LEABHARLANN CHOLÁISTE NA TRÍONÓIDE, BAILE ÁTHA CLIATH | TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY DUBLIN
Ollscoil Átha Cliath | The University of Dublin

Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC TRANSFER IN JAPANESE AS A THIRD LANGUAGE

A Thesis Presented to the Centre for Language and Communication Studies,

Faculty of Arts, Trinity College, University of Dublin

In Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Robert Joseph Fouser

2000

TRINITY COLLEGE
9 NOV 2000
LIBRARY DUBLIN
Thesis
5890

DECLARATION

I, Robert Joseph Fouser, declare that this thesis has not been submitted for a degree or part of a degree at any other university, and that it consists entirely of original research conducted by Robert Joseph Fouser. I grant permission to the Trinity College Library to lend or copy this thesis upon request.

Signed: Robert Joseph Fouser

Date: October 1, 2000

To my mother, my sister, and the memory of my father

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of a number of people. I would first like to thank my supervisor, Professor David Singleton, for his unfailing support and patience during lulls in my progress. I also thank Professor Singleton for encouraging me to publish and to give conference presentations from the early stages of my Ph.D. and for his support for my career as it has evolved in Japan. I would also like to thank Professor David Little for his support with administrative matters and Dr. Ema Ushioda and Mr. Yoshi Makita for helping me adjust to life as a Ph.D. student in Dublin.

In Australia, I thank Professors Hugh Clarke and Brian Taylor of the University of Sydney for their support while I was a visiting scholar there. Their support was critical in helping me collect necessary data for this thesis. I would like to thank Ms. Fukuda Mika for her help in developing the data elicitation instruments and for helping to arrange the pilot study. I thank Ms. Marie Fellbaum for putting me in touch with Professor Brian Taylor who offered to invite me to the University of Sydney and for our many interesting discussions in Sydney. I would like to thank all of the learners and native-speaker informants in Sydney for participating in this study.

In Japan, I would like to thank my colleagues at Kumamoto Gakuen University for being considerate of my need for block time to finish the final draft of this thesis. I would also like to thank Mr. Ahn Hyongjun for helping me check the bibliography and Professor J.V. Neustupný for his interest in my research. In Korea, I would like to thank I Professors Lee Sangoak and Lee Chungmin for their support and interest in my research. I would also like to thank Professor Paik Sungjong and

Mr. Hong Huimin for constantly pressing me to get the thesis finished.

Finally, I save my deepest thanks for my mother, Jean Fouser, and my sister, Beth Fouser, for their support from the time of application to Trinity College Dublin to submission of the thesis. Their love and high expectations have helped me keep my eye on the prize. I love them so much.

I am eternally grateful to all of you!

Robert J. Fouser

Kagoshima, Japan, March 2000

SUMMARY

This thesis explores the issue of language transfer in the acquisition of Japanese as a third or greater language at the university level. The term "L≥3" was adopted to describe the acquisition of a language or languages beyond a second language or first foreign language. The following research questions were investigated:

1. What is/are the major source(s) of language transfer in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?
2. What are the roles of sociolinguistic transfer and sociolinguistic competence in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?
3. How do L2 proficiency, prior language learning experience, and residence in Japan affect sociolinguistic transfer and sociolinguistic competence in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?
4. What is the relevance of L≥3 acquisition research for general second language acquisition theory development?

To investigate the above research questions, 24 learners third-year learners of Japanese at the University of Sydney and 10 native-speaker informants who were living in Sydney volunteered as subjects for this study. The learners came from a variety of first and second language backgrounds, but all had followed the same course of study at university, which began at the *ab initio* level in the first year. Of the 24 learners, 21 were learning Japanese as an L≥3; three were learning it as a first foreign language. The following data elicitation instruments were used: C-test, DCT (Discourse Completion Task), DET (Discourse Evaluation Task), SWT (Short

Writing Task), and a Language Learning Background Questionnaire. The C-test was used to evaluate overall language proficiency, whereas the DCT, the DET, and the SWT were designed to elicit data on learner sociolinguistic competence through speech act realisation tasks. Data gathered from the above instruments was analysed quantitatively and qualitatively in an attempt to discern possible sources of transfer and other factors that influence sociolinguistic competence. An opportunity for written introspection was included in the DCT, the DET, and the SWT to gather additional information on reasons for responses and on metalinguistic notions.

Results from the study showed that first language had the most influence on learner performance because no learners had learned a second language that was closer to Japanese typologically than their first language. Native speakers of Chinese and Korean performed better in lexical areas because of the large Chinese-character-based lexicon in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, but overall, native-speakers of English ranked second after Korean learners in language proficiency. These findings are limited, however, because there were only two native speakers of Korean in the data sample. With regards to sociolinguistic competence and transfer, the study showed that learners were aware of different speech levels in Japanese and the need to use honorifics in certain situations, but that they did not use the informal register in situations that would ordinary have called for it. This suggests the instruction in the use of the informal register may not have been sufficient. Finally, the study showed that the C-test is a valid measure of Japanese proficiency and that the HDI (Honorific Density Index) is useful in providing a quantitative measure of honorific use in different speech act frames.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration iii
Dedication iv
Acknowledgments v
Summary vii
Table of Contents ix
List of Tables xiii
Note on Romanisation xvii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction 1
1.2. Statement of the Problem 4
1.3. Theoretical Background 8
1.3.1. Hypotheses 8
1.3.2. Method 11
1.3.3. Purpose of Research 12

