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ABSTRACT

The present study investigates native speakers’ speech adjustments for non-native speakers whose proficiency levels are intermediate and advanced. The studies on Foreigner Talk (FT) in the past 15 years are reviewed and summarized. Most of the literature on FT deals with beginner level non-native speakers in or outside the classroom, and lack statistical plausibility. The present study aims to remedy these deficiencies.

Ten native speakers of Japanese and five intermediate and five advanced level non-native speakers of Japanese are selected on a voluntary basis from two university communities. Their social background, such as age, sex, social status, physical appearance, prior acquaintance, is controlled in order to compare native speakers’ speech adjustments more objectively.

A problem solving technique is used in the experiment in order to hold the subjects’ attention on content, not on language. Three tape-recording sessions for the native speakers, and two sessions for the non-native speakers are assigned on a one-to-one basis.

Six linguistic features (formal form, syntactic deletion, coordinate conjunctive forms, repetitions to promote comprehension, honorific forms, complex constructions) are selected to see differences in their use by native speakers in their discourse with native and non-native speakers. The hypothesis that native speakers use more listener-oriented speech for non-native speakers than for native speakers is examined in the context of six more specific sub-hypotheses.

The statistical results show that speech adjustments of the native speakers with highly proficient speakers are very minimal: Their only adjustment with the advanced speakers is in coordinate conjunctive forms.

Their speech adjustments with the intermediate speakers are found in coordinate conjunctive forms, syntactic deletion, and repetitions to promote comprehension. Especially, repetitions to promote comprehension are statistically very significant. The native speakers, on the whole, try to make themselves understandable (they are listener-oriented) when they
talk with the intermediate speakers.

Other features (formal form, honorific forms, complex constructions) do not show any difference in their use by the native speakers for either listener proficiency level.

The findings in the present study may be applied in classroom teaching for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers, but the primary purpose of this study is to contribute to studies on FT in general.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

In 1971, Ferguson first used the term "foreigner talk" (FT) in his article and hypothesized that the FT of a speech community may serve as an incipient pidgin. He defined FT as follows:

.....many, perhaps all, speech communities have registers of a special kind for use with people who are regarded for one reason or another as unable to readily understand the normal speech of the community (e.g. babies, foreigners, deaf people).....A register of simplified speech which has been less studied, although it seems quite widespread and may even be universal, is the kind of "foreigner talk" which is used by the speaker of a language to outsiders who are felt to have very limited command of the language or no knowledge of it at all. (p.143)

His interest was in analyzing the process of pidginization.

However, some researchers after him (Henzl 1973, 1979; Hatch, Shapira, and Gough 1978; Long 1981a,b, 1982, 1983a,b; Wesche and Ready, in press; for instance) became interested in the study of FT in relation to second language acquisition (SLA). Krashen's (1981a) theories of "input plus one" (input which is a little above the learner's proficiency level is well received) and "focus on content not on form" (focus on what the learner wants to say, not on grammar he uses, has better effect in SLA) contributed to FT research as theoretical background. Even some researchers investigated actual effects of FT in SLA (Schmidt 1981 - quoted in Long 1983; Wesche and Ready, in press).

The results are not conclusive yet. Wesche and Ready (in press) report that the adjusted mode of speech by professors when teaching psychology in the students' second language helped students acquire the second language as well as knowledge of the subject.

Schmidt's longitudinal case study on a Japanese artist in Hawaii (1981) shows that the early fossilization of the subject's English prevented him from acquiring an advanced level of English, although he was always exposed to comprehensible "input plus one" input from his English friends and admirers.
Other researchers such as Larsen-Freeman (1983) and Blum & Levenston (1978) are critical of some forms of FT in SLA. Blum & Levenston warn that an unsuccessful paraphrasing by the teacher in the early stage of second language learning hinders students in acquiring the correct use of vocabulary.

Larsen-Freeman (1983) argues that learners can acquire a second language by obtaining simplified input through "selective" attention to the unmodified speech of native speakers (e.g. radio, TV, books). She says that native speakers' overaccommodated speech is harmful.

Although some researchers are critical of FT as a good input for SLA, it is reasonable to hypothesize that "linguistic/conversational adjustment is necessary for SLA" (Long 1983). Krashen (1981b) also supports FT as one of the useful simple codes in SLA.

As Long (1983) suggests, one of the strongest motivations for the study of FT is "the possibility that some or all of them play a role in SLA". Findings in FT will help to develop efficient classroom teaching materials and textbooks as well as effective teaching approaches.

However, actual data on the positive effect of FT on SLA are very limited. Since language acquisition takes time, it is often hard for the researcher to control variables over the necessary period.

Many studies have reported on the linguistic and/or conversational characteristics of FT for beginner and/or intermediate levels (Ferguson 1975, Meisel 1977, Hatch, Shapira, and Gough 1978, Long 1981a, Skoutarides 1981, Varonis & Gass 1982), and FT in the classroom (Henzl 1973, 1979; Chaudron 1982, 1983; Long & Sato 1983, Wesche & Ready, in press). However, there are few studies on FT for intermediate to advanced level speakers in the natural setting outside the classroom. Only Gaies' study (1982) handles advanced level speakers outside the classroom.
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study, therefore, is to investigate the native speaker's adjustment in discourse and in syntax with the non-native speaker whose proficiency level is quite high (intermediate to advanced). To investigate the effect of FT on the second language acquisition is beyond the scope of this study.

In Japan, in the summer of 1985, the author participated in a 7-week study program for teachers who teach Japanese abroad, sponsored by the Japan Foundation. The teachers (high school, college, and university instructors) were from 27 countries all over the world. There were 80 non-native and 10 native speaker participants in this program. The author observed 30 of these non-native speakers, talking with many varieties of Japanese native speakers, and noticed that native speakers seldom modified their speech linguistically and/or conversationally once they knew that non-native speakers could speak the language fluently. Foreign accent, grammatical mistakes, physical appearance ('looking foreign') did not cause the use of so-called 'foreigner talk' in their discourse. Foreigner Talk which is usually used by native speakers with beginner level non-native speakers, ( 'slowing down', 'clear articulation', 'use of here and now topics', 'use of simple sentences', and 'repeated use of yes/no questions', etc.) was rarely used with highly proficient non-native speakers.

It was also observed that native speakers could maintain detailed discussion and/or conversation with highly proficient non-native speakers for a long period and with a large selection of topics, but that with beginners, detailed and prolonged discussion never happened. As Long (1981a) states, interaction between native speakers and low level non-native speakers are, in many cases, much shorter than five minutes.

These impressionistic observations are going to be investigated in a more objective manner, and the following question is raised:

"Do native speakers use any syntactic and/or conversational adjustments for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers? If they do, what kind of adjustments do they use?"
Since there is almost no data on the characteristics of FT for highly proficient speakers outside the classroom in Japanese or in any other language (except Gaies, 1982), the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses were made after preliminary checking of some of the data collected for this research. In the preliminary checking, statistical analysis was not performed.

**Hypothesis:** Native speakers use more listener-oriented speech for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers.

The terminology of 'listener-oriented' speech is used in Makino (1983). He says (p.139):
"The speaker-orientation is defined as the speaker’s communicative motivation to express some highly subjective and presuppositional information by inwardly looking at himself. The listener-orientation is defined negatively as non-speaker-orientation." In his paper, he refers to native speakers’ shift of formal-informal style in the discourse caused by listener and speaker orientation. He does not mention FT, but the distinction between speaker and listener oriented speech would highlight the characteristics of FT. In this paper, listener oriented speech is interpreted as listener-conscious speech, in which speakers are aware of the distance from the listener (linguistically, socially, and psychologically), and try to make themselves understandable or try to understand the listener. When native speakers speak with non-native speakers, they might adjust themselves in the following linguistic features, which are stated as six sub-hypotheses.

**Sub-hypothesis (1):** Native speakers use more formal form in the sentence final predicate for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers.

In Japanese, there are two forms (styles) in the sentence final predicate: formal and informal. The choice of these two styles depends on the social and/or psychological distance between the interlocutors. In the native to non-native speaker discourse, the native speaker might be more conscious (linguistically) about the distance between the speakers than in the native to native speaker discourse. Besides, in many Japanese textbooks for beginners, only formal form is used in conversation. Formal form is considered to be very basic and suitable for any occasion by many Japanese speakers. This is the motivation for sub-hypothesis (1).
Sub-hypothesis (2): Native speakers use less syntactic deletion for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers.

In Makino (1983), only formal and informal style shifts are discussed for speaker- and listener-oriented speeches. However, in this paper, syntactic deletion is considered to be another feature of speaker-orientation, because syntactic deletion is often used subjectively when the speaker thinks that mutual presupposition and/or information exist in the discourse. (e.g. "Well, there is no evidence, so..... you know.") It is also often used when the speaker feels that what he wants to say is well expressed even though the sentence is not complete syntactically. The grammatical and theoretical deletions discussed in Kuno (1978) are not included here. (For details, see 3.3.4 Coding.)

Sub-hypothesis (3): Native speakers use fewer coordinate conjunctive forms for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers.

A prolonged dialogue using coordinate conjunctive forms (For details, see 3.4.2 Unit of Analysis.) is also another feature of the speaker-oriented speech. That is, when the speaker has lots to say, he tends not to give the listener an opportunity to speak. In that case, coordinate conjunctive forms are used one after another almost endlessly in Japanese. However, the native speaker seems to be often consciously listener-oriented in the discourse with the non-native speaker, therefore, he uses fewer coordinate conjunctive forms.

Sub-hypothesis (4): Native speakers use more repetitions to promote comprehension for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers.

Native speakers often do use repetitions in their conversations with their native speakers, but their repetitions are often speaker-oriented. That is, empathy, playing, emphasis, echoing, self-correction, stuttering, and syntactic constraint constitute most of their repetitions. However, repetitions for non-native speakers are often listener-oriented. They are used for the purpose of promoting comprehension for the non-native speaker. Thus, comprehension checks, confirmation, rewording, correction, rephrasing and explanation, and answering are the main kinds of repetition in native to non-native speaker conversation.
**Sub-hypothesis (5):** Native speakers use fewer honorific forms in verbs and nominals for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers.

Honorific forms in Japanese are used to express politeness and respect for people in formal occasions, and they are more complex than the neutral formal form. Since native speakers are often listener-oriented for non-native speakers, they tend to use fewer honorific forms for intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers than for native speakers. (For the details of the honorific form, see 3.4.4 Coding.)

**Sub-hypothesis (6):** Native speakers use complex constructions in their discourse with intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers as often as in their discourse with native speakers.

The Japanese complex constructions are handled in the last chapters of many textbooks, because they are supposed to be very difficult for most non-native speakers. However, most native speakers are not aware of this and seldom modify their speech in this respect. They use passive, causative, provisional, conditional, desiderative, and relative constructions quite freely in their discourse with non-native speakers. (For the syntactic analysis of the Japanese complex constructions, see 3.4.2 Unit of Analysis and 3.4.4 Coding.) This is because the Japanese complex construction is felt by most native speakers to be one semantic unit (although relative constructions are pronounced separately, most of them are actually pronounced as one word), and they take no account of their listener’s difficulties in the use of the complex construction.
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON FOREIGNER TALK

This review of literature on FT is subdivided as follows:

2.1 Characteristics of FT - Statement of characteristics of FT in many languages.

2.2 Use of FT - Why FT is used.

2.3 Language Acquisition and FT - Theoretical background.

2.4 Summary.

2.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF FT

The characteristics of FT are divided into two categories in Long (1983a): linguistic and conversational. However, since these categories seem to overlap in most of the literature, in this literature review they are considered together.

Ferguson (1971) is a classic article on FT. He hypothesized that the characteristics of FT in languages which use the copula in equational clauses, such as English and Japanese, are omission of the copula and uninflected verb forms. Later, Ferguson (1975) collected data through an elicitation task. He asked native speakers of English to write down how they would modify well-formed sentences when they have to speak to an imaginary uneducated non-European (non-speaker of English). He classified the results: omission (articles, copula, prepositions, conjunctions, and inflectional morphology), expansion (addition of 'you' in imperatives, use of tag - 'OK?', 'Yes?'), replacement and rearrangement (use of 'no' for all negatives, use of 'me' and 'him' in place of the nominative, lexical substitutions).

The same method (elicitation procedure in writing) was used in Meisel (1976). He states that the characteristics of FT in German were much the same as in Ferguson (1975). He also quotes French and Finnish, saying that they "use basically the same means of simplification in FT."
Hatch, Shapira, and Gough (1978) collected data of FT in English in a natural setting. They constructed three situations: 1) discourse between an English speaker and an adult learning English without formal instruction, 2) speech of a teacher when conversing with, rather than ‘teaching’ a beginners’ class in English, 3) telephone conversations between three foreign students and various restaurant, airline, and service personnel. Their findings on linguistic characteristics roughly correspond with Ferguson’s. However, omission of copula was rare in the data.

Their data were collected in natural conversation, and they report the following, additional characteristics: slowing down, repetition, heavy stress and increased volume for key words, long pauses, elimination of contractions, clear articulation, giving definitions, confirmation (use of 'Do you understand?' and 'Okay?'), apology for not knowing the language of the foreigner, compliment for the foreigner’s English, filling in the linguistic gaps, use of terms of affection ('dear', 'honey').

Other FT characteristics viewed from different aspects are reported by Long (1981a,b, 1983b), and Chun et al (1982).

Chun et al (1982) report that native speakers seldom correct non-native speakers’ grammatical errors in the discourse and that when native speakers correct errors, they correct discourse and vocabulary errors.

Long (1981a) uses features like ‘topic maintenance’ and ‘topic move’ in analyzing his FT data, and says that talk about any one topic in the discourse between the native speaker and the non-native speaker of low-level proficiency is very short and superficial.

Long (1981b, 1983b), quoting his experiment (1980), where variables among native and non-native speakers are well controlled, says that strategies and tactics which native speakers use more in the discourse with the foreigners of low proficiency level than in the discourse with native speakers are confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests, self-repetitions, other-repetitions, and expansions.
Gaies’ study (1982), a modified replication of Long (1981a), handles advanced level speakers outside the classroom. His data show that there is no statistical difference between native/native and native/non-native speaker interaction regarding ‘topic initiating’ and ‘topic continuing’.

FT in the formal setting, like Teacher Talk in the classroom and FT in the laboratory situation, is linguistically grammatical in many languages. (Czech, English, German - Henzl 1973, 1979; Japanese - Skoutarides 1981; French, English - Wesche & Ready, in press). They report the following characteristics: redundancy (exact repetition, use of synonyms, rephrasing), slower speech rate, long pauses, use of well-formed sentences, use of concrete, common terms, clear pronunciation.

Henzl (1979) reports that teachers (English, German, Czech) always use neutral form (socially, regionally, and emotionally unmarked form) and that they never use comical terms, ironies, vulgarisms, and pejoratives.

However, Long and Sato’s report (1983) is critical about Teacher Talk. They say that native/non-native conversation during second language instruction is not realistic, because teachers often use display questions which are hardly ever used by native speakers outside the classroom.

Also, Long (1982) mentions that teachers use "primarily predigested sentences, structurally and lexically controlled, repetitious in the extreme, and with little or no communicative value." (p.220)

2.2 USE OF FT

2.2.1 WHO USES FT?

Native speakers of the language use FT when they have to communicate with non-native speakers whose proficiency level seems to be low. Their FT may be grammatical or ungrammatical. (Ferguson 1975; Meisel 1976; Hatch, Shapira, and Gough 1978;

2.2.2 WHAT MAKES NATIVE SPEAKERS USE FT?

Very little work has been done on this subject. Long (1983a) lists five possibilities: 1) the physical appearance of non-native speakers, 2) one or more linguistic features of the non-native speaker's interlanguage (accentedness and/or ungrammaticality), 3) comprehension level of non-native speakers, 4) comprehensibility to the native speaker of what the non-native speaker is saying, 5) combinations of two or more of these four factors.

1) physical appearance

Varonis and Gass (1982) say that physical appearance is not a critical factor for FT. They found that one group of native speakers of English modified their speech more to two native speakers of English who feigned a heavy non-native accent when they asked for street directions, than did another group of native speakers of English who were asked for the same information by the same two native speakers, this time using their normal English.

However, Long (1983a) mentions his own experience that "(he) has occasionally found himself making (grammatical) linguistic and conversational adjustment to Asian-Americans who are native speakers of English, not only early, in first encounters, but sometimes even subsequently, temporarily 'forgetting' they are native speakers" (p.185).

The physical appearance of non-native speakers may or may not cause the use of FT.
2) non-native speakers' interlanguage

Varonis and Gass (1982) list two linguistic features of the non-native speaker's interlanguage - accentedness and grammaticality - as triggers of FT/FTD (foreigner talk discourse). They argue that grammatical errors alone cannot become the contributory factor for FT, saying that native speakers modified their speech to other native speakers talking with a non-native accent, but grammatically correctly.

Raiser's study (1976) shows that "the accent-bearing voice was perceived as using incorrect grammar more frequently than was the native" (p.259) even though there were no grammatical errors in the accented speech.

However, Warren-Leubecker & Bohannon's experiment (1982) show that the accentedness alone influences native speakers to use FT only at the beginning of the discourse.

Varonis and Gass (1982) further mention that native speakers rated good pronunciation lower when it coincided with errors of grammar.

