or laughing. There was also reaction to aspects of oral discourse that had been skillfully woven into a dialogue, particularly if it had been normal dysfluency such as an error or hesitation. Last the instructor often felt surprise at the proficiency of the students. With 34 students those reluctant to ask a question or volunteer an answer have little chance for personal attention. The performances were an opportunity to hear the English of students who would have been silent.

Student Scripts

The student scripts were evaluated by the checklist above. There were notable differences between the first and subsequent scripts. The first were like textbook dialogues. For example the language was too precise for oral discourse. In the script above (p. 19) the customer specifies "I pushed the button no. 2...", instead of "I pushed *this* button..." There was only one example of quality/quantity hedging found in another script "...it makes a *funny* noise." Most scripts were too specific "There is not display on this CD player. Usually, CD player displays the time, number of music." Next interaction was limited to a series of well separated turns of question/answer or statement/response instead of a more fluid exchange. For example there was only one instance of backchannelling "Oh, really?" In terms of expressing emotion, scripts showed examples of politeness with greetings and apologies, but they were overly polite. There was only one instance of an interjection "Clerk: 'She is in conference now.' Customer: *No!* Call your boss."

Finally only one script had one example of normal dysfluency, a hesitator "Please change it [*sic*] the new one. *Uh*...Blue one." There were no interruptions, errors, or repeats. Students used contractions, but inconsistently. For instance in the script above the customer says "*I'm* afraid *it's*

useless”, but several exchanges later “*It is* a matter of course” without the contraction. Overall the scripts of the first role play are examples of the contrived, textbook-like dialogues that the students have learned during high school.

Later scripts, after focusing exercises on features of authentic NS conversations, had much richer examples of spoken English. For instance, below are excerpts by the same partners as above (p. 19). There is an interruption, interjection, repeat, and a tag question.

Wife: I'm tired of doing housework. Everyday I have to get up early and make you and children awake and make breakfast and washing clothes of all my family and clean rooms and...

Husband: ...(*interruption*) OK OK.(*interjection, repeat*) You want to give me some of them, don't you? (*tag question*)

There is also an example of hesitation and error “Hmm...Where no, no what should I do?” Another script had many backchannels, interruptions, and normal dysfluencies.

Terumi: Yesterday, I saw many police....

Junko: [Did you?]

Terumi: ...in front of Tomato Bank...

Junko: [Uh...n n..ear near Benesse?]

By the final role play students were knowledgeable enough to annotate their scripts with the meta-terms of the check list. For example a student marked their own script “A: ‘Oh (*interjection*), that's great. Will you go to Osaka by your car?’ B: ‘No (I will go there [*ellipsis*] by train.’” After focusing exercises on features of authentic NS conversations the second, third and fourth scripted dialogues were qualitatively closer to spoken NS English.

To evaluate if there was a significant difference the first three scripts were scored: if there was the respective feature, the group received a point. Points per role play were totaled and compared. Scoring minimized differences between pre- and post- treatment because only one occurrence of a feature was necessary for a point, minimizing post- values. No matter how many examples of a feature were found in a post-treatment script, it would receive only one point. The data was nominal and non-parametric. To find if there was a significant difference between scores, a Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test (Non-Parametric) analysis was done. For example the scoring of the scripted dialogue above is five as there were five features: polite formula, ellipsis, adjacency pair, contraction, and discourse marker. Here is an example of a scored scripted dialogue 2 by the group above.

1. Andy (A): Are you going to go to shops, Mike?
2. Mike (M): Yeah, (*ellipsis* I'm going to the shops..) if you want. Shall I get something for you?
3. A: Uh, (*hesitator*) if you don't mind (*contraction*). Uh...could you get me some...Well, I haven't toothpaste left.(*error*)
4. M: OK, all right.
5. A: I like Sa Sa ...Sanident. (*repeat*) Uh, if the store has got it.
6. M: Well, OK. (*discourse markers*)

7. A: Oh, (*interjection*) I have run out of soap! (*Adjacency pair*: indirect request and response following)
8. M: Yeah, I'll get it for you.
9. A: Uh... and do you mind posting my letter at the same time, OK?
10. M: Not at all.
11. A: Oh, I'll give you money. (*quality/quantity hedging* amount of unstated)
12. M: No, wait and give me after I come back. It's simple, isn't it? (*tag question*)
13. A: All right. Thanks indeed. (*polite formula*)
14. M: You're welcome.