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. The Japanese Language and Japanese Sociolinguistics 15
2.1.1. General Introduction to the Japanese Language 15
2.1.1.1. Genetic Affiliation 16
2.1.1.2. The Writing System 17
2.1.1.3. Phonetics, Phonology, and Dialects 21
2.1.1.4. Lexicon 22
2.1.1.5. Syntax 25
2.1.2. Japanese Sociolinguistic Norms 26
2.1.2.1. Differences in Age and Social Class 26
2.1.2.2. Female and Male Speech 27
2.1.2.3. Social Class and Language 29
2.1.2.4. Speech Levels and Honorifics 30
2.1.2.5. "Language Life" 40

2.1.3. Summary 43
2.2. General Language Transfer and Sociolinguistic Transfer 45
2.2.1. General Language Transfer 45
2.2.2. Sociolinguistic Transfer 47
2.2.3. Sociolinguistic Transfer in Japanese as a Second and Foreign Language . 54
2.2.4. Summary 66
2.3. L≥3 Acquisition Research 68
2.3.1. Introduction 68
2.3.2. Definitions of L≥3 Acquisition 69
2.3.3. Methodological Problems 72
2.3.3.1. Research Design 72
2.3.3.2. Instruments 76
2.3.3.3. Control over Variables 79
2.3.4. Studies on Language Transfer in L≥3 83
2.3.4.1. Interference in L≥3 Acquisition 84
2.3.4.2. Facilitation Studies 87
2.3.5. Studies on the Effects of Prior Language Learning Experiences 94
2.3.6. Summary 98

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design 101
3.1.1. Overview 101
3.1.2. Pilot Study 103
3.1.3. Variables 104
3.2. Methodology 105
3.2.1. Subjects 105
3.2.2. Instruments 108
3.2.2.1. Language Learning Experience Questionnaire 110
3.2.2.2. C-test 111
3.2.2.3. Discourse Completion Task (DCT) 115
3.2.2.4. Discourse Evaluation Task (DET) 119
3.2.2.5. Short Writing Task (SWT) 122

3.2.3. Written Introspection 124
3.3. Procedure 125
3.3.1. Background 125
3.3.2. Data Collection 125
3.4. Analysis 128

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction 129
4.2. Japanese Language Proficiency 129
4.2.1. The C-test 130
4.2.2. Other Proficiency Measures 137
4.2.2.1. Self-evaluation of Japanese Proficiency 138
4.2.2.2. DCT and SWT Chinese Character Density 142
4.2.3. Concluding Discussion of Language Proficiency 150
4.3. Language Transfer and Perceptions of Japanese 157
4.3.1. Language Transfer 157
4.3.1.1. Effects of Multiple Language Learning 158
4.3.1.2. C-test Item Analysis and Sources of Transfer 160
4.3.1.3. Lexical Creations 167
4.3.1.4. Grammatical Particle Usage 173
4.3.2. Perceived Language Distance 178
4.3.2.1. Perceptions of Difficulty 178
4.3.2.2. Introspective Comments on Japanese 186
4.3.3. Concluding Discussion of Language Transfer 190
4.4. Sociolinguistic Proficiency 192
4.4.1. The HDI (Honorific Density Index) 193
4.4.2. HDI Analysis of the DCT and the SWT Results for Learners and Native Speakers 203
4.4.3. Results from the DET for Learners and Native Speakers 213
4.4.4. Concluding Discussion of Sociolinguistic Proficiency 218
4.5. Sociolinguistic Transfer 223
4.5.1. Social Variables and Speech Act Coding 223
4.5.2. Speech Act Analysis and Sources of Transfer 229

4.5.2.1. Apologies 231
4.5.2.2. Complaints 240
4.5.2.3. Disagreement 246
4.5.2.4. Invitations 250
4.5.2.5. Making Promises 255
4.5.2.6. Refusals 259
4.5.2.7. Requests 265
4.5.2.8. Expressing Thanks 271
4.5.3. Concluding Discussion on Sociolinguistic Transfer 276

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

5.1. Hypotheses 283
5.2. Research Questions 287
5.3. Pedagogical Implications 291

REFERENCES 295

APPENDICES

A: Explanatory Letter and Consent Form 309
B: Language Learning Experience Questionnaire 311
C: C-test (Instrument) 317
D: Discourse Completion Task (DCT) (Instrument and Responses)..... 321
E: Discourse Evaluation Task (DET) (Instrument and Responses) 355
F: Short Writing Task (SWT) (Instrument and Responses) 383