3) comprehension by non-native speakers

Hatch, Shapira, and Gough (1978) show that native speakers on the telephone modify their speech (in English) when talking to non-native speakers whose comprehension is at beginner level.

Henzl's data (1973, 1979) show that in a story-telling situation for non-native speakers (one-way speech), teachers modify their speech according to non-native speakers' supposed proficiency level. (Her data are in English, German, and Czech.)

Warren-Leubecker and Bohannon (1982) also report that the non-native speaker's verbal feedback is "the most powerful factor in the occurrence of simplified speech."(p.213)

Skoutarides' data in Japanese (1981), however, show that native speakers' FT is often fossilized. They often use FT at the beginner level for intermediate, non-native speakers. They seldom pay attention to non-native speakers' present comprehension level, and often do not change their first impression of non-native speakers' speech from the time
when they first met.

4) comprehensibility

Varonis and Gass (1982) conclude that the comprehensibility of a message to a native speaker, including all the linguistic features contributing to comprehensibility such as grammaticality and pronunciation, is the main factor in determining both the native speaker's evaluation of, and reaction to, non-native speech.

5) combination of two or more factors

Long (1983a) summarizes that "native speakers react to a combination of factors when they make linguistic/conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. In certain limited circumstances, primarily initial reactions to small interlanguage samples, the non-native speaker's comprehensibility and/or physical appearance may be more influential". (p. 188)

2.3 LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND FT

Krashen's 'input plus one' theory (1981a, 1981b) indicates that language input for language acquirers is well received when comprehensible input by native speakers is a little above the acquirers' proficiency level. Therefore, he supports the necessity of simple codes - foreigner talk, teacher talk, interlanguage talk, and caretaker's speech - at early and intermediate stages of language acquisition.

Hatch (1983) also supports simplified input in second language acquisition. She claims that "motherese (simplified input) is thought to have several functions: it promotes communication, establishes an affective bond, and serves as an implicit teaching mode. The simplified input of foreigner talk also serves these functions". (p. 64).

Long (1983a) hypothesizes that linguistic and conversational adjustments are necessary for SLA. Also, Long (1981b) suggests that participation in conversation with a native speaker, made possible through the modification of interaction, is the necessary and sufficient condition for second language acquisition.
However, Long (1983a) mentions that it is hard to see the actual relation between language acquisition and FT input, since language acquisition takes time and it is impossible to control variables over such a long period.

Wesche and Ready's longitudinal (one academic year) experiment and observation (in press) in a bilingual university setting is in support of the theory of simplified input. Non-native speakers of English and/or French at Ottawa University studied psychology through their second language for a year. The results show that they learned the subject and the second language at the same time. Their understanding level of the subject was the same as that of the native speakers, their respective skills in the second language improved very much, and their confidence in speaking in the second language increased. Wesche and Ready say that "the gains shown were approximately equivalent to those of students at similar proficiency levels in well-taught 45-hour courses in English and French as second language" (p.33). Two professors who taught the courses modified their speech according to the students' proficiency level (advanced level), although their ways of adjustment were quite different. Their data also support Krashen's theory, "focus on content, not on form".

However, Schmidt (1981 - in Long 1983a) reports on the "early fossilization of 'Wes', a middle class, adult Japanese immigrant to the USA (Honolulu)..... After approximately three years of extensive contact with English native speakers, Wes' interlanguage is reminiscent of Alberto's (Schumann 1978). Not only is there minimal English morphology, but also no apparent development in this area for about two years." Wes has lots of native speaker friends and admirers (he is an artist), and "constantly receives large amounts of input that is both comprehensible to him and contains many items not in his interlanguage, yet which he does not proceed to acquire" (p.191-2).

Some researchers are critical about some forms of FT input. Blum and Levenston (1978) argue that "an unsuccessful paraphrase offered as explanation in class may lead the student to misapprehend the meaning of a word and then later to misuse it.....The other danger, common to all strategies of simplification, is that the distinction between acceptable
and non-acceptable usage is blurred. When the teacher systematically avoids lexical items by paraphrase, he often uses collocations unacceptable under normal circumstances. The learner, lacking any independent criteria for judging degree of acceptability in the target language accepts the teacher’s usage as the norm, not realizing that he is thereby widening the gap between his interlanguage and the target language. All strategies of lexical simplification may have this unwished-for effect” (p. 412-3).

Larsen-Freeman (1983) argues that "the accommodation aspect of native speaker input may not be necessary for acquisition to proceed. Indeed, overaccommodation such as that of Hatch’s subject "G", whose FT included syntax and morphology that was less grammatical than that of his students, may even inhibit acquisition" (p. 91). Then she says that selective attention to unmodified speech of native speakers (like listening to radio, watching TV, reading books) can have the same effect of simplified input, and that it is sometimes better than ungrammatical foreigner talk input.

2.4 SUMMARY

1. Most studies of FT state its linguistic and conversational characteristics for beginners in and outside the classroom, but few describe FT for advanced level non-native speakers outside the classroom.

2. Not many studies use control groups and statistical analyses.

3. What triggers native speakers’ use of FT is not conclusively established.

4. It is quite possible that FT plays an important role in SLA, but the actual relation between second language acquisition and FT is not well known.
This chapter is divided as follows:

3.1 Subjects
   3.1.1 Non-native Speakers of Japanese
   3.1.2 Criteria for Proficiency Levels
   3.1.3 Native Speakers of Japanese

3.2 Design of Experiment
   3.2.1 Data Collection
   3.2.2 Matching
   3.2.3 Statistical Design
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   3.3.1 Instruction for the Subjects
   3.3.2 Tape Recording
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   3.4.1 Transcribing
   3.4.2 Unit of Analysis
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   3.4.4 Coding

3.5 Follow-Up Interviews

3.6 Limitations of the Study
3.1 SUBJECTS

3.1.1 NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF JAPANESE

Five non-native speakers of Japanese at the intermediate level of proficiency, and five non-native speakers at the advanced level of proficiency participated in this study on a voluntary basis. They were all students of the University of British Columbia (UBC) who had been studying Japanese for some years. The "Volunteers Needed" notice (a copy is attached in Appendix A) was first circulated in some classes where Japanese language, literature, or culture were taught; then the author talked to the students in or outside the class with the permission of the instructor. Some students were personal acquaintances of the author. Their proficiency levels were judged by at least two native speakers of Japanese including the author according to the criteria defined in the next section. The second judge was usually an instructor of the students' Japanese classes.

The following considerations were taken into account in selecting volunteers. The students were to be between 20 and 30 years old; male and female students to be mixed at each proficiency level; their physical appearance (Japanese or non-Japanese) to be mixed at each proficiency level.

Table 1 shows the list of the participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>APPEARANCE</th>
<th>BACKGROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERMED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Mother is Japanese. Has been to Japan. Studying 2nd year Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2 CRITERIA FOR THE PROFICIENCY LEVELS

**Advanced Level Speakers**

1. can understand the native speaker’s speech at normal speed, in normal pronunciation, on general topics; can understand colloquial forms, slang, although may or may not use them in their own speech;
2. may have foreign accent, but it does not disturb communication;
3. can produce grammatically correct and conversationally appropriate sentences almost always (80-100%);
4. have a varied vocabulary, and can discuss general topics with ease.

**Intermediate Level Speakers**

1. can understand the native speaker’s speech at normal speed, in normal pronunciation, on general topics, most of the time (50-100%), but find it hard to understand colloquial forms and slang (0-50%);
2. have foreign accent, but it seldom disturbs communication (70-100%);
3. can produce grammatically correct and conversationally appropriate sentences most of the time (50-100%);
4. have enough vocabulary to discuss general topics with ease sometimes, but with effort most of the time.
The above criteria for advanced and intermediate level non-native speakers are based on "ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages) Provisional Proficiency Guideline" (Foreign Language Annals, October, 1984, v.17, p.453-455), and the Table of Proficiency Levels in the Good Language Learners (Naiman et al, 1978, p.6). The "advanced level" in this study is close to the "superior level" in ACTFL and the "advanced (native-like) level" in the Good Language Learners; the "intermediate level" is close to the "advanced plus" in ACTFL, and the "working knowledge level" in the Good Language Learners.

3.1.3 NATIVE SPEAKERS OF JAPANESE

Four Japanese students who were studying English at Langara Campus, Vancouver Community College, and six Japanese students who were studying English in the Continuing Education Programme, UBC, participated in this study on a voluntary basis. The "Volunteers Needed" notice in Japanese (see Appendix A) was first circulated in some classes with the permission of the instructor and/or the organizer, then the author talked to the students in or outside the classroom.

The following considerations were taken into account in selecting volunteers. The students were to have been in Canada for less than six months; to have little experience in talking with non-native speakers of Japanese in Japanese; to be between 20 and 30 years old; to be a mixture of males and females.

Table 2 shows the list of the participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>BACKGROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANGARA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 3 months. Little experience in FT. University student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 3 months. A little experience in FT. University student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 3 months. A little experience in FT. University student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 3 months. A little experience in FT. University student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 2 months, and in Europe for 1 month. Some experience in FT. University graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 4 months, and in Hawaii for 2 months. A little experience in FT. University graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 2 months, and in Mexico for 1 month. A little experience in FT. University graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 2 months, and in Nepal and Thailand for 1 month. A little experience in FT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 4 months. Some experience in FT through exchange tutoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Has been in Canada for 5 months. Some experience in FT through exchange tutoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 DESIGN OF EXPERIMENT

3.2.1 DATA COLLECTION

This is an experiment to observe whether and how a native speaker modifies his/her speech when he/she talks to a non-native speaker whose proficiency level is quite high, in a one-to-one situation. In this experiment, social factors such as age, social status, prior acquaintance, and experience in Foreigner Talk were controlled. In order to compare the native speaker's speech shift, the experiment was designed with three tape-recording sessions for each native speaker: first and second sessions with the non-native speaker (intermediate and advanced); third session with the native speaker. The experimental unit consists of two people, and is called a dyad, and in each session the subjects were asked to talk for half an hour in Japanese on a problem provided by the author, or on anything else.

A problem-solving technique was used in this experiment in order to elicit spontaneous speech and discussion, and to hold the subjects' attention on the content not on the language. A copy of the "problem" used in this experiment is in Appendix A.

The problem-solving technique was used in the first session, and in the second session, the subjects were asked to discuss the discussion in the first session. In the third session, the subjects (native speakers only) were asked to discuss and compare the Canadian and Japanese ways of thinking, as shown by their handling of the problem. However, all the subjects were told that they could talk about anything else if the problem was too difficult or not interesting.

The tape-recording sessions were held all in one day in ten empty classrooms on the UBC campus. Each dyad was alone in a classroom to prevent unwanted noise.

3.2.2 MATCHING

Four native speakers from Langara and one from UBC were grouped together as the Langara Group, and five from UBC were grouped together as the UBC Group.
Random matching was used. (It was done by the author before the experiment.)

The name of each native or non-native subject was written on a piece of paper. The pieces were folded, and divided into four groups: Langara, UBC, Intermediate, and Advanced. For the first session, the Langara group was matched with the intermediate group, and the UBC group with the advanced group by picking names randomly. In the second session, the Langara group matched with the advanced, and the UBC group with the intermediate group. In the third session, the Langara group was matched with the UBC group.

The members of the each group did not have any prior acquaintance with the members of the other groups except in one case. In this case, matching was avoided intentionally.

Table 3 is the list of the matched dyads in each session. The subjects were not informed about the grouping and the matching process. That is, the native speakers did not know about the non-native speakers' proficiency levels.

**Table 3: Matched Dyads**

1ST SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE</th>
<th>NON-NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(LANGARA)</td>
<td>(INTERMED.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*#4</td>
<td>#4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(UBC)</th>
<th>(ADVANCED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*#5</td>
<td>#8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>#7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>#10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2ND SESSION

(LANGARA)......(ADVANCED)
#1.........#10
#2.........#6
#3.........#9
*#4.........#8*
#7.........#7

(UBC)......(INTERMED.)
*#5.........#2*
#6.........#1
#8.........#4
#9.........#3
#10.........#5

3RD SESSION
Native Speakers Only

(UBC)......(LANGARA)
#6.........#1
#9.........#2
#8.........#3
*#5.........#4*
#10.........#7

Note: Tapes of * marked dyads were not used due to mechanical problem. Details are in 3.3.2 Tape Recording and in 3.4.1 Transcribing.

3.2.3 STATISTICAL DESIGN

In this experiment, the independent variable was proficiency with three levels. That is, each native speaker talked with three interlocutors, whose proficiency levels were intermediate, advanced, and native. Dependent variables were set as follows, corresponding to the six sub-hypotheses described in 1.3 Purpose of the Study: 1. use of formal form, 2. use of coordinate conjunctive forms, 3. use of deletion, 4. use of repetitions, 5. use of honorific forms, and 6. use of complex constructions. (For the details of these six variables, see 3.4.4 Coding.)
Features in each dependent variable were first counted, and then converted into ratios by dividing by the number of utterances. For instance, 20 occurrences of formal form against 150 utterances of a subject talking with an intermediate non-native speaker were converted into a ratio \((20/150 = .13)\), and this procedure was repeated with other subjects and the cell means of ratios were calculated in each proficiency level. (For the definition of the utterance, see 3.4.2 Unit of Analysis.)

The data was then analyzed by an ANalyses Of VAriance with Repeated measures design (ANOVAR) on each dependent variable. Since ANOVAR compares data among three levels, the post hoc Scheffé test was performed on the results from ANOVAR which showed statistically significant differences, in order to detect where the statistical difference existed among three levels. The levels were compared in pairs (native vs. advanced, native vs. intermediate, advanced vs. intermediate).

3.3 PROCEDURE

3.3.1 INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SUBJECTS

All twenty expected subjects gathered in a room before the experiment to receive instructions. All the instructions were given in Japanese by the author. First of all, they were asked to sign the "Statement of Consent" for the experiment (see Appendix A). This experiment was approved by the University of British Columbia Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee for Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects. It was then explained that the purpose of the experiment was to compare the Japanese and Canadian ways of thinking in handling a money problem. The 'problem' (see Appendix A) was then handed out for each subject to read beforehand.

They were told that it would take one hour (for two sessions) for the Canadian students, and one and one half hours (for three sessions) for the Japanese students.
They were asked to speak in Japanese, preferably only in Japanese, to discuss the problem; however, they were told that they could talk about anything else if the problem was too difficult to discuss or not interesting.

They were also told that the first session was to discuss the problem, that the second was to discuss what they had discussed and discovered in the first session, and that the third session was to discuss and compare the Canadian and Japanese ways of thinking in handling the problem.

The matched names and the room to be used were then announced. Each dyad was given a taperecorder and instructed to introduce oneself before the discussion and to tape record that part also.

This instruction session took about half an hour.

3.3.2 TAPE RECORDING

Ten tape recorders were used. All of them were pre-checked for mechanical defects. However, two of the recorders did not function properly during the recording sessions and some tapes had to be discarded: out of 25 recorded tapes (A and B sides of the tape are counted as one each), three tapes were not clear enough for transcription, and some parts of one tape were totally impossible to transcribe. That is, three tapes of the native speaker subject #4 (with the non-native subjects #4 and #8, and the native speaker subject #5) were not used. Also, the middle part of one tape (discussion between the native subject #7 and the non-native subject #7) was not used. The recorded length of the good tapes ranged from 20 to 40 minutes.

Since no assistant was available for the recording sessions, the subjects were instructed to start the recorders themselves to save time, but not to stop the machine until the author came to stop it. The expected time for the experiment was one and half hours at most, but it took three hours actually, because the time needed for the instructions and for the changing rooms and partners sessions was omitted from the calculation. It took time for
the author to go around ten rooms to stop the machines and to give instructions for the next session. However, all the subjects were patient and cooperative and stayed until they had finished their recordings.

3.4 ANALYSIS

3.4.1 TRANSCRIBING

Approximately 15 minutes of each good tape was transcribed: five minutes from the beginning, five minutes from the middle, and five minutes from the end. For the tape with mechanical trouble in the middle part, seven minutes from the beginning and eight minutes from the end were transcribed. Altogether, five hours of the tapes were transcribed and used for the statistical analyses. Another 30 minute (15 min. x 2 levels x 1 subject) was transcribed, but not used for the analyses since it was hard to compare when one level was missing. (This was the tape of the native subject #5, partner of the native subject #4 whose tape was discarded.)

The tapes were transcribed in the Japanese orthography using kanji (Chinese characters), katakana, and hiragana (Japanese phonetic alphabets) for ease of writing and reading. Since detailed and elaborate phonological analyses were not to be performed in this study (only contraction and deletion of particles were to be counted for supplementary statistics), the transcription was written at the orthographical level.

The transcription was done by the author using a Sony CFS-230 with a headphone for a better sound control.

3.4.2 UNIT OF ANALYSIS

i) Rejection of the T-Unit

For syntactic analysis, many researchers have used the T-unit, "a main clause plus all subordinate clauses and non-clausal structures attached to or embedded in it" (Hunt,
1970:4, p.4). They have counted the number of clauses in a T-unit and the number of words in a clause to analyze syntactic maturity and complexity. A clause is defined by Hunt (1966, p.735) as "one subject or one set of coordinate subjects with one finite verb or one finite set of coordinate verbs." In the field of FT research, Long (1981a, 1981b, 1983), Gaies (1982), Wesche and Ready (in press) used the T-unit. Gaies (1980) defends the T-unit although he admits some drawbacks to it.