Score: 11

Table 1

A Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test(Non-Parametric) Scripts 1 and 2

Student group (sg), Script 1 (S1), Script 2 (S2)

sg	S1	S2	d	ranks
1.	6	10	-4	5.5(-)
2.	6	8	-2	2.5(-)
3.	9	7	2	2.5
4.	8	10	2	2.5
5.	7	11	-4	5.5(-)
6.	5	11	-6	8(-)
7.	6	11	-5	7(-)
8.	6	8	-2	2.5(-)

T=5

N=8

Since the test is one-tailed at <0.05 level of significance, the Critical Value (CV) is 6 (Burns, 1997, p. 179). As $T(5) < CV(6)$, the null hypothesis is rejected: there is a significant positive difference in performance between Role play 1 and 2. Using the same method Role play 3 also shows a significant positive difference with Role play 1: $T(1) < CV(4)$ rejecting the null hypothesis.

Student Feedback

Student feedback in English or Japanese was sought after the performances of scripted dialogues 2 and 3. The responses were categorized and ranked.

1. extremely useful: 8 comments
2. difficult, I'm not used to using such features: 7
3. I want to sound natural in English: 6
4. fun: 6
5. interesting: 5
6. I didn't know it was OK to use the features of oral discourse: 5
7. it's the same as speaking Japanese: 3
8. our lesson books until now have been very different: 3
9. this will be useful for watching English movies and travel to the US: 2
10. I want to learn connected speech: 1
11. it's good to practice ellipsis and contractions: 1
12. I've had many chances to listen to authentic English: 1
13. I'm happy I can sound natural: 1
14. it's complicated, I'm shy about using 'Oh, Well' etc.: 1

Student response was favorable. Students also showed an increase in awareness of the spoken register. Of note were categories 6,7 and 8, relating to oral discourse. Before the intervention they showed no awareness of the oral register. Now they were referring to meta-terms like oral discourse, ellipsis, and contractions.

Also important is the perceived difficulty. Students' comments and questions show their uncertainty over use of the features. One noted "...but it was difficult for me that I added to dialogue, for example tag, ellipsis...I don't know which part is how can change [sic]. Another wonders "I'm not sure where and how the features put in the conversation[sic] naturally." About 80% of the students claimed in the informal survey at the end "I did my best" or "I worked hard." Students remained affectively open, however. For almost all comments about difficulty the students qualified themselves by adding "useful", "fun", "interesting", or "I want to continue learning the features of spoken English." One student indicated the difficulty of breaking away from the *yakudoku* emphasis on accuracy, "When I talk (speak) English in conversation style, I often try to say correctly. so[sic] in my conversation, I can hardly say repeat or ellipsis."

Discussion

The data shows a significant increase in use and awareness of the features of spoken discourse in student written scripted dialogues after focusing exercises on features of authentic NS conversations. There are, however, limitations on the interpretation of the results. First is the construct validity. Only an optimal number of the features of spoken discourse were selected for the focusing exercises and use in the scripted role-plays. There is an undetermined amount of subjectivity in the choice of items. The reliability of the scoring of the student scripts can also be questioned as the investigator did it himself. An effort was made, however, to elicit results to reject the hypothesis by using a group with lower level participants. Furthermore the scoring of the checklist was designed to minimize

the amount of change.

Internal validity is problematic. One can only infer that the subjects' behavior was modified by the intervention. There are, however, some suggestive hints from the students' written feedback. Their questions show previously undemonstrated meta-awareness as do their self-annotated scripts. Some students modified their scripts in response to their peers' role plays. This too, suggests students noticing and an increase in awareness. To a degree there were signs that student behavior had changed due to the intervention. Because validity is questionable and replication is difficult data was triangulated with tape recordings, scripts, instructor observation, and student feedback.

With the above limitations in mind the study achieved the following. The performances allowed the instructor to observe all learners in lengthy student-centered English exchanges. It was the first time for the instructor to hear several speak English. In the study, there was a significant difference between the first and subsequent three scripts. The first established that the students were unaware of the features of spoken discourse. Their scripts read like contrived textbook dialogues. Scripted dialogue 2, after focusing exercises on features of authentic NS conversations, was closer to the spoken NS norm appearing to be more natural. Students also showed a new significant awareness of the oral register. This persisted in scripted dialogues 3 where there were no focusing exercises on features of authentic NS conversation, and 4 where there were. Student affective reaction was also positive.