LIST OF TABLES

1. Overview of the Japanese Writing System 18
2. Examples of the Common Lexicon in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese 20
3. Overview of Japanese Phonology 21
4. Overview of the Japanese Lexicon 23
5. Structure of the Japanese Lexicon 24
6. Overview of Female and Male Speech Differences 28
7. Traditional Four-Part Classification of Honorifics 32
8. Alternative Classification Systems for Honorifics 33
9. Overview of Ide's (1982) Classification of Honorifics 34
10. Overview of Verbs of Giving and Receiving 39
11. Summary of Studies on Japanese Learners of English 49
12. Summary of Studies on Learners of Japanese 56
13. Background Information on Learners 107
14. Overview of Data Elicitation Instruments and Procedures 110
15. Comparison between an English and a Japanese C-test 113
16. Example of a DCT Situation 118
17. Example of a DET Dialogue and Questions 120
18. Overview of Data Collection Procedures 126
19. Learner C-test Descriptive Statistics 130
20. Correlation of Learner C-test Results 132
21. C-test Statistics by L1 and L2 Group 134
22. Native Speaker C-test Descriptive Statistics 135
23. Correlation of Native Speaker C-test Results 136
24. Self-Evaluation by L1 and L2 Group 139
25. Comparison of Average Self-Evaluation between Native Speakers of Chinese and English 141
26. Writing Volume and Chinese-Character Density for the DCT and the SWT by L1 Group 143
27. Correlation of C-test, Writing Volume, and Chinese-Character (Kanji) Volume for Learners 145
28. Correlation of C-test, Writing Volume, and Chinese-Character (Kanji) Volume for

Native Speakers 146
29. Comparison of Native and Non-Native Writing Volume and Chinese-Character Density for DCT and SWT 147
30. Mean C-test Scores by Age, Residency in Japan, and Major Course Group 152
31. C-test Performance According to Number of Foreign or Non-Native Languages Learned before Learning Japanese 159
32. Analysis of Selected C-test Items 163
33. C-test Item Analysis: Comparison among Chinese, Anglophone, and Korean Learners 165
34. Environment of Selected Lexical Deletions 168
35. Examples of Lexical Approximations and Creations 169
36. Environment of Selected Particle Deletions 174
37. Examples of Different Particle Use 175
38. Mean Ratings of Japanese Language Difficulty by L1 Group 180
39. Correlation among C-test, Self-Evaluation of Proficiency, and Difficulty Perception 184
40. Examples of Introspective Comments on Language 188
41. Examples of Introspective Comments on Personal Experience and on the Instruments 189
42. Components of the HDI (Honorific Density Index) 200
43. Mean Honorific Count for DCT and SWT by L1 Group 204
44. Native-Speaker HDI Descriptive Statistics for the DCT and the SWT 206
45. Mean HDI Results for DCT and SWT by L1 Group 209
46. Correlation of Learner and Native-Speaker HDI Results for the DCT 211
47. Descriptive Statistics for the DET by Learner L1 Group and by Dialogue Number 214
48. Correlation of DET Scores with the C-test and Other Language Proficiency Measures for Learners 216
49. Fractional Rank Percentage Correlation for DET and Other Instruments for Learners and Native Speakers 217
50. Selected Native-Speaker Introspective Comments on the DCT, the SWT, and the DET 219
51. Overview of Speech Act and Speaker-Hearer Relationship in the DCT,

the SWT, and the DET 224
52. Correlation of Mean DCT HDI Figures by L1 Group with the SVI 228
53. Sample of Ranks and Fractional Percentage Rank Calculations for Selected HDI Figures and the C-test 230
54. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Apology Responses .. 232
55. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situations 5 (SVI –4) 233
56. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to the SWT (SVI +4) 235
57. Questions about DET Dialogue 3 (SVI +4) 238
58. Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Complaint Responses 240
59. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 8 (SVI +2) 241
60. Questions about DET Dialogue 6 (SVI –4) 244
61. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Disagreement Responses 246
62. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 7 (SVI –2) 247
63. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Invitations Responses 250
64. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 3 (SVI –4) 251
65. Questions about DET Dialogue 1 (SVI +2) 254
66. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Promises Responses 255
67. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 4 (SVI +4) 256
68. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Refusals Responses .. 259
69. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 2 (SVI +4) 260
70. Questions on DET Dialogue 5 (SVI –2) 263
71. Descriptive Statistics for Learners and Native-Speaker Requests Responses 266

72. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 1 (SVI –2) 267
73. Questions about DET Dialogue 4 (SVI –4) 269
74. Descriptive Statistics for Learners and Native-Speaker Thanks Responses .. 271
75. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 6 (SVI 0) 272
76. Questions on DET Dialogue 2 (SVI +4) 274
77. Mean Fractional Percentage Ranks for Speech Acts 279

NOTE ON ROMANISATION

This thesis follows the Hepburn system of romanisation except for long vowels, which are indicated with a double "o" and a double "u" instead of a macron above a single "o" or "u" and the use of "wo" instead of "o" for the grammatical particle. This change allows for a more detailed illustration of Japanese orthography and phonology as they relate to the research methods used in this study. The use of "wo" is intended to distinguish it from the honorific nominal prefix *o-*. Capital letters indicate words and parts of words that were originally written in Chinese characters. This change helps show how many Chinese characters learners used in their responses.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

The early 1990s witnessed the end of the Cold War and the emergence of large regional trading blocs. These two events have had profound influence over world affairs as repressed ethnic conflicts have torn apart old nation states and regional integration has given rise to nascent super states, such as the European Union. In the meantime, protracted immigration and migration have brought diverse groups of people together in burgeoning urban centres around the globe.