The T-unit was not used in this study because, after some trials, it became clear to the author that the Japanese language has the following syntactic characteristics.

1. **verbs** - Some Japanese inflected verbs often contain two or more morphemes which represent sentences in the deep structure.

   e.g. A contracted Japanese verb "kawasarechatta" is often pronounced as one word, but it has at least four sentences in the deep structure. (This is a complex construction.)

   *kaw*- (to buy)
   
   *as-* (causative - to make)
   
   *are-* (passive)
   
   *chatta* (contracted form of te-shimau-ta - past perfect form)

   "Kawasarechatta" can be translated as "I was manipulated to buy and bought it unwillingly."

   ![Syntax Tree](diagram.png)
Thus, simple word counting cannot capture the syntactic complexity in Japanese.

2. **deletion** - In Japanese, many syntactic elements can be deleted grammatically if the meaning is clear from the context. Thus, the subject, copula, and clauses are often deleted in spoken Japanese.

   Sore, kinoo katta hon ne.
   (it)(yesterday)(bought)(book)(isn’t it)

   (It is the book you bought yesterday, isn’t it?)

   In this sentence, the topic marker *wa* after *sore*, the subject ‘you’ before the verb *katta*, and the copula *desu* after *hon* are deleted. However, it is quite grammatical as a spoken Japanese sentence.

   If a clause has to contain a subject and a verb, as defined by Hunt, then two sentences like "We got up early today, and we went hiking." and "We went hiking and picked some flowers." have different values (the first one has two T-units, and the second, one T-unit). In Japanese these two sentences have exactly the same in the surface structure: "Got up early today, and went hiking." "Went hiking and picked some flowers." A T-unit analysis is therefore inadequate here.

   In this paper, the utterance was used as the unit of the syntactic analysis, because it can reflect the characteristics of spoken Japanese better than the T-unit.

   **ii) Definition of the Utterance**

   The structural criteria for a new utterance are defined by Reeder (1982, p.9) as when

   a) a new speaker begins a conversational turn, or

   b) the same speaker, within a conversational turn, ends a tone group, as signalled by the presence of at least one primary stress followed by a terminal intonation contour and pause juncture.

   e.g. 'Craig/ (pause) 'Craig/ ---- 2 utterances
Besides these two criteria, the following criteria were added for analyzing the speech data in this study.

1. Two simple sentences connected without a pause juncture are to be counted separately.

   e.g. Do you know koo koo, it's a 'high school', isn't it? ---- 2 utterances

2. Compound clauses are to be counted separately.

   a. Clauses conjoined with coordinate conjunctions such as:
      
      but (*kedo, *heredo, *heredomo)
      and (*shi, *de, *soshite)
      so (*dakara, *sorede)
      or (*...ka, (*soretomo)...ka)
      then (*sorekara)

   b. Clauses conjoined with gerund form (te-form) which has the meaning of 'and':

      Tatoeba atashi ga jibun no kuruma o
      (for example)(I) SM (own) (of) (car) OM

      motte naku-te anata ga jibun no kuruma o
      (have)(not-and) (you) SM (own) (of) (car) OM

      motteiru. ---- 2 utterances
      (have)

      SM = Subject Marker, OM = Object Marker

      (Suppose I don't have my own car, and you have your own.)

   c. Clauses conjoined with the verb conjunct form:

      Watashi wa Nihon no shuukyoo ni
      (I) TM (Japan)(of)(religion)(in)

      kyoomi ga ari, aru shuukyoo
      (interest) SM (have-and) (a) (religion)

      ni-shozoku-shite-imasu. ---- 2 utterances
      (belong to)

      TM = Topic Marker

      (I am interested in Japanese religions and belong to a religious organization.)
3. A discontinued sentence and a new sentence (semantically independent) following it
with or without a pause juncture are to be counted separately.

e.g. When I was reading this,.....Oh, which did you read first? ---- 2 utterances

4. A fused sentence is to be counted as one utterance.

e.g. *I bought a cake is good. * = ungrammatical usage

5. A dislocated clause, phrase, or word with or without a pause juncture is to be included
in the main sentence and counted as one utterance.

e.g. Very shy, I am. / Very shy,.....I am.-----1 utterance

6. A short sentence used as filling is to be counted as one utterance. Sentences like "let
me see", "what do you say", and "what shall I say", are often inserted into a speech as
filling and do not have their literal meaning, but they carry a speech act (hesitation,
uncertainty, request for time for thinking, etc.). Since they are syntactically and
semantically independent, they are to be counted separately from the main text.

7. Verbal noddings (yes, umm, aha, yeah, etc.) inserted while the other speaker is talking
(and the speech is not affected by them) are not to be counted as utterances. However,
if something of this kind is used as an answer to a yes/no question, a tag question, or
as a reaction to a statement, it is to be counted as an utterance.

Examples of utterance boundary are listed in Appendix B.

3.4.3 RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT

Ten percent of all the transcribed utterances were examined by a second judge in
order to assess the reliability of the utterance counting. The ten percent was taken mainly
from the native to native speaker speech data because the utterances in them are more
complicated than in the native to non-native speaker speech data.
The second judge first read the definition of the utterance given in 3.4.2.(ii), then listened to the tapes, and simultaneously read transcribed manuscript.

The results of the second judge’s counting and the author’s were then compared. Full agreement was obtained in the native to non-native speaker speech data and more than 90% agreement was obtained in the native to native speaker speech data in the first trial. The definition of the utterance in this study can therefore be assumed to be clear and explicit enough.

3.4.4 CODING

Six dependent variables were identified, coded, and counted according to the following criteria.

i) Use of Formal Form

Some examples of the formal and informal forms in the Japanese verbs and copula are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBS:</th>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to write</td>
<td>kaku (present)</td>
<td>kakimasu (present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaita (past)</td>
<td>kakimashita (past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>taberu</td>
<td>tabemasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tabeta</td>
<td>tabemashita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to do</td>
<td>suru</td>
<td>shimasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shita</td>
<td>shimashita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPULA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>da</th>
<th>desu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>datta</td>
<td>deshita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Japanese is an SOV (verb final) language, these forms appear in the sentence final and coordinate clause final positions. The informal verb form should be used in the
subordinate clause (syntactical rule in Japanese), but some subordinate clauses can take the formal form. In the data in this study, if the formal form was used in the subordinate clause, it was counted as well.

*e.g.* *Maishuu kayoobi to mokuyoobi ni*

(every week)(Tues.)(and)(Thurs.) (on)

*renshuu ga arimashite, UBC no gakusei-san*

(practice)SM(be - formal) (UBC) (of) (students)

*to-issho-ni kendoo o yatte-imasu.*

(together with)(kendo)OM (be doing - formal)

(There are practices on Tuesday and Thursday every week, and I am doing *kendo* with UBC students.) - underlined verbs are formal in the Japanese sentence.

ii) *Use of Deletion*

Deletion in discourse is well discussed in Kuno (1978). He discusses grammatical deletion in discourse such as the answer to a yes/no question.

A: Were you still a small boy in 1960?
B: Yes, I was still a small boy φ.

A: Were you born in 1960?
B: *Yes, I was born φ.* (p. 16)

He discusses why a certain sentence element is deletable in one case and not deletable in another.

However, in this study, deletion means a more idiosyncratic type of deletion. The speaker often does not complete the sentence if the context is judged to make the meaning obvious, or if he gets lost in the middle of a speech, or if he thinks that it is impolite to be explicit. Thus the deletion handled in this study is more speaker-oriented than the deletion discussed in Kuno. Deletions like the examples in Kuno are not counted in this study, since they follow the deletion rules and are not idiosyncratic.
Examples of deletions counted in this study:

*Dono kurai no  tatemono no kazu’tte yuuka... anoo...*  
(how many)(of) (buildings)(of)(number) (or) (ah...)  

(How many, the number of the buildings.....ah.....)

*Demo, boku skii ga suki nan’de.......*  
(but) (I) (ski) SM (fond of) (copula)

(But, I like skiing, you know, so.......

iii) Use of Coordinate Conjunctive Forms

Coordinate conjunctions, gerund form, and verb conjunct forms were counted. For details, see 3.4.2.(ii), *Definition of the Utterance*.

iv) Use of Repetitions

The types of repetitions used for the promotion of comprehension were defined as follows:

1) **comprehension checks** (checking comprehension of the interlocutor)

*Shinseki’tte wakarimasu ka, shinseki.*  
(relatives) (understand) QM (relatives)

(Do you know *shinseki? Shinseki.*)  

QM = Question Marker

2) **confirmation** (confirming what the interlocutor means or says)

NNS: *Sanzen-doru no koto wasure temo-ii to omoimasu.*  
($3,000) (of)(thing)(forget)(OK) QM (I think)

NS: *Wasure chau no?*  
(forget)(completely)

NNS = Non-Native Speaker, NS = Native Speaker, QM = Quotation Marker

(NNS: I think it’s OK for me to forget about $3,000.)
(NS: Just forget completely?)

(3) rewording (replacing a word with an easier, more understandable, common word)

Sukoshi Burajiru, Porutogesu-go ga wakarimasu.
(a little)(Brazil) (Portuguese) SM (understand)

(I understand Brazil, Portuguese a little.)

(4) correction and/or expansion (correcting the interlocutor’s wrong usage)

NNS: Kazoe masen.
(count)(no)

NS: Kazoe-rare-nai gurai oo desu ne.
(not-countable)(as such)(many)(isn’t it)

(NNS: No counting.)
(NS: It’s too many to count, isn’t it?)

(5) rephrasing and explanation (explaining a word by rephrasing)

Onna-no-hito wa kekkonshi-tara kaji,
(ladies) TM (once married)(household duties)

kosodate toka sooyuno ni
(bringing up children)(or) (something) (on)

sen’nen-shita hoo-ga-ii to omou’n’desu kedo ne.”
(concentrate) (had better) QM (I think) (but)

QM = Quotation Marker

(I think that girls, once married, had better concentrate on kaji (household duties), such as bringing up children or something, you know, but.....)

(6) answering (answering a linguistic question about a word or usage)

NS: Kaesanakutemo otoosan dattara yurushite kureru.....
(even if not return)(father)(if)(permit)(give favour)
NNS: *Yurushi....?*

NS: *Permit.*

(NS: Even if we don’t return (money), father will give us a favour of ‘yurushi’.....)
(NNS: *Yurushi....?*)
(NS: Permit.)

The following types of repetitions were counted separately since they are not primarily used to promote comprehension.

1. **Empathy** (expressing agreement, admiration, surprise)

NNS: *Irinoi-shuu kara kimashita.*
(Illinois) (from)(came)

NS: *Irinoi-shuu desu ka.* (with a falling intonation)
(Illinois) (copula)QM

(NNS: I am from Illinois.)
(NS: Oh, from Illinois.)

2. **Play** (enjoying conversation using slang, funny expressions, jokes)

NS: *Fukyaa ii desu ka.*
(if it blows)(good enough) QM

NS: *Fukyaa ii desu yo.*
(you know)

(*fukyaa - contracted form of fukeba --- slang*)

(NS: Is it enough if it (the engine of the car) blows?)
(NS: It is enough if it blows.)

3. **Emphasis** (emphasizing the speaker’s own statement)

*Sankai yutte mo, yonkai yutte mo gohai yutte mo.....*  
(3 times)(to tell) (4 times)(to tell)(5 times)(to tell)
(Even if you tell three times, four times, five times.....)

(4) **echoing** (repeating part of the interlocutor’s comment immediately and mechanically)

NSS: *Tamagawa Gakuen, shitte’masu ka.*  
(Tamagawa School) (do you know?)

NS: *Tamagawa Gaku..... Aa, shitte’masu.*  
(Tamagawa Sch.....) (Oh, I know)

(5) **self-correction** (correcting one’s own wrong usage)

*Kandoo, kando-shita, kando-shite kaette kimashita.*  
(move) (moved) (moved-and) (came home)

(They were move, moved, moved-and came home.)

(6) **habitual use (used as filling)** (filling a gap while searching for a suitable word or expression)

*Dakara, are desu yo, bumpoo ga muchakucha*  
(So) (you know) (grammar) SM (messy)

*desu yo. Moo honto, are desu yo.*  
(is) (really) (you know)

(So, you know, my grammar is messy, really, you know.)

(7) **stuttering** (stuttering a word or part of a compound word)

*Oi ga, oi, oi, kono hito oi na wake de aru kara, sonoo.....*  
(nephew) SM (this person)(nephew)(is)(case)(so)(well.....)

(The nephew, nephew, nephew, this person is her nephew, so.....)

(8) **syntactic constraint** (repetitions needed syntactically)

.....*yakusoku wa yakusoku*,.....
(promise) TM (promise)

(.....a promise is a promise,.....)

(9) contextual constraint (repetitions needed contextually)

Oi mo okane ni komatte iru shi miboojin mo okane o kashita wa ii kedo
(nephew)(also)(money)(hard up)(and)(widow)(also)(money)OM(lent)TM(ok)

ima komatte'masu yo ne, okane ga kaette konakute.
(now)(hard up)(you know)(money)SM(not returned)

(The nephew is hard up for money, and the widow is also hard up for money now, after lending money, because it is not returned.)

(10) self-addressing (talking to oneself while checking past memory or processing the interlocutor’s statement)

NNS: Kimpatsu?
(blonde)

NS: Kimpatsu...(pose)... deshita ne.
(blonde) (it was)

(NNS: Blonde?)
(NS: Blonde......, yes, it was.)

(11) imitation (imitating expressions of the interlocutor)

NNS: Watashi no Nihon no namae wa Yamada Taro desukara, Taro to yonde kudasai.
(my) (Japanese) (name) TM (Yamada Taro) (is) (so) (please call me Taro)

NS: Watashi no namae wa Yasunobu desu keredomo chijimete Yasu to yonde kudasai.
(my)(name)TM(Yasunobu)(is)(but)(make it short) (Yasu) (please call me Yasu)

(NNS: My Japanese name is Yamada Taro, so please call me Taro.)
(NS: My name is Yasunobu, but make it short and please call me Yasu.)

Note: Aliases are used here in order to protect the subjects’ privacy.
(12) **assurance** (assuring or answering the interlocutor's doubt or comment)

NNS: *Ii kazoku dattara ii kedo ne.*  
(good)(family)(if)(alright)(but)(you know)

NS: *Ii kazoku desu yo.*  
(good)(family)(is)(I tell you)

(NNS: If it’s a good family, it’s OK, but...)  
(NS: It’s a GOOD family.)

v) **Use of Honorific Forms**

There are two forms in honorific style: exalting and humble. The exalting form in verbs and nominals is used to express politeness and respect for other people, especially socially superior, or psychologically remote people. The humble form is used for the speaker himself or for his in-group members, such as family or company members, when he talks with out-group members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e.g.</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
<th>HUMBLE</th>
<th>EXALTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copula:</td>
<td>to be</td>
<td>desu</td>
<td>deirasshaimasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs:</td>
<td>to come</td>
<td>kimasu</td>
<td>irasshaimasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to speak</td>
<td>iimasu</td>
<td>osshaimasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominals:</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>ryooshin</td>
<td>goryooshin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
<td>otoosan</td>
<td>otoosama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vi) **Use of Complex Constructions**

Some typical Japanese complex constructions were selected in this study for comparison purposes as follows:

1. passive construction (*tabe-rare-ru*) - to be eaten
2. causative construction (*tabe-sase-ru*) - to make someone eat
3. provisional construction (*tabe-reba*) - if (you) eat
4. conditional construction *(tabe-tara)* - once (you) eat, when (you) eat

5. desiderative construction *(tabe-tai)* - to want to eat

6. relative construction

They are defined as complex because the form implies more than one sentence in the deep structure.

```
  S
  \ /
 NP VP rare-ru

S
  \ /
 NP VP tabe
```

3.5 FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

The importance of the follow-up interview in research is emphasized in Neustupný (1981). In this study, the follow-up interview was performed in order to complement the statistical results.

All but one of the native speaker subjects were contacted by telephone three to six weeks after the experiment (one had gone back to Japan). They were asked the following questions:

1. Did you consciously modify your speech when you talked with the two non-Japanese students?

2. If you did, how did you modify it?

3. Were you comfortable with each of the three speakers?

Then they were told that the true purpose of the experiment was to investigate native speakers’ speech adjustment when they talk with non-native speakers, and were asked to permit the use of the speech data for the study. None of them objected.

The results of these questions will be discussed in 4.2 Results of the Follow-Up Interviews.
3.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The sample from native and non-native speakers is extremely small, and is only from university communities. The results of this study are therefore restricted in scope. They should be seen only as a preliminary investigation into native speakers' speech adjustment in discourse with non-native speakers whose proficiency level is quite high (intermediate to advanced).
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 STATISTICAL RESULTS

Four of our six sub-hypotheses (#2 - use of syntactic deletion, #3 - use of coordinate conjunctive forms, #4 - use of repetitions to promote comprehension, and #6 - use of complex constructions) were confirmed by using the one-way analyses of variance with repeated measures program (ANOVAR).

After ANOVAR was used, the post hoc Scheffe test was conducted on #2, #3, and #4. (Sub-hypothesis #6 states that there is no difference in the use of complex constructions between the native/native and native/non-native speakers.) The post hoc Scheffe revealed that significant differences were only in the native vs. intermediate in #2 (syntactic deletion) and #4 (repetition to promote comprehension), and that significant differences were found both in the native vs. intermediate and in the native vs. advanced in #3 (use of coordinate conjunctive forms).