Future study will investigate whether the intervention resulted in the students realizing they could use their L1 knowledge of the features of spoken discourse in L2 transactional conversations, or if the intervention expanded their knowledge of L2 oral discourse beyond that taught by their reading-skill English language learning curriculum. Within the limitations of the study, one can conclude authentic conversations are pedagogically useful in the Japanese EFL classroom to develop pragmatic knowledge and therefore increase communicative ability.

References

- Aston, G., 1993. Notes of the Interlanguage of Comity. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka, (eds) Interlanguage Pragmatics, (224-250). New York: OUP.
- Bachman, L., and Palmer, A., 1996. Language Testing in Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L., 1990. Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M., and Reynolds, D., 1991. Developing Pragmatic Awareness: Closing the Conversation. ELT Journal, 45, 1, 4-15.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., and Finegan, E., 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Harlow: Longman.
- Brown, G., and Yule, G., 1983. Teaching the Spoken Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, R., 1997. Introduction to Research Methods. South Melbourne: Longman.
- Cathcart, R., 1989. Authentic Discourse and the Survival English Curriculum. TESOL Quarterly, 23,1,

105-126.

- Cohen, A., and Olshtain, E., 1981. Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: the case of apology. Language Learning, 31, 113-134.
- Eisenstein M., and Bodman J., 1993. Expressing gratitude in American English. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka, (eds.) Interlanguage Pragmatics, (64-81). New York: OUP.
- Gorsuch, G., 1999. Mombusho Approved Textbooks in Japanese High School EFL Classes: An Aid or a Hindrance to Educational Policy Innovations? The Language Teacher 23, 10, 5-15.
- Guest, M., 2000. "But I have to teach grammar!" An analysis of the role 'grammar' plays in Japanese university English entrance examinations. The Language Teacher 24, 11, 23-29.
- Kasper, G., 1997. Can Pragmatic Competence be taught? NFLRC NetWork #6. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Kasper, G., 1999. Data Collection in Pragmatics Research. University of Hawai'i Working Papers in English as a Second Language, 18, 1, 71-107.
- Kasper, G., and Blum-Kulka S., 1993. Interlanguage Pragmatics, New York: OUP.
- Myers-Scotton, C., and Bernstein, J., 1988. Natural Conversations as a Model for Textbook Dialogue. Applied Linguistics, 9, 4, 372-384.
- Neu, J., 1993. Assessing the Role of Nonverbal Communication in the Acquisition of Communicative Competence in L2. In R. Scarcella et al., (eds.) Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language, Newbury House.
- Nunan, D., 1992. Research Methods in Second Language Learning. Cambridge University Press.
- Sasaki, M., 1998. Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts. A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. Journal of Pragmatics, 30, 457-484.
- Schmidt, R., 1983. Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds.), Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition. (237-274). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schmidt, R., 1993. Consciousness, Learning, and Interlanguage Pragmatics. In G. Kasper and S. Blum-Kulka, (eds.) Interlanguage Pragmatics, (21-42). New York: OUP.
- Sunshine 3, 1997. Kairyudo.
- Swan, M., Walter, C., The New Cambridge English Course, level 3
- Takatsuka, S., 1999. Does teaching English contribute to greater cross-cultural understanding on the part of learners in Japan? Bulletin of Faculty of Education, Okayama University, 112, 123-134.
- Williams, M., 1988. Language taught for meetings and language used in meetings: Is there anything in common? Applied Linguistics, 9, 1, 45-58.
- Yoshimi, D., 1999. L1 language socialization as a variable in the use of *ne* by L2 learners of Japanese. Journal of Pragmatics, 31, 11, 1513-1525.

(平成 12 年 12 月 26 日原稿受理)

語い教授における対話スクリプトを使ったオーセンティックな話し言葉の規範の使用

クリス・J・クレイトン (岡山大学教育学部)

本研究は、適切な語い使用という語用論的能力の教授について考察するものである。被験者は日本の国立大学における 34 人の EFL 学習者で、Basic Conversation の授業を履修する学生である。彼らは、ABAB single case study の中で 4 つの対話スクリプトについて記述、実演を行い、実験の処遇として、オーセンティックな NS の対話における口語的な語いの主な特徴の使用についての活動が含まれる。Wilcoxon Singled Ranks Test によって、話し言葉の特徴の使用について、処遇の有無による有意差があることがわかった。本研究の結果は、日本人 EFL 学習者のクラスにおけるオーセンティック・マテリアルの使用の有用性を示したものとなっている。

キーワード：語用論的能力，口語的な語い，オーセンティックな話し言葉，対話スクリプト，ABAB single case study