Linguistically, these trends have stimulated interest in language learning activity and in maintaining and reviving ethnic languages, as increasing numbers of people learn several languages for intranational, regional, and international communication. Increased linguistic and intercultural contact has stimulated interest in sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of second language acquisition because miscommunication in the target language may create intercultural and interpersonal misunderstandings that go beyond the issue of linguistic competence. Repeated experience with miscommunication can also contribute to the development of racial and ethnic prejudice against certain nationalities (Thomas 1983) or groups of people, which only reinforces their marginalised status in society (Gumperz 1982). The desire to prevent language learners from becoming marginalised, either as individuals or as members of a group, has stimulated interest in the sources of miscommunication in the target language. Preventing marginalisation, however, does not assume that learners are necessarily interested in taking the opposite route of

integration into the target-language community. In this thesis, I will focus on one of the causes of target-language miscommunication: sociolinguistic transfer from a language or languages that the learner already knows to target language production and comprehension. Subsequent to this chapter, Chapter 2 presents an overview of the Japanese language and a review of the relevant literature on Japanese sociolinguistic norms, sociolinguistic transfer, and language transfer as it relates to the acquisition of languages beyond a second or first foreign language. Chapter 3 presents the methodology of the study, and Chapter 4 presents the results and discussion of the results. Chapter 5 is a conclusion that includes a discussion of the implications of the findings from this thesis for research and for teaching Japanese to speakers of other languages.

At this point, several definitions are in order. "Language transfer" is defined in various ways in the literature (see Gass and Selinker 1983, Dechert and Rauparch 1989, and Odlin 1989 for general surveys of research on transfer). In this thesis, I use Odlin's (1989: 27) working definition of transfer as "the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) learned." Sharwood Smith and Kellerman (1986) have proposed "cross-linguistic influence" as a replacement term for "language transfer." Because "cross-linguistic influence" is a comprehensive term that includes other phenomena of linguistic influence, such as language attrition, and thus goes beyond the range of the present discussion, I will continue to use the term "language transfer." Various conscious and unconscious cognitive processes work together to cause the occurrence of transfer in interlanguage. In many cases, learners draw on knowledge from other languages to test hypotheses about the target language

or to produce and process language more efficiently (e.g., Ringbom 1987, Poulisse 1990, Gutiérrez 1993, Schmid 1993).

"Sociolinguistic transfer" refers to the influence of sociolinguistic forms from L1 and other languages on the production and comprehension of the target language. My definition of "sociolinguistic transfer" is similar to Odlin's (1989) term "discourse transfer," which focuses on the transfer of L1 discourse patterns and register usage into the second language. "Sociolinguistic transfer" was used in several studies in Wolfson and Judd (1983) and in Beebe (1990). The term "sociolinguistic" refers to linguistic forms that reflect broader trends, which I will term "sociocultural," of language use in society, such as age, sex, status, and place of origin. From this definition, "sociolinguistic competence" is, to borrow Swain's (1984: 189) definition, "the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately." To this definition, I add the idea of "interactive frames" (e.g., Goffman 1974), or sociocultural structures of expectation that inform interlocutors' use of sociolinguistically appropriate forms in a given situation because competence includes the background knowledge that informs performance. For example, regarding Japanese, the language focused on in this thesis, sociocultural expectations refer to the norm of expressing deference to strangers in most frames of interaction, whereas the *masu/desu* verb endings are explicit sociolinguistic forms that, along with other such forms and non-verbal language, comprise the speech level that is appropriate for use between strangers. A number of researchers (e.g., Kasper 1992) use the term "pragmatic transfer" to refer to the many of the phenomena discussed in this thesis. Though "pragmatic transfer" would have been adequate for the thesis, I chose "sociolinguistic transfer" because the term "sociolinguistic" generally connotes a broader range of phenomena in different modes of language than "pragmatics" or

"discourse" and, as such, is more applicable to discussion of the influence of sociocultural factors on written production in the thesis.

Finally, "miscommunication" refers to the failure of interlocutors to understand each other, and "pragmatic failure" refers to the speakers' failure to achieve his or her goals in the given frame of interaction. Sociolinguistic transfer is, as I mentioned before, only one of the causes of miscommunication in second language discourse. Grammatical errors, pronunciation problems, and native speaker views and expectations of non-native speakers are frequent causes of miscommunication as well (for a discussion of native-speaker expectations, see Janicki 1985, Siegal 1996). In most second-language interactions, sociolinguistic transfer does not cause overt miscommunication, but as Fouser (1997) argues, a feeling of unnaturalness, a dissonance, that affects native speakers in different ways. In this thesis, "sociolinguistic dissonance" will refer to the feeling of unnaturalness that fills the large space between miscommunication, on the one hand, and close accommodation to native-speaker norms on the other.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Following the revival of interest in language transfer in the early 1980s, researchers in second language discourse have found that sociolinguistic transfer is responsible for many instances of miscommunication. Most studies have focused on speech acts in second language production. Research on sociolinguistic transfer has focused almost exclusively on L1 patterns that cause miscommunication in a target L2. Relatively little research has been conducted on the development of sociolinguistic competence over time and on sociolinguistic transfer in learners of a language or

languages acquired beyond the L2, which will be referred to as "L≥3," either cross-sectionally or longitudinally. In addition, the majority of studies have focused on sociolinguistic transfer into English as an L2. Cross-cultural research on the sociolinguistic competence of native speakers has usually been based on a comparison between English and another language.

One final definition is in order. The notation "L≥3" originates from the mathematical formula "Li,i≥3," which describes anything that is greater or equal to three. When used in place of L2, the term "L≥3 acquisition" is broad enough to include all languages learned beyond the L3 without the addition of another cumbersome numerical term, such as L4, L5, or L6. This is justifiable because learners of an L3 and subsequent languages all have prior language learning experience(s) and a linguistic knowledge base of at least two languages to draw on. Learners of an L2, however, only have the experience of first language acquisition and a native-language knowledge base to draw on (Cenoz and Valencia 1994, Klein 1995). In this thesis, I use the term "L≥3" to refer to this third major type of language acquisition.