The two sub-hypotheses rejected by ANOVAR (#1 - use of formal form, and #5 - use of honorific forms) are strongly related to social and psychological factors. The linguistic factor (fluency levels) did not seem to play a big role in these parts of the experiment.

On the whole, the native speakers' speech adjustments for the advanced level speakers were very minimal. Details on each feature will be discussed in the next.
4.1.1 USE OF FORMAL FORM

Table 4 shows the results on the use of formal form by eight native speakers. The results are given in the form \( \frac{a}{b} = c \), where \( a \) is the number of occurrences, \( b \) the number of utterances, and \( c \) their ratio. The \( \bar{X} \) are the cell means of the ratios, and \( s \) the standard deviations.

Table 4: Use of Formal Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>103/132 = .78</td>
<td>100/152 = .66</td>
<td>69/169 = .41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>61/131 = .47</td>
<td>36/168 = .21</td>
<td>17/154 = .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>34/148 = .23</td>
<td>38/131 = .29</td>
<td>14/185 = .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>104/126 = .83</td>
<td>98/143 = .69</td>
<td>129/188 = .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>12/59 = .20</td>
<td>58/136 = .43</td>
<td>68/127 = .54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>40/133 = .30</td>
<td>88/140 = .63</td>
<td>3/90 = .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>58/146 = .40</td>
<td>61/118 = .52</td>
<td>47/163 = .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>69/112 = .62</td>
<td>80/169 = .47</td>
<td>63/107 = .59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{X} \) | .48 | .49 | .34 |
\( s \)     | .25 | .17 | .26 |

The cell means of the intermediate and advanced appear to be higher than that of the native, but the standard deviations of the three levels are very large, therefore, the ANOVAR results show that there are no significant differences among the three levels \( (F = 2.02, (df=2,14), p = .169, \text{n.s.}) \). (For statistical information about ANOVAR, see Appendix C.)

Subjects #1 and #2 modified their use of formal form according to the interlocutor's proficiency levels (they used more formal form with less proficient speakers), but other
subjects did not follow this pattern. The use of informal form, however, was not high, as is shown in Table 5, and there were no significant differences among three levels ($F = 2.15, (2,14), p = .154, \text{n.s.}$). The totals of the cell means of formal and informal forms were .57 (intermed.), .56 (advanced), and .46 (native), respectively. This is because most of the utterances (50% of them) in the data are incomplete syntactically (although not semantically), due to deletion, discontinuation, etc.

**Table 5: Use of Informal Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>0/132 = .00</td>
<td>12/152 = .08</td>
<td>16/169 = .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>9/131 = .07</td>
<td>20/168 = .12</td>
<td>35/154 = .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>26/148 = .18</td>
<td>17/131 = .13</td>
<td>24/185 = .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>4/126 = .03</td>
<td>1/143 = .01</td>
<td>9/188 = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>2/59 = .03</td>
<td>4/136 = .03</td>
<td>10/127 = .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>34/133 = .26</td>
<td>20/140 = .14</td>
<td>24/90 = .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>7/146 = .05</td>
<td>4/118 = .03</td>
<td>9/163 = .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>10/112 = .09</td>
<td>7/169 = .04</td>
<td>3/107 = .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\overline{X}$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole, the native subjects used more formal form than informal form, as Tables 4 and 5 show. They used informal form in order to express immediate reaction to the interlocutor's comment and to display their own monologue-type speech.

The shift of formal and informal forms in the native to native-speaker discourse (Makino 1983) also appeared in the native to non-native speaker discourse in the same
manner.

The following examples show how formal and informal forms were used in discourse.

Example 1:

NNS#7: *Okusan-no-hoo ga tsuyoi * n'desu ha.  
(wife) SM (stronger) (copula-formal) QM

NS#8: *Sore wa nai, sore wa nai kedo.....(laugh)*  
(it) TM (no-informal) (but)

(NNS#7: Wife is(formal) stronger than husband?)  
(NS#8: No, isn't(informal), no, isn’t, but.....)

Example 2:

NNS#5: *Okane o motte-imasu.*  
(money)OM (have - formal)

NS#3: *Motte'ru? Motte'ru noni kaesanai?*  
(have-informal) (although)((not return-informal)

(NNS#5: He has(formal) money.)  
(NS#3: He has(informal)? He has, but doesn’t return (informal)?)

Example 3:

NNS#10: *Nagai?*  
(long-informal)

NS#1: *Nagai.........ee, nagakatta-desu.*  
(long-informal)(yes)(it-was-long - formal)

(NNS#10: Long(informal)?)  
(NS#1: Long(informal)....., yes, it was long(formal).)

More examples are listed in Appendix B.
4.1.2 USE OF SYNTACTIC DELETION

Table 6 is the results on the use of syntactic deletion by eight native speakers. There were significant differences among the three levels \((F = 7.35, (2,14), p = .007)\) in ANOVAR, and the post hoc Scheffe test revealed that the difference was in the native vs. intermediate \((F = 7.21, (2,14), p < .05)\). (For details of Scheffé, see Appendix C.) The native speakers used less syntactic deletion for intermediate speakers than for advanced and native speakers.

Table 6: Use of Syntactic Deletion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>12/132 = .09</td>
<td>49/152 = .32</td>
<td>70/169 = .41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>31/131 = .24</td>
<td>73/168 = .44</td>
<td>66/154 = .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>44/148 = .30</td>
<td>40/131 = .31</td>
<td>56/185 = .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>25/126 = .20</td>
<td>47/143 = .33</td>
<td>69/188 = .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>12/59 = .20</td>
<td>43/136 = .32</td>
<td>50/127 = .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>31/133 = .23</td>
<td>33/140 = .24</td>
<td>20/90 = .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>43/146 = .29</td>
<td>30/118 = .25</td>
<td>55/163 = .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>43/112 = .38</td>
<td>59/169 = .35</td>
<td>52/107 = .49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of right dislocation, which is a counterpart of left dislocation in English, was counted together with syntactic deletion because some linguists (for instance, Kuno 1980) consider that right dislocation is derived from repetition and syntactic deletion.

(a) *Baka da yo, Yamada wa.*
(stupid) (is) (Mr.Yamada)TM

(STupid, you know, Mr. Yamada is.)
(b) [Yamada wa] baka da yo, Yamada wa [baka da yo].

(Sentence (a) is derived from (b).) (p. 78)

However, the ratio of right dislocation appearing in the data was very low and there was no difference between the three levels. (\(\bar{X} = \text{intermed. (.03)}; \text{advanced (.05)}; \text{native (.05).})

It can be said that the general assumption that native speakers use syntactically complete sentences for non-native speakers is not true for highly proficient speakers. The native speaker subjects in this study did not modify their speech for the advanced non-native speakers in regard to syntactical deletion.

Some examples are listed here. More are listed in Appendix B.

**Example 1**: NS#6 with NNS#9

NS#6: Doko ni sunde-orareta'n desu ka. Nihon no..... (where) (you lived - honorific) QM (Japan) (in)

(In Japan, where did you live?) - In Japanese, [in Japan] is right dislocated.

**Example 2**: NS#7 with NNS#7

NS#7: De, anata wa ima......kono..... (with a rising intonation) (and) (you) TM (now) (this)

(And, you are now in this.....)

(This is a question asking whether the interlocutor is attending this university (UBC).)

**Example 3**: NS#10 with NNS#5

NS#10: Kochira de umareta'n desu ka. Bankuubaa de..... (here) (were you born) (Vancouver) (in)

(Were you born here? In Vancouver?)
4.1.3 USE OF COORDINATE CONJUNCTIVE FORMS

Table 7: Use of Coordinate Conjunctive Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>14/132 = .11</td>
<td>19/152 = .13</td>
<td>31/169 = .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>36/131 = .28</td>
<td>31/168 = .18</td>
<td>52/154 = .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>50/148 = .34</td>
<td>48/131 = .37</td>
<td>119/185 = .64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>31/126 = .25</td>
<td>17/143 = .12</td>
<td>85/188 = .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>20/59 = .34</td>
<td>49/136 = .36</td>
<td>72/127 = .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>41/133 = .31</td>
<td>47/140 = .34</td>
<td>35/90 = .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>31/146 = .21</td>
<td>40/118 = .34</td>
<td>52/163 = .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>64/112 = .57</td>
<td>66/169 = .39</td>
<td>62/107 = .58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{X} \] .30 .28 .43

s .13 .12 .16

By using coordinate conjunctive forms, the speaker can make his/her statement endlessly long without being interrupted by the listener. By using coordinate conjunctive forms, the speaker signals that his/her speech still continues and that no interruption should be inserted. In this manner, the use of coordinate conjunctive forms is very speaker-oriented.

There were significant differences among the three levels \( (F = 9.84, (2,14), p = .002) \) in ANOVAR, and the post hoc Scheffé test confirmed that there were differences in the native vs. intermediate \( (F = 6.17, (2,14), p < .05) \), and in the native vs. advanced \( (F = 8.42, (2,14), p < .05) \). This means that the native speakers used fewer coordinate conjunctive forms for the non-native speakers than for the native speakers. The native speakers often tried to listen to the non-native speakers rather than speaking themselves. In this manner, the native speakers were very listener-oriented for the non-native speakers. However, most
of them became very speaker-oriented in the native/native discourse, often occupying long conversational turns.

The highest user of the coordinate conjunctive forms was NS#3 (119/185, ratio .64). Her speech with NS#8 was highly speaker oriented as follows:

NS#3: Atashi mo Nihongo o baa to yonde;/ sorede hajime kanojo to, hitorime no hito to hanashitetara chotto kuichigatta no ne./ Are, okashii na to omotte/ moo ikkai yonde,/ soshitara Nihongo,/ dakara sono toki wa Nihongo moo ikkai yondara attete,/ kochi mitara, tatoeba, kokono 'apologize' toka aru'n dakedo,/ kochi wa tada 'say' mitai na fun’iki deshoo./ De, kochi wa 2,3-kai’tte aru’n dakedo/ kochi wa 1-kai, 'someday' toka nantoka itte,/ un, nanka wasure chatta kedo,/ 1-kai kana,/ son'na nanka 'a few' te yuu kanji ja nakatta no ne./

Notes:
Underlined words are coordinate conjunctive forms.
/ = utterance boundary.

Translation: (I also read the Japanese text quickly, and then I was talking with her, the person in the first session, then, I found a little discrepancy, you know. Oh, how strange, I thought, and I read (the problem) once more, and then the Japanese part, so I read the Japanese text once more, then I found I was correct, and I read this part (English part), then, for example, it says 'apologize' or something here, but in this part (Japanese part), it says only 'say' or something, doesn't it? And, here, it says 'a few', but here it says 'once', it says someday or something, and, well, I've forgotten, but, maybe it is 'once', anyway, it did not sound like 'a few', you know.)

4.1.4 USE OF REPETITIONS TO PROMOTE COMPREHENSION

Repetition in discourse is necessary to make conversation understandable and vivid. As Makino (1980, 1985) states, native speakers use lots of repetitions in their conversation with other native speakers for the purpose of confirmation, consideration, thematization, empathy, focusing, and so forth. Repetition itself is not necessarily a characteristic of
Foreigner Talk. However, many researchers in FT classified repetitions as self-repetitions, other-repetitions, partial repetitions, exact repetitions, etc., and created an impression that 'repetition' is a typical FT (for instance, Brulhart 1985, Wesche and Ready, in press).

In this paper, repetitions were grouped into two kinds: repetitions to promote comprehension (listener-oriented) and general repetitions (speaker-oriented). In the listener-oriented repetitions, (1) comprehension checks, (2) confirmation, (3) rewording, (4) correction and/or expansion, (5) rephrasing and explanation, and (6) answering, were sub-grouped, counted, and totalled. In the speaker-oriented repetitions, (1) empathy (this is listener-oriented, but not used to promote comprehension), (2) play, (3) emphasis, (4) echoing, (5) self-correction, (6) habitual use, (7) stuttering, (8) syntactic, or (9) contextual constraint, (10) self-addressing, (11) imitation, and (12) assurance, were sub-grouped, counted, and totalled. Speech samples for these categories are listed in 3.4.4 Coding and in Appendix B.

The above categories were examined by two other judges in order to assess reliability. Two judges read 3.4.4 (iv), and Appendix B (5) first, and both agreed fully with the classification of repetitions. Then one judge listened to tapes and classified 83 samples of repetitions. The other judge listened to other tapes and classified 81 samples. The agreement rate between the first judge and the author was .84, and between the second and the author was .86 in the first trial. It can therefore be assumed that the categories used in this paper are explicit and clear enough to classify repetitions.

Table 8 displays use of listener-oriented repetitions. Partial or exact repetitions of words, phrases, and sentences within the same utterance or within the three succeeding utterances were counted as repetitions in this study. (However, function words, such as particles (subject marker, object marker, etc.), tense marker, etc., were not counted. Repetitions of a syllable or sound were not counted as repetitions, either.)
Table 8: Use of Repetitions to Promote Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>54/132 = .41</td>
<td>12/152 = .08</td>
<td>3/169 = .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>59/131 = .45</td>
<td>15/168 = .09</td>
<td>8/154 = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>57/148 = .39</td>
<td>15/131 = .12</td>
<td>4/185 = .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>72/126 = .58</td>
<td>25/143 = .18</td>
<td>10/188 = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>43/59 = .73</td>
<td>16/136 = .12</td>
<td>6/127 = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>19/133 = .14</td>
<td>11/140 = .08</td>
<td>1/90 = .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>17/146 = .12</td>
<td>10/118 = .09</td>
<td>4/163 = .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>49/112 = .43</td>
<td>32/169 = .19</td>
<td>3/107 = .03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{x}$ | .41  | .12  | .03  |
$s$     | .20  | .04  | .02  |

The results of ANOVAR showed that there were significant differences among the three levels ($F = 24.95, (2,14), p = .000$), and Scheffe revealed that there was a significant difference between the native and intermediate ($F = 22.75, (2,14), p < .05$), but that there was no difference between the native and advanced ($F = 1.21, (2,14), p = .05, n.s.$). The native speakers used significantly more repetitions to promote comprehension with the intermediate speakers than with the advanced and native speakers.

However, the cell means of the ratios for speaker-oriented repetitions were .22 (intermed.), .32 (advanced), and .34 (native), respectively ($F = 3.80, (2,14), p = .048$). Speaker-oriented repetitions used by the native speakers with the intermediate speakers were statistically fewer than with the native and advanced speakers (Scheffe: $F = 3.78, (2,14), p < .05$).

The repetitions that the native speakers used with the intermediate speakers were mainly listener-oriented to promote comprehension (the ratio of listener-oriented repetitions
to the total number of repetitions was .65), whereas the repetitions used for the advanced and native speakers were mainly speaker-oriented to promote general communication (the ratios of listener-oriented repetitions to the total numbers were .27 (advanced) and .08 (native), respectively).

4.1.5 USE OF HONORIFIC FORMS

The native speakers (both male and female) seldom used honorific forms in the experiment, and there were no statistical differences between the three levels ($\bar{X} = .01$ (intermediate), .01 (advanced), .00 (native); $F = 1.54$, (2, 14), $p = .248$, n.s.).

The highest user of the honorific form was subject #1. However, he used only five different honorifics (once each) for the intermediate speaker, two for the advanced speaker, and none for the native speaker.

Table 9 lists the honorifics used by each subject. These honorifics were used only once each except 'o-uchi'. (In this case, the number of occurrences is written in the parentheses after the word.)

Translations of the honorifics are provided after the table.
### Table 9: List of Honorifics Used by the Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>mooshimasu</td>
<td>irashita</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gozonji</td>
<td>o-joozu</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goran’ninaru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kekkoodesu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gakusei-san</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3(F)</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>sundeorareta</td>
<td>on’na-no-kata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ikareteorareta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>home-stay-sareta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>sotsugyoosareta</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ikareta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>go-ryooshin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imooto-san</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ootoo-san</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8(F)</td>
<td>gozonji</td>
<td>gozonji</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9(F)</td>
<td>irashita</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>o-uchi(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o-toshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10(F)</td>
<td>go-ryooshin</td>
<td>shitteareru</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bengoshi-san</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F = female)
These honorifics are classified with translation in the following:

**Humble Form**

*mooshimasu* (I humbly say)
*kekoodesu* (It is good enough for me.)

**Exalting Form**

*gozonji* (do you know?)
*irashita* (you have been....)
*goran’ninaru* (you see something)
*sundeorareta* (you lived....)
*ikareteorareta* (you have been somewhere)
*home-stay-sareta* (you did home-stay)
*sotsugyoosareta* (you have graduated)
*ikareta* (you went)
*shitteraru* (you know something)

(nominals)
*gakusei-san* (students)
*bengoshi-san* (Mr. lawyer)
*imooto-san* (your younger sister)
*otooto-san* (your younger brother)
*go-ryooshin* (your parents)
*o-uchi* (your home)
*o-toshi* (your/her age)
*o-joozu* (you are good at...)
*on’na-no-kata* (lady)

The native speakers’ use of honorifics is, as shown, very sparing. As Neustupný (1983) says, Japanese native speakers do not overuse honorifics. Most native speakers know how to avoid honorifics while maintaining politeness. They eliminate rigid formality by restructuring sentences and by deleting some syntactic elements.

The following examples were used by native speaker #7 talking with non-native speaker #7. He deleted syntactic elements which might be used with verbs in honorific form.

*Nihongo wa hotondo’tte yuuka moo kanzen ni?*
(Japanese)TM(almost) (or) (already)(perfectly)

(Regarding Japanese, (can you speak) almost or already perfectly?)
(Well, what are you studying in the graduate school?)

If the underlined verbs were used in honorific form, it would sound too formal, and if they were used in non-honorific form, it would sound like model sentences in beginner's textbooks. He was successful in eliminating the parenthesized parts in order to maintain casualness but still keep politeness.

Sex difference in using honorifics was not observed in the data. For the young people in the experiment, women do not tend to use more honorifics than men. This contradicts a generally held opinion.
4.1.6 USE OF COMPLEX CONSTRUCTIONS

As predicted, there was no difference in the use of complex constructions between the three levels (\(F = 2.10, (2,14), p = .16, \text{n.s.}\)).

Table 10: Use of Complex Constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT #</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>19/132 = .14</td>
<td>38/152 = .25</td>
<td>13/169 = .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>42/131 = .32</td>
<td>19/168 = .11</td>
<td>27/154 = .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>54/148 = .37</td>
<td>24/131 = .18</td>
<td>69/185 = .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>44/126 = .35</td>
<td>31/143 = .22</td>
<td>51/188 = .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>23/59 = .40</td>
<td>40/136 = .29</td>
<td>61/127 = .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>24/133 = .18</td>
<td>45/140 = .32</td>
<td>23/90 = .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>37/146 = .25</td>
<td>18/118 = .15</td>
<td>29/163 = .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>45/112 = .40</td>
<td>45/169 = .27</td>
<td>37/107 = .35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = .30 \quad .22 \quad .28 \]
\[ s = .10 \quad .07 \quad .12 \]

Among six complex constructions picked out for this study (passive, causative, provisional, conditional, desiderative, and relative constructions), the least used one was "causative - s-ase". Only three subjects used it, and only once each.

(1) NS#1 to NNS#10

*Soredattara, Nihon no pabirion de haturak-ase-te morattara?*

(2) NS#6 to NS#1

*Kotchi ni nagaikoto oru yatsu ni iuw-ase-ru to ne.....*
(3) NS#10 to NS#7

...iesu noo o yappari ne, hakkiri-sase-nai to.....

Translation:

(1) Well then, why don't you ask them to let you work in the Japanese Pavilion?

(2) If I let them talk, the guys living here for a long time, you know,.....

(3) ...if you don't make things clear saying yes or no, you know.....

Use of other complex constructions (passive, provisional, conditional, and desiderative constructions) was also very low. It was too low to do statistical analyses. For instance, the passive construction appeared only 12 times in the discourse with the intermediate speakers, 11 times with the advanced, and 8 times with the native speakers. The cell means of the ratios were .01(intermed.), .01(advanced), and .01(native). Other constructions occurred in more or less similar pattern: Provisional [$\bar{X} = .03$(intermed.), .03(advanced), .04(native)]; Conditional [$\bar{X} = .04$(intermed.), .04(advanced), .04(native)]; Desiderative [$\bar{X} = .03$(intermed.), .01(advanced), .02(native)].

Relative construction and the verb clause plus noun construction (verb + hazu(supposed to), beki(should), wake(the reason why), tsumori(intend to), etc.) were counted together because the structure is the same. (These nouns are used as modality in Japanese, as the translation implies.) There was no significant difference between the three levels here, either ($\bar{X} = .20$(intermed.), .15(advanced), .18(native); F = 1.49, (2,14), p = .26, n.s.).

Examples of utterances containing complex constructions are listed in Appendix B.
4.2 RESULTS OF THE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

All the native subjects except #9 (who had gone back to Japan) were interviewed by telephone sometime after the experiment, and asked whether and how they modified their speech for the non-native speakers. (For the exact questions asked, see 3.5 Follow-Up Interviews.)

The following table summarizes the results of the answers given by the subjects regarding their conscious speech adjustments.

Table 11: Native Speakers' Conscious Speech Adjustment

(1) Not Modified At All

NS#3 with NNS#5(intermed.) and NNS#9(advanced)
NS#4* with NNS#4(intermed.) and NNS#8(advanced)
NS#6 with NNS#1(intermed.) and NNS#9(advanced)

(2) Modified for Intermediate Speakers Only

NS#5 with NNS#2(intermed.) and NNS#8(advanced)
NS#7 with NNS#1(intermed.) and NNS#7(advanced)
NS#8 with NNS#4(intermed.) and NNS#7(advanced)

(3) Modified for Both Intermediate and Advanced Speakers

NS#1 with NNS#2(intermed.) and NNS#10(advanced)
NS#2 with NNS#3(intermed.) and NNS#6(advanced)
NS#10 with NNS#5(intermed.) and NNS#10(advanced)

*Tapes were not available due to mechanical trouble.

The advanced non-native speakers (NNSs) #7, #8, and #9 did not receive any conscious speech adjustment from the native speakers (NSs), but NNSs #6 and #10, and all the intermediate NNSs received conscious speech adjustment from at least one of their two experimental partners.
Those who had consciously modified their speech for the non-native speakers were asked how they modified their speech. All of them (#1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10) answered that they paid attention to vocabulary, especially when they talked with the intermediate speakers. They said that they avoided the use of "difficult" words and slang, and that when and if they used them, they repeated them by rewording, rephrasing, and explaining. Their answers correspond with the statistical results on repetitions to promote comprehension (see Table 8). The native speakers often used repetitions to promote comprehension for the intermediate speakers.

Four subjects (#1, 2, 5, 10) said that they used clearer and slower pronunciation for the intermediate speakers. NS#2 said that he used a "beautiful standard Japanese" pronunciation for the intermediate and advanced speakers.

However, statistical results (ANOVAR) on contraction and deletion of particles (phonological reduction) show that there were no differences among the three levels (Contraction - $\bar{X} = .30$ (intermed.), .33 (advanced), .47 (native); $F = 2.92$, $p = .09$, n.s.; Particle Deletion - $\bar{X} = .06$ (intermed.), .04 (advanced), .07 (native); $F = 2.65$, $p = .11$, n.s.). In these statistics, contraction counting was done at the orthographical level. For example, contractions such as "I'm", "isn't", "it's been", were each counted as one contraction. As for deletion of particles, deletion of question marker was not counted because it is almost always omitted in informal form. For examples of contraction and deletion of particles, see Appendix B.

NSs #1, #2, #5, and #8 said that they let the non-native speakers take the initiative in choosing the topic or subject, and let them talk about anything they liked. The native speakers consciously adjusted themselves in choosing topics when the non-native speakers' fluency levels were not sufficient for discussion of the given topic. NS#5 said that he allowed NNS#2, whose proficiency level was quite low, to choose any topic when he found that NNS#2 could not handle discussion of the problem, saying "Well, let's talk about something else. What can you talk about?"
In summing up, the native speakers answered that they consciously adjusted themselves in:
1) vocabulary,
2) pronunciation,
3) choosing topics.
However, they did not believe that they made any conscious adjustment in syntax.

Concerning comfort when talking with the non-native speakers, NS#1 said that he became very tired after two sessions. Actually, he was the most conscious speaker. He never used informal form, seldom used syntactic deletion (ratio .09, lowest user) and contraction (ratio .02, lowest user) for the intermediate speaker and he most frequently used honorifics. NS#8 said that she often became uncomfortable when talking with NNS#4 (intermed.) because she was not sure whether NNS#4 understood correctly what she said. NS#8 said that NNS#4 spoke Japanese almost like a native speaker, but that her vocabulary was limited and insufficient for discussion of an abstract subject. Therefore, NS#8 said that she repeated the same thing in a different way in a very subtle manner, without asking whether or not NNS#4 understood what she said.

Some native speakers (#3, #8) mentioned that the non-native speakers got bored in the second session because they had to talk about the same thing again, and that they had a difficult time to keep the conversation moving due to the NNSs' bored attitude.

Other native speakers (#2,4,5,6,7,10) said that they did not get tired, nor felt uncomfortable talking with the non-native speakers.

4.3 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES

4.3.1 USE OF COMPLIMENT

One feature which was impossible to calculate statistically but did exist as a characteristic in the native to non-native speaker discourse was the use of compliment. The
native speakers often compliment the non-native speakers on their fluency in Japanese. This type of compliment was also reported in Hatch, Shapira, and Gough (1978). Native speakers hardly ever compliment one another for speaking their language fluently. If they do, it is as a joke, insult, or challenge.

Some examples of compliments:

**Example 1:** NS#1 to NNS#10 (advanced)

\[ \text{Nihongo wa joozudesu kedomo, dono kurai mananderu'n desu ka.} \]
(Japanese)TM (good) (but) (how long)(have you been studying)

(Your Japanese is good, you know, how long have you been studying?)

**Example 2:** NS#6 to NNS#1 (intermed.)

\[ \text{Boku no Eigo yori mo anata no Nihongo no hoo ga yoppodo joozu desu yo.} \]
(my) (English)(than) (your) (Japanese) (than) SM (far) (better)(is)(you know)

(Your Japanese is far better than my English, you know.)

4.3.2 **USE OF ENGLISH**

Another feature which did exist in the native to non-native speaker discourse was the use of English. The native speakers used many English words and phrases in their NS/NS and NS/NNS discourses, but most of them were English loanwords in Japanese (e.g. college, diamond, loan, driver’s license, car, train, etc. - For judgement of loanwords, *Nihongo ni natta Gaikokugo Jiten* (Dictionary of Loanwords in Japanese), Kawamoto, S. et al, eds., 1983, was used.) However, English utterances were used only with the non-native speakers as shown in Table 12. Since the native speakers often used English in order to promote comprehension, most of the examples are counted in Repetitions to Promote Comprehension (see 4.1.4.).
### Table 12: Use of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>NATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>1(w)/169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>1(w)/154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>5(w),2(E)/148</td>
<td>1(E)/131</td>
<td>5(w)/185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>26(w)/126</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>3(w)/188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>12(E)/59</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1(w)/133</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>6(w),13(E)/112</td>
<td>2(w)/169</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

w = words (use of English words, phrases, and short sentences in Japanese utterances)
E = English (use of English utterances)

Phrases and short sentences (e.g. 'about 75 years old', 'I don’t think so') in Japanese utterances were treated as words. English loanwords and English proper nouns (e.g. Irish, Canada, King’s English, VIA, Cambie, Main, etc.) were not counted as English.

The native speakers' use of English in the data is grouped as follows:

(1) **Rewording**

**Example 1:** NS#6 with NNS#1

_Gosen-doru desu ne, five thousand dollars....._

(Translation: _Gosen-doru, isn’t it, five thousand dollars....._)

**Example 2:** NS#3 with NNS#5

_Kono nephew, oi wa....._

(Translation: This _nephew, oi....._)

(2) **Answering**

**Example 1:** NS#3 with NNS#5

NNS: _Mayou?_
NS: Confuse.

Example 2: NS#7 with NNS#1

NNS: Umaku no koto nan desu ka?

(Translation: What is umaku?)

NS: His business is GOOD.

(3) Quoting English words and phrases in the 'problem'

Example 1: NS#6 with NNS#1

Kanojo wa about 75 years old desu kara...

(Translation: She is about 75 years old, so...)

Example 2: NS#10 with NNS#10

Good relationship, iya shinrai ga nakunatte shimaimasu ne.

(Translation: Good relationship, no, trust will be lost.)

(4) Responding NNS's use of English

Example 1: NS#10 with NNS#5

NNS: You mean friends don't return?

NS: Yeah, they don't return two dollars or three dollars.

Example 2: NS#7 with NNS#1

NNS: Should she talk to him?

NS: Directly?

NNS: Um, yes.

(5) Judging NNS's proficiency subjectively

Example 1: NS#3 with NNS#5

NS: Atashi no yutteru koto wa wakarimasu ka?

(Translation: Do you understand what I'm saying?)

NNS: Hachijiju percent.

(Translation: 80 percent.)

NS: Aa..., What difference between relationship and friendship?
Example 2: NS#7 with NNS#1

NNS: *Doo suruka.....tabun keisatsu ni oshieru deshoo ne.*

(Translation: What to do.....probably, she’ll teach police.)

NS: I don’t think so.

(6) **For ease of expression** (used mainly in NS/NS discourse)

Example 1: NS#6 with NS#1

'Sorry' to 'pardon me' *no renzoku desu yo.*

(Translation: It's the succession of 'sorry' and 'pardon me'.)

Example 2: NS#3 with NS#8

'I don’t think so' *toka 'really?'' toka itte...*

(Translation: Saying 'I don’t think so' or 'really?' or something.....)

In the NS-NNS situation, if the native speaker speaks the non-native speaker’s language, it is natural for him to use the language in order to promote comprehension. This is also reported in Skoutarides (1981). However, if the non-native speaker is highly proficient, native speakers seldom switch to the non-native speaker’s language. In the data, the native speakers’ use of English for the advanced speakers was very minimal. In the experiment, although the subjects were asked to speak only Japanese (if possible), the tendency of the native speakers to use English with speakers of low proficiency in the intermediate group was obvious. If the purpose of the conversation is to communicate, not to practise the language, it is natural to use the non-native speaker’s language for better understanding.

4.3.3 **SLANG AND DIALECT**

Henzl (1979) reports that teachers use socially, regionally, and emotionally unmarked form for non-native students in the classroom. This tendency was observed in the data although they were not analyzed statistically. Slang, vulgarism, and dialect were found in the native/ native interaction (used by the male subjects only), but seldom found in the
native/non-native discourse.

Examples: (appeared in the NS/NS discourse)

- ore (male form of 'I')
- oyaji (dad)
- okkasan (mom)
- ofukuro (mom)
- gaki (kids)
- zurakaru (to escape)
- hetchara (no trouble)
- bitchiri (without space/break)
- fukyaa (if the engine blows)
- dekkai hema (big blunder)
- .....jan. (...isn’t it)

All the subjects were from Tokyo area except #6 and #10, who came from the Kansai (Osaka, Kyoto) area. However, #10 did not use the Kansai dialect at all; #6 did not use it with two non-native interlocutors, but used it with the native speaker #1. Some of the expressions he used were:

- Honma desuu? (Is it true?)
- Oh, akkoo! (Oh, there!)
- Honde, shaanai... (Then, no other choice...)
- Hima ya kara... (Since they have nothing to do...)

4.3.4 SPEECH PATTERNS

The speech patterns in the social (general) talk and in the discussion parts are quite different in the data. In the social talk, each speaker’s conversational turn is very short and the topics of the discourse shift very quickly, with a question and answer sequence both in the native to native and in the native to non-native discourses. However, in the discussion of the problem, both native and non-native speakers stick to the topic and each speaker’s speech turn tends to be very long since he/she uses the statement form for expressing his/her opinion.

Differences in such features as "topic move" and "topic maintenance" in the native/native and the native/non-native discourses may depend on non-native speakers’ fluency levels, as Long (1981a) mentions, but they may also depend on the type of discourse
(i.e. social talk or discussion) when non-native speakers’ proficiency levels are intermediate and advanced.

4.4 SUMMARY

1. The native speakers’ speech adjustments in discourse with highly proficient speakers are very minimal. The statistical results on the six features investigated in the present study show that the native speakers modify their speech with the advanced non-native speakers only in the use of coordinate conjunctive forms.

2. The native speakers modify their speech with the intermediate non-native speakers in the use of syntactic deletion, coordinate conjunctive forms, and repetitions to promote comprehension. Especially, repetitions to promote comprehension are statistically very significant.

3. The native speakers do not modify their speech with the intermediate and advanced non-native speakers in the use of formal form, honorific forms, and complex constructions.

4. Most of the native speakers who say that they modify their discourse with the non-native speakers pay conscious attention to vocabulary, pronunciation, and choosing topics, but not to syntax.

5. The descriptive analyses show that the native speakers do compliment the non-native speakers; use English in order to promote comprehension with speakers of low proficiency; but seldom use slang and dialect with non-native speakers.

4.5 GENERAL DISCUSSION

As stated in the previous sections, the native speakers in the present study did not modify their speech with the advanced non-native speakers except in the use of coordinate conjunctive forms. The native speakers used fewer coordinate conjunctive forms for the advanced speakers than for the native speakers. The advanced speakers in the experiment
were very talkative and often used longer conversational turns than the native speakers, and the native speakers often listened to them. This might be why the native speakers had little chance to use coordinate conjunctive forms.

On the whole, the native speakers’ speech adjustments with the advanced speakers were rare in the features investigated in the present study. The native speakers’ conscious adjustments with them were also minimal. (Six out of nine subjects said that they did not modify their speech for the advanced speakers.)

However, the native speakers did modify their speech with the intermediate speakers. They used fewer coordinate conjunctive forms, fewer syntactic deletions, and more repetitions to promote comprehension for the intermediate speakers than for the native speakers. The native speakers were more listener-oriented for the intermediate speakers than for the advanced and native speakers. Six out of nine native speakers said that they consciously adjusted their discourse with the intermediate speakers.

From the data in the present study, it is not too speculative to say that native speakers’ speech adjustments for non-native speakers (use of FT) largely depend on non-native speakers’ proficiency levels, and partially on native speakers’ levels of linguistic consciousness.