Ambilinguals, or bilinguals with native proficiency in two languages, who learn a non-native language and persons who learn an L2 and L3 simultaneously occupy a grey area between L2 and L≥3. Although, ambilinguals have the experience of learning two languages and a knowledge base of two languages, they learned the first two languages from birth or childhood rather than as a non-native language. They thus have linguistic and cultural resources from two languages without the cognitive experience of learning a non-native language. Simultaneous language learners have neither the linguistic and cultural resources nor the cognitive

experience of non-native language learning. The experience of learning two languages simultaneously, however, may stimulate the rapid development of cognitive skills in second language acquisition. For the purposes of this research, I have excluded ambilinguals and simultaneous language learners from this study (for discussion of the difference between ambilinguals and bilinguals in L≥3 acquisition, see Mägiste 1984, Thomas 1988). I have, however, included bilinguals who learned a second language from childhood, but who remain stronger in their "native language," because their experiences offer valuable insight into how L≥3 learners use existing linguistic and cultural knowledge.

Investigating the influence of L1 and L2 sociolinguistic norms in L≥3 written production and listening comprehension is particularly interesting because the addition of another sociolinguistic and sociocultural variable will contribute to a greater understanding concerning which aspects of sociolinguistic competence learners believe to be transferable from L1 and L2. It will also shed light on how individual variables, such prior language learning experience, age, length of time spent in Japan, and academic interests affect target language sociolinguistic competence. In the end, investigating sociolinguistic transfer in learners of an L≥3, who have experienced learning at least one non-native language, will help answer the question of how some learners process and create language to communicate in the target language. Researching sociolinguistic transfer in learners of an L≥3 is also useful in testing results from existing studies under conditions that include additional linguistic and cultural variables.

As an important regional language in the Asia-Pacific area, Japanese is an

interesting language to research, because most learners of Japanese learn it as an L≥3 and because they often have considerable difficulty using the sociolinguistic forms, such as honorifics, formulaic expressions, and verbs of giving and receiving, which form an integral part of Japanese sociolinguistic competence (Ide 1982, Matsumoto 1988, Kikuchi 1994). Although many languages have systems of honorifics, the Japanese system is especially difficult because of the large number of explicit forms, such as honorific lexical items (i.e., terms of address), honorific prefixes and suffixes, and humble forms of nouns and verbs (Wenger 1982). In this thesis, I will investigate how L1 and L2 influence intermediate- to advanced-level learners of Japanese as an L≥3 in their written production and listening comprehension of three important types of sociolinguistic forms in Japanese: honorifics, formulaic expressions, and verbs of giving and receiving in various frames of interaction. Intermediate- to advanced-level learners were chosen because these sociolinguistic forms are introduced at the lower-intermediate and intermediate levels in most Japanese language programmes in Australia, where the data for this study were collected. Japanese language education in most Western countries follows this pattern, but in Korea, these sociolinguistic forms are introduced early in the curriculum.

The findings from this research have important implications for second language acquisition research and for foreign and second language education. For second language acquisition research, this research will show that the acquisition of an L≥3 differs considerably from the acquisition of an L2 because of greater linguistic knowledge and previous exposure to learning a non-native language. For foreign and second language education, particularly with respect to Japanese, this research will show that learners' awareness of how to use their existing

sociolinguistic competence and language learning experiences can facilitate learning and teaching of an L≥3. As language learning diversifies and as bi- and multilingualism grow in previously monolingual societies, theoretical and pedagogical issues surrounding L≥3 acquisition will attract increased attention.

1.3. Theoretical Background

I will attempt to answer the following research questions in this dissertation:

1. What is/are the major source(s) of language transfer in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?

2. What are the roles of sociolinguistic transfer and sociolinguistic competence in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?

3. How do L2 proficiency, prior language learning experience, and residence in Japan affect sociolinguistic transfer and sociolinguistic competence in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?

4. What is the relevance of L≥3 acquisition research for general second language acquisition theory development?

1.3.1. Hypotheses

The underlying hypothesis used to explore the above research questions is that language transfer is a cognitive process by which learners draw on their linguistic resources from the L1 and L2 to process L≥3 input by connecting it to existing knowledge nodes. Language transfer is thus thought of as a cognitive process concerning the application of learner hypotheses about the target language to meet communicative needs in the target language. In applying this definition of language transfer to question of L≥3 acquisition in this thesis, I predicted that transfer in written production and listening comprehension would come mainly from the language that the learner perceived to be closest to the target L≥3, provided that learners perceived their L2 proficiency sufficient to be of use in L≥3 acquisition (Kellerman 1977, 1978, 1983, Khaldi 1981, Singleton and Little 1984, Ringbom 1985). In cases where the learner had difficulty in perceiving language distance or if neither the L1 nor the L2 was perceived to be close to the L≥3, I predicted that the learner would draw on both L1 and L2 knowledge in making hypotheses about the L≥3, with the L1 being more dominant. In L≥3 written production, I predicted that transfer would be less facilitative than in listening comprehension because lexical searching is cognitively more demanding in linguistic production than in comprehension (Ringbom 1991).