The classification of repetitions in this study (speaker-oriented and listener-oriented repetitions) worked well - as is shown in the results. Some irregular results in other literature (as in Brulhart 1985) may be due to their classification of repetitions. As shown in 4.1.4, the native speakers used rather fewer repetitions for the intermediate non-native speakers than for the native speakers if repetitions were speaker-oriented (such as play, emphasis, empathy, echoing, habitual use, stuttering, etc.).

Some repetitions are syntactically mandatory (such as pronouns and conjunctions in English), and some repetitions are due to the content of conversation (such as repeated use of some verb phrases or noun phrases.) They are often used in native/native conversations. They may be self-repetitions or other-repetitions. These repetitions should be excluded from
repetitions to promote comprehension, which are mainly used for non-native speakers. Studies on FT in the past did not separate these speaker-oriented repetitions from listener-oriented repetitions to promote comprehension. The classification used in this study may be useful in FT research.

The results on the formal form were against the prediction. The native speakers did not use more formal form for the non-native speakers. The native speakers' individual differences in the use of this form were very large and did not show any statistical differences between the three levels. Since many Japanese textbooks for beginners use this form as a basic form for conversation, and native speakers tend to use formal form for out-group members, it seemed to be natural to raise the sub-hypothesis (1). However, it was rejected. This may be because the proficiency of the non-native speakers in the experiment was far better than beginners' level, and also because the native speakers did not regard the non-native speakers as 'out-group' members.

The sub-hypothesis (5) predicted that native speakers use fewer honorifics for non-native speakers than for native speakers because honorifics are more complex than the neutral formal form. However, this was not proved statistically, because the native speakers in the study (either male or female) seldom used honorifics for either the native or non-native speakers.

Common opinions on honorifics may be that Japanese people tend to use more honorifics with people whom they meet for the first time or with out-group members, and that women tend to use more honorifics than men. However, Neustupný (1983) mentions that Japanese native speakers tend to avoid honorifics by restructuring the sentence or by deletion in order to lessen formality and rigidness in conversation. This may be the case for the native speakers in the study. (See examples in 4.1.5.)

Shift between formal and informal forms in discourse was observed in the native and non-native speaker dyads as well as in the native and native dyads. The native speakers often used informal form in their discourse with the native and non-native
speakers to express immediate reactions to the interlocuter's comment, long cherished conviction, or in monologues. It would be very tiring not to use any informal form in discourse, because use of formal form is very listener-oriented and the speaker is always conscious of the listener. English-speaking people might find it very hard to talk with other people if they did not use such phrases as 'what to say', 'oh, my God', 'oh, what am I doing', which are used in talking to oneself.

Complex constructions did not show any difference in use by the native speakers in their discourse with the native and non-native speakers. As predicted, the native speakers did not modify their speech syntactically for the non-native speakers consciously or unconsciously. Japanese complex constructions (such as causative, passive, provisional, conditional constructions) are often felt by native speakers as one semantic unit and often pronounced as one word. Japanese relative construction does not take any relative pronouns. The native speakers in the experiment seem, therefore, not to have paid any particular attention to these constructions.

However, causative, passive, provisional, conditional, and desiderative constructions were not used very often even in the native/native discourse. Use of these constructions may depend on the topic of the conversation and not on the fluency levels of non-native speakers, if their levels are more than intermediate. The native speakers used the relative construction and the verb phrase plus noun (to express modality in Japanese) quite often, both with the non-native speakers and with the other native-speakers in the experiment; but if beginner level non-native speakers had been involved in the experiment, the native speakers might have adjusted their use of them.

Some features which were not dealt in the six sub-hypotheses, but appeared in the data as possible characteristics of FT were analyzed descriptively (see 4.3). These features were impossible to analyze quantitatively. For instance, use of compliment, due to its characteristics; speech patterns and use of English, due to lack of proper quantifying methods; dialect, due to uncontrolled subjects; and slang, due to small amount of
occurrences. However, although they were not analyzed statistically, it may be possible to say that these features were used or avoided by the native speakers in order to encourage communication with the non-native speakers. Descriptive analyses may lack objectivity, but they provide insight and lead to further study. It is hoped that the features dealt with in the descriptive analyses would be analyzed more objectively in the future.

Findings in the experiment may be applied in classroom teaching for intermediate and advanced non-native speakers. For instance, teaching how to express politeness by restructuring the sentence or by deleting certain syntactic elements, not by simple use of formal form or honorifics, for intermediate and advanced non-native speakers may be useful. This is also suggested by Neustupný (1983) from the viewpoint of a non-native speaker. To bring into classroom teaching the reality of native speakers’ speech acts with native and non-native speakers outside the classroom is, as Long and Sato (1983) suggest, very important. However, findings in the present study constitute just a small part of native speakers’ speech acts. To apply these findings to classroom teaching, more sophisticated investigations may be required.
5. CONCLUSIONS

The intention in the present study was to investigate the reality of native speakers' speech adjustments (use of Foreigner Talk) for non-native speakers whose proficiency levels are intermediate and advanced. Foreigner Talk, as is shown in the study, does not exist as a rigidly classified mode of speech for foreigners. It is dynamic and flexible. It is quantitatively, not qualitatively, different from the NS/NS speech mode.

Since the language studied in this paper is Japanese, most of the features selected for the statistical analyses are language specific and may not be extended directly to Indo-European languages, such as English. However, features analogous to formal-informal forms, honorific forms, etc., could be observed even in English.

The features selected for this study are all measurable, and can be analyzed statistically and objectively. However, these features are just a small part of native speakers' speech characteristics. There are many other features which cannot be quantified. The conclusions drawn in this study should be considered with this point in mind.

The findings in the present study might be applied in classroom teaching of intermediate and advanced level non-native speakers. However, before this can be done, more sophisticated investigations will be required. We hope that the present study will contribute to studies on FT and language teaching in Japanese and other languages.
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APPENDIX A

1. "VOLUNTEERS NEEDED"
2. "VOLUNTEERS NEEDED" in Japanese
3. "PROBLEM" in English
4. "PROBLEM" in Japanese
5. "STATEMENT OF CONSENT"
PROBLEM

A widow (about 75 years old) lent $5,000 to her nephew. The nephew needed that money to expand his business. He promised to pay back $200 every month, but after 10 months, he stopped paying back. He seemed to be busy because his business was getting big. So one day the widow asked him politely about the delayed payment. He apologized for his forgetfulness and promised to pay back promptly. However, nothing happened. She asked again, but nothing happened. She is not poor, but not rich either. She needs that money, but she does not want to break her good relationship with her nephew. She knows that he is a good fellow. Now she does not know what to do.

What suggestions can you make for this lady? How can she successfully get the money back without breaking their good relationship? Think and discuss several possibilities. If you have any similar experiences, talk about them.
問題

ある75歳位の未亡人が、甥に毎月4万円ずつ返してもらうという約束で100万円貸しました。甥は自分の事業を拡張する為の費用として借りたのですが、仕事が忙しくらしく10カ月（40万円）返したところでまたり返金がとだえてしまいました。未亡人は、それとなく甥に、お金を少しずつでも返してくれるように2、3回言ったのですか「つい忙しくて...すぐに返します。」と、言われるだけでナシのつぶてです。甥は、とても未亡人に親しみで気のよろ青年です。未亡人としては、自分はそんなに金持ちでもないので、甥の感情を寄さないで残りの60万円を返してもらいたいのですが、どうしたら良いか思案にくれています。どうしたらうまく返してもらえると思いますか。良い考えを聞かせて下さい。また、似たような事を体験したら、その事も話し合って下さい。
APPENDIX B

Speech Samples:

1. Utterance Boundary
2. Formal-Informal Form Shift
3. Syntactic Deletion
4. Coordinate Conjunctive Forms
5. Repetitions
6. Complex Constructions
7. Contraction
8. Deletion of Particles

Note: As mentioned earlier, aliases are used in the data in order to protect the subjects' privacy.
1. UTTERANCE BOUNDARY (/ = utterance boundary)

Example 1: NS#3 and NNS#5

NS#3: *Jaa, hajimeni...../ Soodanaa, kon'na...../ Anata dattara hyakuman-en kashimasu ka./*
NNS#5: *Uuun...../

NS#3: *Hito ni...../ Un, kore.....shinji-gatai?/
NNS#5: *Shinji?/

NS#3: *Un, shinji...../

(Translation):

NS#3: Well, first of all...../ Well, this kind of...../ If it's you, do you lend $5,000?/
NNS#5: Uuum...../
NS#3: To a person...../ Yeah, this is.....hard to believe?/
NNS#5: To believe?/
NS#3: Yeah, to believe...../

Example 2: NS#7 and NS#10

NS#7: *De, kono mondai desu ne...../

NS#10: *Hai. /

NS#7: *De, moo ikhai chotto yonde mimasu. /

NS#10: *Ma, moo irete oitemo...../

NS#7: *Moo ii desu ka. /

NS#10: *Un. /

NS#7: *Eeto...../

NS#10: *To, sakki no hito to wa dooyuu...../

NS#7: *Ee, ichiban saisho wa Jon to hanashita n'desu kedo, /
NS#10: Un./

NS#7: Kare wa, uuun, yappari kono oi no kazoku ni mazu saisho ni yuubeki de aru to...../

NS#10: Hai./

(Translation):

NS#7: And, this problem, you know...../
NS#10: Yes./
NS#7: Well, I'll read it once more quickly./
NS#10: Well, it's OK now to start...../
NS#7: Is it OK, already?/
NS#10: Yeah./
NS#7: Well...../
NS#10: Well, what (did you talk about) with the previous people?/
NS#7: Yes, I talked with John in the first session, you know...../
NS#10: Yeah./
NS#7: Well, he (said that the widow) should talk to the nephew's family first...../
NS#10: Yes./

Example 3: NS#9 and NNS#6

NNS#6: Kore, seiyoo dattara, chokusetsu shitsukoku ieba ii...../

NS#9: (laugh) Aa, soo desu nee./ Yappa, Nihonjin wa, anoo, aite ni, uuun, tatoe koo okane o kaeshite morau ni shitemo, jibun ga, anoo, okane o kaeshite morau kenri ga aru to shitemo; naka naka...../ tatoeba, anoo, mattaku, anoo, shiranai hito'tte yuun'de areba, maa, sukoshi wa betsu deshoo kedo,/ kono baai da to, kekkyoku, oi ni ataru wake deshoo ne, miboojin no hito to,/ dokara narubeku sono aite ni, aite ga kizu tsukanai yooni'tte koto sugoku ki o tsukeru to omoun'desu ne./

NNS#6: Uuun...../

(Translation):

NNS#6: If this kind of thing happens in the western society, it will be OK if we tell directly and persistently./
NS#9: (laugh) Ah, that's right./ But, Japanese people, well, when they get their money back, even if they have the right to get the money back, it is hard for them to...../Well, if it is a business-like relationship, it might be different a little./ but in this case, the person is her nephew, isn't he, the widow's nephew./ So, I think that she takes a great care so that she won't....., the nephew won't get hurt, you know./
NNS#6: Uuum...../
Example 4: NS#8 and NNS#7

NS#8: Soreka mata wa..../ A, soo ka./ Keiyakusho o kawashite inakereba, moshi keiyakusho o kawashite ireba....../ Nan’te yuu no ka naa...... /

NNS#7: Hooritsutekini chotto kenri ga arimasu ga...... /

NS#8: Un./

(Translation):

NS#8: Or, may be...../ Oh, that’s it./ If she didn’t exchange a contract, if she did exchange a contract...../ I wonder what to say...../
NNS#7: She may have a legal right, but...../
NS#8: Yeah./

2. FORMAL-INFORMAL FORM SHIFT

Example 1: NS#8 with NNS#7

NS#8: Sore wa nan’te yuu no ka naa......, kanojo ga warui n’de atte, (it) TM (what to say - informal) (she) SM (wrong) (is) (and)

atode dooshiyoomonai to omou n’desu ne. (later) (can’t do anything) (I think - formal)

TM = Topic Marker, SM = Subject Marker

(Translation):

NS#8: Well, what to say.....(informal), I think that(formal) she is wrong and that she can’t do anything later.

Example 2: NS#3 with NNS#5

NS#3: Kono miboojin wa ki no yasashii hito nan’desu ne (this) (widow) TM (kind and nice) (person) (is-formal) (you know)

NNS#5: Un. (Um.)
NS#3: Aa, chigau, oi wa.....
(oh)(no - informal)(nephew)TM

(Translation):

NS#3: This widow is(formal) a nice and kind person, you know.
NNS#5: Um.
NS#3: Oh, no(informal), the nephew is.....

Example 3: NS#6 with NNS#9

NS#6: Watashi mo koyuu taihen wa nai-desu.
(I) (also)(this kind of)(experience)TM(don’t have - formal)

De, kon’na okane, motta koto mo mai shi,
(and)(this much)(money)(to have had)(never - informal)(and)

kashita koto mo nai shi, karita koto mo nai shi.....
(never have lent, either, and) (never have borrowed, either, and)

(Translation):

NS#6: I do not have(formal) this kind of experience, either, and besides, I’ve never(informal) had this much money, never(informal) lent money, and never(informal) borrowed money, and...

Example 4: NS#2 with NNS#3

NNS#3: ....kedo, karite kara sugu kaeshimashita
(but) (after borrowing)(immediately)(returned - formal)

NS#2: Kaeshita.
(returned - informal)

(Translation):

NNS#3:.....but, I returned(formal) the money immediately.
NS#2: Returned(informal).

3. SYNTACTIC DELETION
Example 1: NS#1 with NNS#10

(to speak)(chance)SM(no)(so)(no good)(became) (I’m sorry)

NS#1: Son’na....
(such a.....)

(Translation):

NNS#10: I don’t have a chance to speak (Japanese), so it is not good. I’m sorry.
NS#1: Such a.....

Example 2: NS#2 and NS#9

NS#9: Iroiro ikimashita ka.
(various) (went)(Question Marker)

NS#2: Shiatoru ni ittari, Stanrei Paaku ya nanka ni
(Seattle)(to)(went,and)(Stanley Park)(or something)
ne, yonaka ni kuruma de ne.....
(you know) (at night) (by car)(you know)

(Translation):

NS#9: Did you go (to) various (places)?
NS#2: Went to Seattle, and to Stanley Park or something, at night, by car, you know.

Example 3: NS#2 with NNS#6

NS#2: Aa, Rokkii, kondo 27-nichi kara Rokkii Foo.....
(Oh)(Rocky)(this time)(27th)(from)(Rocky IV)

NNS#6: A, soo, shiranakatta.
(Is that so?)(I didn’t know.)

(Translation):
NS#2: Oh, Rocky, from 27th on, Rocky IV.....
NNS#6: Is that right? I didn’t know.

Example 4: NS#8 with NNS#7

NS#8: De, kore ijoo matenai toka omottara, saiban toka.....
(and)(any more)(can’t wait)(if she thinks)(trial)(or)

NNS#7: Soo desu ne.
(Yes, it is so.)

(Translation):
NS#8: And, if she thinks that she can’t wait any longer, a trial or.....
NNS#7: That’s right.

Example 5: NS#7 with NNS#7

NS#7: Jaa, toriaezu kono mondai ni.....
(then)(for the present)(this)(problem)(to)

NNS#7: Ii desu.
(OK)(is)

(Translation):
NS#7: Well, then, to this problem.....
NNS#7: OK.

4. COORDINATE CONJUNCTIVE FORMS

Example 1: NS#7 with NNS#7

NS#7: De, Boku, anoo, ichioo Nihon-no daigaku o dete, de, ni-nen-han hataraita n’desu kedo, insatsu-gaisha de hataraita n’desu kedo, nanka chotto, Eigo’tte yuuka, kochira ni ryuugaku suru’tte koto ga koo chuugakusei jidai kara zutto nozondete, de, yahari jibun de okane o tamete, soide koyoo to omotte, de, kaisha wa yamete kita n’desu.
And, I, well, graduated from a Japanese university, and worked for two and a half years, but, oh, I worked in a printing company, but, I had been wishing to study English here since my junior high days, so I saved money to come here, then I quit the company and came here.

Example 2: NS#2 with NS#9

NS#2: Oyaji to okkasan de yattete, nan‘nin ka juugyooin ga ite,
(dad) (and) (mom) (are doing-and)(some)(employees)SM (exist-and)

sorede ima aniki ga sore o tetsudattete, kyonen no juugatsu, aniki wa kekkonshite...
(and)(now)(brother)SM(it)OM(helping-and) (last October)(brother)TM(married-and)

OM = Object Marker

(Translation):

NS#2: My dad and mom are doing (the family business), and there are some employees, and now my big brother is helping them, and last October, he got married and...

Example 3: NS#7 with NNS#7

NS#7: De, kugatsu 18-nichi ni kite, mada 2-kagetsu gurai desu kedomo,
(and) (September 18th)(on)(came-and)(still)(2 months)(about) (is)(but)

de, rainen no sangatsu kurai made imasu.
(and)(next year)(March)(about)(until)(stay)

(Translation):

NS#7: And, I came here on September 18th and it's still been about 2 months, but, and I'll stay until next March.

Example 4: NS#2 with NNS#6

NS#2: Ima 2-nen de, dakara at 2-nenkan benkyoo-shite.....
(now)(2nd year)(am-and)(so)(another 2 years)(will study-and)
NS#2: Now, I am in the 2nd year, and, so I'll study another two years and.....

5. REPETITIONS

A) REPETITIONS TO PROMOTE COMPREHENSION

(1) Comprehension Checks

Example 1: NS#6 with NNS#9

NS#6: Chi ga tsunagatte'ru deshoo? E, wakarimasu?
(blood) SM (related) (isn't it) (eh, do you understand)

Chi ga tsunagatte'ru'tte yuu no.....
(blood) SM (related) (something called)

(Translation):

NS#6: They are related by blood, aren't they? Eh? Do you understand that 'they are related by blood'?

Example 2: NS#1 with NNS#2

NS#1: Ri-fu-to-dai, rifutodai ga ichinichi 3,000-en gurai deshita.
(LIFT FARE) (lift fare) SM (a day) (3,000 Yen) (about) (was)

(Translation):

NS#1: The LIFT FARE, the lift fare was about 3,000 yen a day.

Example 3: NS#3 with NNS#9

NS#3: Kanagawa'tte shitte'masu ka?
(Kanagawa) (do you know)

NNS#9: Ee, shitte'masu.
(yes, I know)

NS#3: Kanagawa nan′desu kedo.
(Kanagawa) (is) (but)

(Translation):

NS#3: Do you know Kanagawa?
NNS#9: Yes, I know.
NS#3: (I'm from) Kanagawa, you know.

Example 4: NS#7 with NNS#1

NS#7: Demone, anoo, shakuyoo shoosho... Do you know shakuyoo shoosho?
(but) (well) (contract)

(Translation):

NS#7: But, well, shakuyoo shoosho... Do you know 'shakuyoo shoosho'?

Example 5: NS#6 with NNS#1

NS#6: Aa, kono miboojin... Miboojin, wakarimasu?
(oh)(this)(widow) (widow) (do you understand)

(Translation):

NS#6: Oh, this widow... Do you understand 'widow'?

(2) Confirmation

Example 1: NS#2 with NNS#3

NNS#3: Tootemu Paaku, shitte′masu ha?
(Totem Park) (do you know)

NS#2: Tootemu Paaku?
NNS#3: Anoo, UBC no ryoo.
(well)(UBC)(of)(dormitory)

(Translation):

NNS#3: Do you know Totem Park?
NS#2: Totem Park?
NNS#3: Well, UBC dormitory.

Example 2: NS#9 with NNS#10

NS#9: 500-doru, e, 25-nen mae no 500-doru desu ka?
($500)(eh)(25 years)(ago)(of)

(Translation):

NS#9: Five hundred dollars, five hundred dollars of 25 years ago?

Example 3: NS#1 with NNS#2

NNS#2: Pikin ni ikitai desu ka.
(Peking)(to)(want to go?)

NS#1: ....?

NNS#2: Pikin.

NS#1: Pikin desu ka.

NNS#2: Pekin.

NS#1: Aaa, Pekin.

(Translation):

NNS#2: Do you want to go to Peking [pi-kin]?
NS#1:....?
NNS#2: Peking [pi-kin].
NS#1: Peking [pi-kin]?
NNS#2: [Pe-kin].
NS#1: Oh! [Pe-kin].

(Peking is pronounced [pe-kin] in Japanese.)

**Example 4:** NS#9 with NNS#10

NNS#10: *Kanadajin bakari.*
   (Canadians)(only)

NS#9: *Kanadajin bakari?*

NNS#10: *Hai.*
   (yes)

(Translation):

NNS#10: Only Canadians.
NS#9: **Only Canadians?**
NS#10: Yes.

**Example 5:** NS#3 with NNS#9

NNS#9: *Son’nani ne, taishita okane janai deshoo?*
   (not so)(you know)(big)(money)(no)(isn’t it)

NS#3: *Taishita okane janai desu ka.*
   (big) (money) (no) (is) Question Marker

(Translation):

NNS#9: It’s not so big money, isn’t it?
NS#3: **It’s not so big money?**

(3) **Rewording**

**Example 1:** NS#10 with NNS#10

NS#10: *De, kotchi wa rikon-suru hito ne, divorce, monosugoku ooi desu ne.*
(and)(here)TM (divorce) (people) (divorce)(very, very) (many) (isn't it)

(Translation):

NS#10: And, there are many people who are divorced, divorces, here.

**Example 2:** NS#6 with NNS#9

NS#6: *Dakara kootoojoo no yakuyoku nanoka....Wakarimasuka, kootoojoo?*  
(therefore)(verbal) (agreement) (or) (do you understand) (verbal)

NNS#9: *Un, maa maa.*  
(yeah, so so)

NS#6: *Kuchi dake no yakusoku nanoka.....*  
(mouth)(only)(of)(promise)(or)

(Translation):

NS#6: Therefore, it’s a verbal agreement or..... Do you understand ‘verbal’?  
NNS#9: Yeah, so so.  
NS#6: It’s a promise of mouth only or.....

**Example 3:** NS#2 with NS#9

NS#2: *Uchi wa are, yoookei dakara..... Ie de yookei yatte’ru.*  
(family) TM(well)(poultry farming)(house)(at)(doing)

NS#9: A..?

NS#2: *Niwatori, niwatori.*  
(chickens, chickens)

NS#9: A, soo!  
(ah, yes)

(Translation):

NS#2: My family is in poultry business..... They are doing poultry farming at home.
Example 4: NS#3 with NNS#5

NS#3: *Miboojin ga, anoo, widow ga nephew ni okane o kashteru n'desu ne.*

(widow) SM (well) (to)(money)(lending)(you know)

(Translation):

NS#3: *Moboojin, ah, well, the widow is lending money to the nephew, you know.*

Example 5: NS#1 with NNS#2

NS#1: *Nihon no hon, noberu wa yoku yomi masu.*

(Japanese)(books)(novels)TM(well)(read)

(Translation):

NS#1: I read Japanese *books, novels* very often.

(4) Correction and/or Expansion

Example 1: NS#1 with NNS#2

NNS#2: *Kamakura wa Tokyo no *chikaku aru masu kara.....*

(Kamakura)TM(Tokyo)(of) (near) (exist) (so)

NS#1: *Hai, chikai desu ne.*

(translation)(near) (isn’t it)

(Translation):

NNS#2: Kamakura is located *close* Tokyo, so... 
NS#1: Yes, it is *near*, isn’t it.

Example 2: NS#10 with NNS#10
NNS#10: Okane o, anoo, *kurenai watashi ni.
   (money)OM(well)(don't give) (to me)

NS#10: Hai, kaeshite kurenai, ne?
   (yes)(don't give you back)(you mean)

NNS#10: Kaeshite kurenai.

(Translation):

NNS#10: (He) *doesn't give the money to me.
NS#10: Yes, he doesn't give the money back to you, you mean?
NNS#10: Doesn't give it back to me.

Example 3: NS#9 with NNS#3

NNS#3: Anoo, *nazeka oi ga okane o kaeshite kurenai to omoimasu ka.
   (well)(why)(nephew)SM(money)OM(not return)(do you think that)

NS#9: Aa, naze kaesanai ka?
   (ah)(why)(not return)

NNS#3: Ee, naze kaesanai ka.

(Translation):

NNS#3: Well, *how the nephew doesn't return the money, what do you think?
NS#9: Ah, why he doesn't return?
NNS#3: Yes, why he doesn't return.

(5) Rephrasing and Explanation

Example 1: NS#8 with NNS#7

NS#8: Nihon ni danchi 'tte aru no shitte'masu ka.
   (Japan)(in)(danchi)(are)(do you know)

Dan.....anoo..... Apartment ga sugoi ippai aru tokoro desu ne.
   (dan.....)(well)(apartment)SM(very)(many)(are)(place)(is)(you know)
(Translation):

NS#8: There are places called danchi in Japan, do you know? Dan....Ah....It's a place where many apartment houses are built, you know.

Example 2: NS#8 with NNS#4

NS#8: Doo omoimasu ka, keiyakusho.
(how)(do you think)(contract)

NNS#4: A?

NS#8: Nante yuu no kanaa..... Chanto kami ni nangatsu
(I wonder what to say)(formally)(paper)(which month)

nan’nichi made ni kaesanakutcha ikenai toka.....
(which day) (by) (have to return) (or)

(Translation):

NS#8: How do you think about a contract?
NNS#4: Ah?
NS#8: I wonder how to say.... Formally, on a piece of paper, you (write) by such and such date, you have to return or.....

Example 3: NS#9 with NS#2

NS#9: Kyookoo shudan ni hairu to yuuka dandan tsuyoku yutte.....
(drastic measure)(take) (or)(gradually)(insistently)(tell)

(Translation):

NS#9: Taking a drastic measure or telling insistently little by little.....

(6) Answering

Example 1: NS#7 with NNS#1

NNS#1: Soo, sono shakuyoo *moji?
(well)(that)

NS#7: Shaku-yoo SHOO-SHO.
(borrowing)(certificate)

(Translation):

NNS#1: Well, that borrowing *moji?
NS#7: Borrowing CERTIFICATE.

Example 2: NS#10 with NNS#5

NS#10: Kooyuu keiken wa arimasu ka.
(this kind of)(experience)(do you have)

NNS#5: Keiken? Uuun, Oh, experience?

NS#10: Experience.

(Translation):

NS#10: Do you have this kind of keiken?
NNS#5: Keiken? Uuum, Oh, experience?
NS#10: Experience.

Example 3: NS#3 with NNS#5

NS#3: .....akiramechau?
(give up)

NNS#5: Akirame?

NS#3: Akirameryu.

(Translation):

NS#3: .....(you completely) give up?
NNS#5: Give up?
NS#3: Give up.
Example 4: NS#2 with NNS#3

NNS#3: Miboojin to iimasu ka, kore.
   (widow)(do you say)(this)

NS#2: MI-BOO-JIN.

(Translation):

NNS#3: Do you say this "miboojin"?
NS#2: MI-BOO-JIN.

B) REPETITIONS TO PROMOTE GENERAL COMMUNICATION

(1) Empathy

Example 1: NS#8 with NNS#7

NNS#7: Sono kenri wa arimasu.
   (that)(right)(exist)

NS#8: Arimasu ne.
   (exist)(doesn't it)

(Translation):

NNS#7: She has the right.
NS#8: She has, hasn’t she?

Example 2: NS#9 with NNS#3

NNS#3: Shibuya wa nigiyaka desu ne.
   (Shibuya)(lively)(is)(isn’t it)

NS#9: Nigiyaka desu nee. Yoru osoku made.....
   (lively)(is)(isn’t it)(night)(late)(until)

(Translation):
NNS#3: Shibuya is lively, isn’t it?
NS#9: Lively isn’t it? Until very late at night.....

Examples 3: NS#1 with NS#6

NS#6: Kuruma ga aryaa benri desu yo koko wa. (car) SM (if you have)(convenient) (here) TM

NS#1: Yaa, benri desu yo ne. (yeah)(convenient) (isn’t it)

(Translation):

NS#6: If you have a car, it’s convenient here.
NS#1: Yeah, it’s convenient, isn’t it?

Examples 4: NS#10 with NS#7

NS#7: Soofuni maa aru teido chotto toomawashi ni yuu. (in such) (well) (a little) (indirectly) (tell)

NS#10: Soo desu ne. Toomawashi ni...... (that’s right) (indirectly)

(Translation):

NS#7: In such a way, well, to tell a little bit indirectly.....
NS#10: That’s right. Indirectly.....

Examples 5: NS#1 with NNS#2

NNS#2: Amari jozu ja arimasen ga, Kankokugo ga sukoshi wakari masu. (so) (good at) (not) (but) (Korean) SM (a little)(understand)

NS#1: Aaaa, Kankokugo desu ka! (Oh) (Korean) (is) Question Marker

(Translation):
NNS#2: Not so good at, but I understand Korean a little.
NS#1: Oh, Korean!

(2) Play

Example 1: NS#1 and NS#6

NS#6: Gaki, gaki wa imasu?
     (kids)(kids)TM(are)

NS#1: Gaki, imasu.

NS#6: Gaki no Eigo, wakaran deshoo?
     (kids)(of)(English)(incomprehensible)(isn’t it)

(gaki--slang; literally means hungry demons)

(Translation):

NS#6: They have kids, kids?
NS#1: They have kids.
NS#6: Kids’ English is hard to understand, isn’t it?

Examples 2: NS#9 with NS#2

NS#2: Basu de?
     (bus)(by)

NS#9: Anoo, ressha de.
     (well)(train)(by)

NS#2: Aa, nantoka nantoka’tte yuu.....
     (oh)(such and such)(called)

NS#9: Nantoka nantoka de. (laugh) VIA de.
     (such and such)(by)

(Translation):
Example 3: NS#6 with NS#1

NS#6: *Hiru no sanji-han goro made.*  
(p.m.) (3:30) (about)(until)

NS#1: *Bitchiri?*  
(without break)

NS#6: *Bitchiri, kekkoo.*  
(without break) (more or less)

NS#1: *Uwaaa!*  
(wow)

*(bitchiri--slangish term)*

*(Translation)*:

NS#6: (We have classes) until about 3:30 p.m.  
NS#1: Without break?  
NS#6: Without break, more or less.  
NS#1: Wow!

Example 4: NS#10 with NNS#10

NNS#10: *Muzukashii, Eigo wa?*  
(difficult)(English)TM

NS#10: *Soo desu ne. Yappari muzukashii desu ne.*  
(well.....) (as you say)(difficult)

NNS#10: *Nihongo mo suggoku muzukashii desu.*  
(Japanese)(also)(very)(difficult)

NS#10: *Un, zenzen, koo, bunpoo toka ga hantai dakara.*  
(yeah, well.....)(grammar)(or)SM(reversed)
NNS#10: soo.
   (yes)

NS#10: Ee, muzukashii desu, tabun.
   (yes) (difficult) (probably)

NNS#10: Hai, yoku wakari masu.
   (yes) (well) (understand)

NS#10: Ee, yoku wakari masu. (laugh)
   (yes)

(Translation):

NNS#10: Is it difficult, English?
NS#10: Well, yes, it is difficult.
NS#10: Japanese is also VERY difficult.
NS#10: Yeah, well.....the grammar is completely reversed.
NS#10: Yes.
NS#10: Yes, it’s difficult, probably.
NS#10: Yes, I understand well.
NS#10: Yes, I understand well. (laugh)

(3) Emphasis

Example 1: NS#2 with NNS#6

NNS#6: .....zenbu de hyakuman shita. Hyakuman en.
   (altogether)(one million)(cost) (one million yen)

NS#2: Yasui ne.
   (cheap)(isn’t it)

NNS#6: Un, deshoo? Dakara betsu ni.....
   (yeah) (isn’t it) (so) (not so)

NS#2: Jitsuni yasui.
   (really)(cheap)

(Translation):
Example 2: NS#8 with NNS#4

NS#8: *Nihon de wa sugoi hayatte’ru.*
   (Japan)(in)(very)(popular)

NNS#4: *Hontonii?*
   (really)

NS#8: *Un, suggoku hayatte’ru.*
   (yeah)(ve-e-e-ry)(popular)

(Translation):

NS#8: In Japan, it’s *very* popular.
NNS#4: Really?
NS#8: Yeah, it’s *ve-e-e-ry popular.*

Example 3: NS#2 with NS#9

NS#9: .....*mondai’tte arimashita?*
   (problems)(existed)

NS#2: *Ore ga?*
   (me)SM

NS#9: *Un, sooja nakute, oniisan ga.*
   (no)(not-but)(your brother)SM

NS#2: *A, aniki ga? Atta yo.*
   (Oh)(my brother)(existed)

NS#9: *Taihen deshita?*
   (was it tough)

NS#2: *Moo, atta, atta, atta, sugoi atta.*
   (well)(existed, existed, existed, really, existed)
(Translation):

NS#9: Had troubles?
NS#2: Me?
NS#9: No, not you, but your brother.
NS#2: Oh, my brother. Yes, he had.
NS#9: Was it tough?
NS#2: Yeah, troubles, troubles, troubles, many troubles.

Example 4: NS#9 with NNS#6

NS#9: *Tasukatta n’desu ka, demo.*
   (was he alive) (but)

NNS#6: *Ashi, kega-shita dake.*
   (legs)(injured)(only)

NS#9: *Eeee! Sugoi, sugoi seimeiryoku desu ne.*
   (oh)(super, super)(strength to live)(is)

(Translation):

NS#9: Was he alive, though?
NNS#6: Injured his legs only.
NS#9: Oh, he is a super, super being.

(4) Echoing

Example 1: NS#7 with NNS#7

NNS#7: *Natsu igai wa sugoku tanoshikatta desu.*
   (summer)(except)(very)(was enjoyable)

NS#7: *Natsu igai wa*(laugh).... *Nande natsu wa?*
   (why)

(Translation):

NNS#7: It was very enjoyable except summer.
NS#7: Except summer(laugh).... Why summer?
Example 2: NS#6 with NNS#9

NS#6: Kono miboojin to yuu hito to oi’tte yuu no wa.....
   (this) (widow)(called)(person)(and)(nephew) TM

NNS#9: Mezurashii?
   (rare)

NS#6: Mezurashii’tte yuuka(laugh)....Chi ga tsunagatte’ru deshoo?
   (rare) (ah, well.....) (blood) SM (related) (isn’t it)

(Translation):

NS#6: This widow and nephew are.....
NNS#9: Rare?
NS#6: Rare, ah, well(laugh).....They are blood-related, aren’t they?

Example 3: NS#7 with NNS#1

NNS#1: Yakuza ni oshiete.....
   (yakuza)(to)(talk and)

NS#7: Yakuza(laugh).....

(Translation):

NNS#1: Talking to a yakuza.....
NS#6: Yakuza(laugh).....