Because the consequences of miscommunication can be detrimental to effective communication in an L2, learners often draw on areas of their L1 sociolinguistic competence when they perceive it to be similar or applicable to the L2 (e.g., Blum-Kulka 1982). Where they perceive little similarity, they draw on metalinguistic knowledge of target language sociolinguistic norms (Takahashi 1996), or fall back on L1 sociolinguistic norms (e.g., Takahashi and Beebe 1993, Ikoma and

Shimura 1994). In learning an L≥3, however, learners have a larger amount of potential sociolinguistic competence to draw on in making hypotheses about the target language. I thus predicted that most learners would, consciously and unconsciously, draw on the sociolinguistic competence that they perceived to be closest and, thus, most applicable to the target L≥3. I predicted that the role of perceived language distance would be more facilitative in areas such as syntax and lexical acquisition than in the development of sociolinguistic competence because lexico-grammatical structures are more explicit and thus easier for learners to analyse. I further assumed that the facilitating role of perceived sociolinguistic similarity would be complicated by a greater number of non-linguistic individual cognitive and affective variables, such as self-identity and attitudes toward the L≥3 culture(s). I therefore concluded that, despite active use of linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in making hypotheses about the target L≥3, learners would have more difficulty with sociolinguistic areas of language than with lexico-grammatical structures.

For learners with intermediate or advanced proficiency (broadly defined) in the target language, such as those in this study, I predicted that cases of outright miscommunication would be relatively rare because most learners have a sufficiency of metalinguistic knowledge to avoid miscommunication. I predicted that indeed most learners would produce sociolinguistically dissonant language. In comprehension, they would have a general understanding of basic sociolinguistic forms, but would have difficulty discerning specialised use of certain forms or in making distinctions among similar forms. Thus, I predicted that sociolinguistic competence would be, to varying degrees, less than overall linguistic proficiency would indicate, though cases of miscommunication would be relatively rare.

The above hypotheses concerning the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3 can be summarised as follows:

1. Language transfer is a salient phenomenon in L≥3 acquisition in written production and listening comprehension of speech acts.

2. Learner perceptions of L≥3 relatedness or closeness to the L1 and L2 will increase the likelihood of language transfer.

3. As a set of complex phenomena influenced by many social and cultural factors, sociolinguistic transfer will more variable and less predictable than lexico-grammatical transfer.

4. In intermediate and advanced learners, sociolinguistic transfer will create sociolinguistic dissonance rather than miscommunication. Because of the inherent variability of sociolinguistic transfer, sociolinguistic dissonance may be greater than the learners' level of lexico-grammatical competence would lead one to expect.

1.3.2. Method

To test the above hypotheses, the following instruments were used in this study: 1) a C-test in Japanese; 2) a Japanese open-ended DCT (discourse completion task); 3) a Japanese discourse evaluation task (DET); 4) a short writing task (SWT) in Japanese (speech act of apology); 5) a language learning experience questionnaire. All these instruments were approved by the Human Ethics Committee at the University of

Sydney in October of 1994, shortly before the data collection began. The combination of instruments was designed to provide a picture of overall Japanese-language proficiency (C-test) and of sociolinguistic competence in written production (DCT and SWT) and listening comprehension (DET) of Japanese as an L≥3. They were also designed to gather information on affective and cognitive variables in metalinguistic knowledge.

From the data yield by this combination of instruments, I attempted to deduce patterns of language and sociolinguistic transfer from L1 and L2 as well as developmental patterns that are necessarily related to transfer. Because the learners came from a variety of L1 and L2 backgrounds, it was impossible to control for these languages strictly in the research design. Not controlling for L1 or L2, however, allowed me to research a diverse group of learners of the same L≥3 who have acquired the language in the same educational program. In Chapter 4, I will report the results using quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis. In discussing the results, I will compare various aspects of these profiles to elucidate patterns across the data sample, using a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods. The use of qualitative and quantitative methods will vary according to the instrument and the question under investigation.

1.3.3. Purpose of Research

In addition to testing the above hypotheses, this thesis has several other goals. The first is to evaluate and test the applicability of some commonly used research methods to L≥3 acquisition research. The second is to evaluate research methodology in interlanguage discourse and to suggest improvements, particularly as

it relates to Japanese (for a discussion of difficulties in using DCTs with Japanese, see Rose 1994). The third is to suggest a model of sociolinguistic transfer in L≥3 acquisition that focuses on the relationship between learner L1 and L2 sociolinguistic competence and sociolinguistic norms in the L≥3. The fourth is to clarify research issues concerning sociolinguistic phenomena in Japanese. This is important to clear up much of the misunderstanding caused by applying pragmatic terms, such as politeness and indirectness, to discussions of Japanese sociolinguistic norms (for a discussion of how these terms perpetuate national stereotypes, see Wierzbicka 1991, Meier 1995). The fifth, and final, goal is to suggest how the findings of this research relate to pedagogical issues in L2 and L≥3 instruction, which include such questions as the role of explicit teaching of target-language sociolinguistic norms in developing sociolinguistic competence and, in the case of L≥3 instruction, encouraging learners to draw on their knowledge and previous language learning experience to facilitate acquisition of the target language.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. The Japanese Language and Japanese Sociolinguistics

2.1.1. General Introduction to the Japanese Language

The Japanese language has received many mystical and romantic treatments in Japan and in the West. Above all, it is considered to be "different" from most other languages. Descriptions based on difference describe the language as "indirect" or "illogical." They go on to discuss the esoteric features of honorifics, complicated speech levels, and male- and female-specific speech styles. Typical of this view is a comment by Toyama: "The honorific system the Japanese language has developed is so fine as cannot be found in the language of any other country" (1978: 6, quoted in Coulmas 1992). For these reasons, many writers in the Japanese press have argued that foreigners can never really "master" Japanese and that, as Miller (1982) argued, those who do are shunned by Japanese society.