(5) Self-Correction

Example 1: NS#9 with NS#2

NS#9: Sorede, 12-gatsu ni kaerimasu node, kaerimasu.....tsumori desu.
   (and) (December)(in) (go back) (so) (go back) (intend to)

(Translation):

NS#9: And, in December, I’m going home, so, oh, I intend to go home.
Example 2: NS#7 with NNS#7

NS#7: .....jibun no shokugyoo ni ikasu, ikashitai to ommoteru.....
(one’s own)(job) (in) (use) (want to use)(thinking) (Translation):

NS#7: .....to use, want to use (knowledge of foreign languages) in one’s own job.....

Example 3: NS#2 with NS#9

NS#2: Nande, sonoo, kaesu kimochi ga nakunaru ka,
(why)(well)(return)(intention)(disappear)Question Marker

nakunatta ka’tte yuu no ga wakan’ni n’da yo ne.
(disappeared)(so called)SM (we don’t know)(you know)

(Translation):

NS#2: Well, why the intention to return (the money) disappear, has disappeared; that is what we don’t know, you know.

Example 4: NS#3 with NS#8

NS#3: Sorede, moshi, sono kashita, karita hon’nin ga.....
(and then)(if) (that)(lent) (borrowed)(person)SM

(Translation):

NS#3: And, if that person who lent, borrowed .....  

(6) Habitual Use (Filling)

Example 1: NS#9 with NNS#6

NS#9: Tatoeba anoo.....asoko no musume-san wa, anoo tatoeba anoo.....
(if) (well)(that family)(daughter) TM (well)

(Translation):
NS#9: If well.....the daughter of that family, well, if, well.....

Example 2: NS#3 with NS#8

NS#3: Soide dakara oi toka ni yuu n'darroo toka'tte, soide daraka, atashi mo
(and so) (nephew)(or)(to)(tell) (she said) (and so) (I) (also)

soo da ne toka...
(agree) (or)

(Translation):

NS#3: And, so, telling the nephew or something, she said, and, so, I agreed or something.....

Example 3: NS#6 with NNS#1

NS#6: Dakara boku mo soo nan'desu. Dakara Eigo de
(so) (I)(too)(so)(am) (so)(English)(in)

shaberu toki ippen Nihongo de kangaechai masu ne.

(Translation):

NS#6: So, I do so, too. So, when I speak English, I think in Japanese once, you know.

(7) Stuttering

Example 1: NS#3 with NS#8

NS#3: Saigo niwa uso tsui, uso tsuite'tte yuuka.....
(in the end)(tell a lie) (or something)

(Translation):

NS#3: In the end, telling, telling a lie or something.....

Example 2: NS#9 with NS#2
NS#9: Demo kiku, kiku no ni wa benkyoo-ni-naru kedo.....
(but) (hear) (hearing) TM (good for study) (but)

(Translation):

NS#9: But, it's good for hear, hearing, but.....

Example 3: NS#8 with NNS#7

NS#8: Tato, tato, kono hito no okusan ga, tatoe, ie-n'naka ni ita to shitemo.....
(even if)(this)(person)(of)(wife)SM(even if) (in the house)(stay)(suppose)

(Translation):

NS#8: Even, even, this person's wife, even if she stays home...

(8) Syntactic Constraint

Example 1: NS#8 with NS#3

NS#8: Kaesu toki ni wa, ikuraka purasu-shite kaesu to ha ne.
(return)(when)TM(some)(add-and)(return)(or)

(Translation):

NS#8: When you return (money), you return it adding some interest or something.

Example 2: NS#10 with NS#7

NS#10: Iya dattara iya to.....
(no) (if) (no)Quotation Marker

(Translation):

NS#10: If it's no, you say no.....

Example 3: NS#9 with NNS#6
NS#9: Atashi-no kaisha'tte yuu no wa josei no ooi kaisha datta n'desu yo ne.
(my) (company) TM (women)(many)(company)(was)

(Translation):

NS#10: My company was a company where many women were working, you know.

Example 4: NS#6 with NS#1

NS#6: Soryaa, taishita okane wa okane desu kedo.....
(well) (big) (money)TM(money)(is)(but)

(Translation):

NS#6: Well, it's a big money, money is money, but.....

(9) Contextual constraint

Example 5: NS#6 and NS#1

NS#6: Boku wa Nagoya desu.
(I) TM (Nagoya)(is)

NS#1: Nagoya. Aa, Nagoya desu ka. Ima, uchi no aniki ga
(Nagoya)(oh)(Nagoya)(is)QM (now)(our)(brother)SM

Nagoya de hatarait'ru n'desu yo ne.
(Nagoya)(in)(working)(you know)

NS#6: A, doko, dokorahen de.....?
(where) (where)(in)

NS#1: Nagoya no doko'tte yutta ka nua.....
(Nagoya)(in)(where)(I wonder)

(Translation):

NS#6: I (studied) in Nagoya.
NS#1: Nagoya. Oh, in Nagoya. My big brother is working in Nagoya now, you know.
Example 2: NS#1 and NS#6

NS#6: *Rokujuuman deshoo. Rokujuuman kaette konai wake deshoo?* 

(600,000) (isn't it) (600,000) (not returned) (isn't it)

NS#1: *Kanari taikin.*

(quite)(big money)

NS#6: *Kekkoo na okane desu yo. Rokujuuman'tte Nihon de yueba nee.*

(big money) (is) (I tell you) (600,000) (Japan) (in) (if you say) (you know)

(Translation):

NS#6: Six hundred thousand, isn't it? Six hundred thousand is not returned, isn't it?

NS#1: Quite a big money.

NS#6: Big money, it is, six hundred thousand is, if you say it in Japan.....

(10) Self-addressing

Example 1: NS#1 with NS#6

NS#6: *Kaeshite morau niwa dooshitara yoika.*

(get it returned) (what to do)

NS#1: *Kaeshite morau niwa dooshitara yoika.*

(Translation):

NS#6: What to do to get (the money) back.

NS#1: What to do to get (the money) back.

Example 2: NS#1 with NNS#10

NNS#10: *Anoo, Tami, oboete'ru ka na.*

(well) (Tami) (do you remember)
NS#1: Eeto, Tami......, Tami'tte yuu no wa......
(aah...)(Tami) (Tami is.....)

(Translation):

NNS#10: Well, Tami, do you remember her?
NS#1: Aaah, Tami....., Tami is.....

Example 3: NS#8 with NNS#4

NNS#4: Hatsuon toka wa zenzen chigau.
(pronunciation)TM(completely)(different)

NS#8: Zenzen chigau.....Uuuun.

(Translation):

NNS#4: Pronunciation is completely different.
NS#8: Completely different..... Uuuum.

Example 4: NS#1 with NNS#2

NNS#2: Yasu-san wa *shokyoo no kyootoo deshoo ka.
(Yasu-san)TM(follower of a religion)(are you)

NS#1: Shokyoo no kyootoo.....desu ka.

NNS#2: Hai.
(yes)

NS#1: Muzukashii Nihongo o shitte'mas ne. Shokyoo no kyootoo.....
(difficult) (Japanese) OM (know)

(Translation):

NNS#2: Are you *shokyoo no kyootoo, Yasu-san?
NS#1: Shokyoo no kyootoo.....you mean?
NNS#2: Yes.
NS#1: You know a difficult Japanese, don’t you? Shokyoo no kyootoo.....
("Shokyoo no kyootoo should be pronounced "Shuukyoo no kyooto", which means 'a follower of a religion")

(11) Imitation

Example 1: NS#1 with NNS#2

NNS#2: Saitama-ken wa sutekina tokoro to omoimasu ka.
(Saitama Pref.)(wonderful place)(do you think)

NS#1: ....umareta tokoro de atte, yappa, sodatta tokoro desu kara sutekina tokoro desu.
(born)(place)(is)(and)(brought up)(place)(so)(wonderful place)(is)

(Translation):

NNS#2: Do you think that Saitama Prefecture is a wonderful place?
NS#1: Since I was born there, and brought up there, it is a wonderful place.

Example 2: NS#2 with NNS#6

NNS#6: .....boku no Nihongo, shiro-kuro no shashin, son'na shashin nan'da kedo......
(my)(Japanese)(black and white picture)(such)(picture)(is)(but)

NS#2: Boku no Eigo wa mada shiro-kuro made itte nai mono.
(my)(English)(yet)(black and white)(until)(go)(not)

(Translation):

NNS#6: .....my Japanese is something like a black and white picture......
NS#2: My English is not yet black and white.

(12) Assurance

Example 1: NS#6 with NNS#9

NNS#9: Asonde'ta?
(were you fooling around)

NS#6: Asonde'ta n'to chau.
(fooling around)(not)

(Translation):

NNS#9: Were you fooling around?
NS#6: No, I was not fooling around.

Example 2: NS#1 with NNS#2

NNS#2: Mishima to yuu sakka o shitte'masu ka.
(Mishima)(called)(write)OM(do you know)

NS#2: Ee, shitte'masu.
(yes)(I know)

(Translation):

NNS#2: Do you know a writer called Mishima?
NS#1: Yes, I know.

Example 3: NS#6 with NS#1

NS#1: Anoo, sugu tomete, tomerare masu ka.
(aaah)(immediately)(can you park a car)

NS#6: Tomerare masu yo.
(can park)(I tell you)

(Translation):

NS#1: Can you park a car without trouble (at UBC)?
NS#6: We CAN park.

6. COMPLEX CONSTRUCTIONS

(1) Passive

Example 1: NS#1 with NNS#2
NS#1: *Shampoo ni Eigo to Furansugo ga hakarete atte*.....
(shampoo)(on)(English and French)(written)

(Translation):

NS#1: On the shampoo, English and French were written.....

**Example 2:** NS#1 with NNS#10

NS#1: *Takusan no hito no naka erabareta wake desu ne.*
(many) (people)(out of) (selected)

(Translation):

NS#1: So you were selected out of many people.

**Example 3:** NS#9 with NNS#6

NS#9: *.....shigoto ni owarete*.....
(work) (by)(chased after)

(Translation):

NS#9: *...being chased after by work*.....

**Example 4:** NS#3 with NNS#5

NS#3: *'Busy, only buy' to shika hakarete nai deshoo.*
(only)(written) (isn't it)

(Translation):

NS#3: It's only written 'busy, only busy', isn't it?

(2) **Provisional**

**Example 1:** NS#6 with NS#1
NS#6: Kyokuron o ieba.....
   (extreme argument) OM (if we say)

(Translation):

NS#6: If we say an extreme argument.....

Example 2: NS#10 with NNS#5

NS#10: Motto Eigo ga dekireba.....
   (more) (English) (if I can speak)

(Translation):

NS#10: If I can speak English more fluently.....

Example 3: NS#8 with NNS#4

NS#8: Shigoto o shite kara kaeseba ii.....
   (job) OM (doing) (after) (if you return) OK

(Translation):

NS#8: It's OK if you return (the money) after you've got a job.

Example 4: NS#7 with NNS#7

NS#7: ....kazoku o motte ireba.....
   (family) OM (if he has)

(Translation):

NS#7: ....if he has a family.....

(3) Conditional

Example 1: NS#6 with NS#1
NS#6: *Hyakuman'tte yuttara.....*
(1 million)(if you say)

(Translation):

NS#6: **If you say** one million.....

**Example 2:** NS#10 with NS#7

NS#10: *Kanajin dattara, moo ookiku nattara bekkyo-shimasu yo ne.*
(Canadian) (if) (once grown up) (live separately)(you know)

(Translation):

NS#10: **If it's** Canadian, **once they are grown up**, they live separately, you know.

**Example 3:** NS#2 with NS#9

NS#2: *Nihon ni kaettara mata sono kaisha ni iku wake?*
(Japan)(to)(return)(again)(that company)(go)

(Translation):

NS#2: **After you go back** to Japan, do you go back to the company?

**Example 4:** NS#8 with NNS#4

NS#8: *Watashi dattara yappashi ginkoo toka.....*
(if I were him) (usually)(bank) (or)

(Translation):

NS#8: **If I were him,** I usually go to a bank or.....

(4) **Desiderative**

**Example 1:** NS#3 with NS#8
NS#3: Kodomotachi ni nan'ka kaitai toka.....
(children)(for)(something)(want to buy)(or)

(Translation):

NS#3: She wants to buy something for her children or.....

Example 2: NS#6 with NNS#1

NS#6: Kanojo wa kare to kankei o kowashitaku-nai'su ne.
(she) TM (him)(with)(relation)(not want to break)

(Translation):

NS#6: She does not want to break the relationship with him, you know.

Example 3: NS#10 with NNS#5

NS#10: Atashi mo zuuto itai naa.....
(I) (also)(for ever)(want to stay)

(Translation):

NS#10: I also want to stay here for ever.....

Example 4: NS#2 with NNS#6

NS#2: Jibun no ii tai koto mada iemasen yo, jibun de.
(I) SM (want to say)(still)(can't say)(myself)

(Translation):

NS#2: I myself still can't say what I want to say.

(5) Relative construction

Example 1: NS#6 with NNS#9
NS#6: *Boku no sunde’ru machi wa.....*  
(I) (SM)(living) (city)TM

(Translation):

NS#6: The city where I’m living.....

**Example 2:** NS#3 with NNS#5

NS#3: *Okane de kaenai mono mo aru.*  
(money)(by)(cannot buy)(things)(exist)

(Translation):

NS#3: There are also things which we cannot buy by money.

**Example 3:** NS#1 with NNS#10

NS#1: *Jibun no orinakya nan’nai eki de.....*  
(I) SM (have to get off)(station)(at)

(Translation):

NS#1: .....at the station which I have to get off.....

**Example 4:** NS#9 with NNS#3

NS#9: *Kochira ni kiteiru Nihonjin.....*  
(here) (to)(staying)(Japanese)

(Translation):

NS#9: Japanese people who are staying here.....

(6) Noun + Verb Phrase (Modality Expression)

**Example 1:** NS#7 with NNS#7
NS#7: Kono miboojin ga yuu beki du to omou n’desu ne.
   (this)(widow)SM(say)(should)copula(I think)(you know)

(Translation):

NS#7: I think that this widow **should talk** (to him), you know.

**Example 2:** NS#6 with NNS#9

NS#6: Itta koto ga arimasu.
   (went)(thing)SM(exist)

(Translation):

NS#6: I **have been** there.

**Example 3:** NS#8 with NNS#4

NS#8: Keiyakusho o kawashita hoo ga ii.....
   (contract)OM(exchanged)(side)SM(better)

(Translation):

NS#8: (We) **had better exchange** a contract.....

**Example 4:** NS#1 with NNS#10

NS#1: Hajime kara owari made hataraite ita wake desu ka.
   (beginning)(from)(end)(till)(worked)(case)(copula)QM

(Translation):

NS#1: Is it the case that you **worked** from the beginning to the end? (= you mean that.....)

7. **CONTRACTION**

**Example 1:** NS#6 with NNS#9
Asonde'ta n' to chau. (= Asondeita noto chigau.)
(fooling around)(different)

(I wasn’t foolin’ ’round.)

Example 2: NS#1 with NS#6

Yoku wakan’nai (= wakaranai) n’desu (= nodesu) kedo ne.
(well)(don’t know) (I tell you) (but) (you know)

(I donno well, but, you know.)

Example 3: NS#8 with NNS#4

Okane ga naku natchatte (= naku natte shimatte).....
(money)(none)(became-and)

(Money has become non-existent and..... = I became broke and.....)

Example 4: NS#3 with NNS#5

Wasure chau (= te shimau) no?
(forget)(completely)

(Forget completely?)

7. DELETION OF PARTICLES

Example 1: NS#2 with NNS#6

Megane (ø) kakete’nai? (OM is omitted)
(glasses)(wearing)

(Isn’t he wearing glasses?)

Example 2: NS#6 with NS#1

Demo, boku (ø) kuruma (ø) motte’ru kara..... (TM and OM are omitted.)
(but) (I) (car) (have) (so)

(But, I have a car, so.....)

Example 3: NS#10 with NNS#5

*Nanika chigai (ê) wakarimasu ka. (SM is omitted.)

(any)(difference) (do you know)

(lit. = Any difference is comprehensible to you?)
Statistical Information:

1. ANOVAR

2. Scheffé
1. ANOVAR

\[ F = F(\text{observed}) = s^2(\text{columns}) \div s^2(\text{interaction} = \text{rows} \times \text{columns}). \]

\( df = \text{degrees of freedom} \) (the independent pieces of information on which a sample statistics is based. - Shavelson, 1981, p.406). In the present statistics, 3 levels minus 1 (\( = 2 \)), as \( df \) (columns), and (8 subjects minus 1 = 7) x (3 levels minus 1 = 2) = 14, as \( df \) (interaction), are used.

\( p = \text{tail probability} = \text{probability to get the result by chance alone (the figure should be at least less than or equal to 0.05 to be statistically significant).} \)

n.s. = not significant.

2. Scheffe

Scheffe test formula:

\[ F(\text{observed}) = (M_i \ - \ M_s)^2 + \text{MSw} \ (1/n_i + 1/n_2) (k - 1). \]

\( M = \text{cell means}, \text{MSw} = \text{mean square within groups}, n = \text{number of subjects in a group}, k = \text{number of groups}. \)

If \( F(\text{observed}) \) is larger than or equal to \( F(\text{critical}) = 3.74 (df = 2,14) \), it is statistically significant.