A closer look at the Japanese language, however, shows that it is not as complex or inscrutable as many of these writers argue. Rather, Japanese is a contrast between complexity and simplicity that reaches to all corners of the language. In this section, I will present a brief outline of the Japanese language in an attempt to take some of the mystery out of the language. I draw heavily on Shibatani (1990) and Kumai, Kono, and Chino (1997) in this section. In the next section, I will describe Japanese sociolinguistic norms and discuss their relationship to questions raised in this thesis. Although most of the research on Japanese sociolinguistic norms deals

with spoken language, many of these issues also affect the use of written language in various genres.

2.1.1.1. Genetic Affiliation

Researchers have yet to prove a genetic affiliation for the Japanese language, mainly because classic comparative methodology has yet to find a convincing set of cognate lexical items between Japanese and another language. In considering geography, phonology, syntax, morphology, and other linguistic factors, two theories offer some insight on the question. The first theory states that Japanese is most closely related to Korean and the Altaic family of languages, such as Manchu, Mongolian, and Turkish (e.g., Miller 1971). Adherents to this theory argue that syntactic and morphological similarities between Japanese and these languages are close enough to support the hypothesis of a genetic relationship. They argue that Korean is particularly close to Japanese because of documented evidence of movements of people from Korea to Japan. The similarity in number and use between grammatical particles in Korean and Japanese is also cited as further evidence of a close relationship.

The Altaic theory has several serious drawbacks. First, all Altaic languages have a rigid system of vowel harmony that dictates which vowels can be used in post-positional agglutinations. Modern Japanese does not have vowel harmony, and the evidence regarding older forms of Japanese is equivocal. Second, Japanese has only one final consonant /n/, whereas the Altaic languages have a variety of final consonants. Third, numerous attempts to find a set of cognate lexical items in Japanese and Korean have failed.

The second theory is known as the "mixed language theory" (Murayama 1973). According to this theory, Japanese is the product of an Austronesian substratum and an Altaic, largely Korean, superstratum. Proponents of this theory argue that the lack of vowel harmony, the simple CV organisation of Japanese syllables, and frequent use of onomatopoeic expressions has more in common with Austronesian languages, whereas the syntax and morphology reflect later waves of Altaic influence from the Asian continent. A third theory developed by Ono (1957) holds that Japanese includes a number of Tamil elements in the Austronesian substratum.

Interesting as Murayama's (1973) theory is, it fails to explain how and when the mixing of indigenous Austronesian languages and continental Altaic languages took place. The lack of a common lexicon in Japanese and any known Austronesian language and Japanese and Korean makes it difficult to prove any sort of relationship. Language mixing to the degree required to support this theory has rarely occurred in human history. Most language contact consists of extensive lexical borrowing and limited syntactical and morphological borrowing. As Shibatani (1990) noted, many scholars agree that the comparative method used for Indo-European languages might not be applicable to other languages, such as Japanese. Despite the lack of evidence, many scholars agree that the most likely candidate for genetic affinity with Japanese is Korean. Until evidence is found of a closer genetic relationship to Korean or another language, however, Japanese remains a language isolate along with languages such as Vietnamese and Basque.

2.1.1.2. The Writing System

Researchers on writing systems have noted the complexity of the Japanese writing system (Sampson 1985, Coulmas 1989, Hannas 1997). Indeed, of all areas of Japanese, the writing system is perhaps the most complex because it contains over 2,000 distinct graphs from four different scripts. Complex though it is, the Japanese writing system is similar to many other writing systems in its haphazard evolution over thousands of years. Table 1 below presents an overview of the four scripts that make up the Japanese writing system. Use of the example word in a short sentence is noted in boxes.

Table 1. Overview of the Japanese Writing System

Script Name	Example	Example Sentence
Kana		
Hiragana	りんご ("apple")	青森の**りんご**がおいしい。("Aomori apples are good.")
Katakana	ファックス ("fax")	**ファックス**の紙がありません。("There's no fax paper.")
Kanji*	日本 ("Japan")	**日本**の夏は暑いですね。("Summer in Japan is hot, right?")
Romaji**	JR ("Japan Rail")	**JR**はまだ赤字です。("JR is still in debt.")

*Kanji = Chinese characters

**Romaji = Roman letters

The *kana* syllabary, which is composed of two scripts, *hiragana* (51 graphs) and *katakana* (51 graphs), evolved from Chinese characters that were used to represent the sounds of the Japanese of the seventh and eighth centuries. As this system emerged, grammatical particles and agglutinating suffixes were written in *hiragana*, with most nouns and verb stems being written in Chinese characters, or *kanji* as they are commonly referred to in Japanese. *Hiragana* and Chinese

characters were used in a variety of combinations until a standard for written Japanese was developed in the late nineteenth century. *Katakana* was used to note the pronunciation of Chinese characters, mainly in Buddhist scriptures. It was adopted as the system for foreign words in the late nineteenth century, but is also used today to convey emphasis or a sense of newness. Roman letters, known as *romaji* (26 graphs) came into common use for advertising and commercial names after World War II. The use of four scripts may seem overly complex, but each script performs a particular purpose that helps distinguish lexical elements from one another on the page. This is no different from how the logographic elements of English words in which the spelling differs from the pronunciation (e.g., "enough," "knife") contribute to the ease of reading at the expense of orthographic simplicity.

Chinese characters also provide a link to the common Chinese-character-based lexicon in Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese as illustrated in Table 2 below. Currently, 1,850 characters are part of the official Ministry of Education list of characters. These are taught in schools and are used in official documents and newspapers. Another 100 characters are official for use in proper nouns (mostly surnames and given names). Publishers are free to use characters beyond the official list, but they must indicate the pronunciation in *furigana*, small *hiragana* print located above or, in the case of vertical writing, next to the characters.

Table 2. Examples of the Common Lexicon in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese

	Japanese	Chinese	Korean	Vietnamese
Script	政府*	政府	정부	chính phu
Roman	seifu	zhengfu	chŏngbu	chinh phu**

*Most frequently written in Chinese characters, but can also be written as せいふ in *hiragana* in books for children and language learners.

**Romanisation of Vietnamese uses the same Roman letters without the special diacritical marks.

Thus, "government" is written exclusively in Chinese characters in Chinese and, with rare exceptions, in Japanese. In Korean, the native script *han'gul* is used more frequently than Chinese characters, but "government" is also written in Chinese characters, usually in academic books and newspaper headlines. Vietnamese shifted to the Roman-letter-based *nam chu* in the late 19th century, but the pronunciation of the word for "government" is similar to that of the other three languages. The use of Chinese characters in the four languages links them together lexically, much as Latin and Greek link the languages of Europe. This connection is weaker for speakers of Vietnamese because the language uses *nam chu* instead of Chinese characters, but speakers of Chinese and Korean can read most of the Chinese characters used in Japanese (proficiency in Chinese characters among Koreans varies, however). The advantages of a large common lexicon that is instantly "readable" across languages is obvious, but differences in instruction and individual differences among learners mean that such similarities do not exert uniform influence among learners from the same language background.

2.1.1.3. Phonetics, Phonology, and Dialects

Japanese phonetics and phonology are also characterized by an interplay between simplicity and complexity. The relatively small number of sounds and the rigid CV phonology makes the phonology much simpler than that of many other languages. In contrast, the language has a complex mora- and syllable-pitch-based accent system and a sharp distinction between long and short vowels, as illustrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Overview of Japanese Phonology

Script	Romanisation	Syllables	Accent Pattern*	Gloss
高校	kookoo	koo-koo	k-o-o-k-o-o LLHHHH	"high school"
ここ	koko	ko-ko	k-o-k-o LLHH	"here"
箸	hashi	ha-shi	h-a-sh-i LHLL	"chopsticks"
橋	hashi	ha-shi	h-a-sh-i LLLH	"bridge"
ありがとう	arigatoo (standard) (Osaka)	a-ri-ga-too	a-r-i-g-a-t-o-o HHHLLLLL LLLLLLLH	"thank you"

*Accent patterns for standard Tokyo Japanese noted with "H" for high pitch and "L" for low pitch under each individual sound.

Differences in use of pitch rarely cause breakdowns in communication the way differences in tone usage would in tonal languages, such as Chinese and Thai. As

shown in the above table, failure to distinguish between long and short vowels could cause a breakdown in communication because vowel length is critical to distinguishing between lexical items. Accent patterns are also important in determining dialect patterns in Japanese (Shibatani 1990).

Most descriptions of the Japanese language overlook the importance of dialects. Japanese has a number of dialects, some of which are not mutually intelligible to the untrained ear. Indeed, many Japanese linguists consider the dialects of the Ryukyu Islands in the south to be a separate language. Dialect studies have also revealed distinct sociolinguistic patterns that affect speech levels and male-female speech. The Kansai dialect spoken in the Osaka-Kyoto-Kobe area, the second most populous region of the country, has an intermediate "informal honorific" speech level that is not found in standard Japanese. By contrast, some dialects in northern Japan have limited use of honorific forms (Shibata 1979). The male-female distinction also varies considerably across the country, with traditionally urban areas such as Tokyo and the Osaka-Kyoto-Kobe area showing a greater distinction between male and female speech. Dialect differences point to a greater diversity of Japanese sociolinguistic norms than is commonly discussed in the literature.

2.1.1.4. Lexicon

Lexically, Japanese is similar to many other languages that have borrowed extensively from other languages. Throughout history, the lexicon has increased in complexity through a large number of borrowings from Chinese and, in more recent years, Western languages, as noted illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. Overview of the Japanese Lexicon

Origin	Example	Percent of Spoken Language
Native*	食べ物 (tabemono "food")	46.9%
Chinese	食事 (shokuji "food")	40%
Western		10.1%
Portuguese	パン (pan "bread")	
English	コンビニ** (konbini "convenience store")	
Asian		nil
Korean	キムチ (kimuchi "kimch'i")	
Mixed		3.0%
Chinese + Native	仕事 (shigoto "work")	
Native + Western	いちごオレー (ichigo oree "strawberry au lait")	
Western + Chinese	ワンマン大学 (wanman daigaku "university run by an autocrat")	

*Words of native origin are frequently written in Chinese characters, but pronounced according to native Japanese pronunciation.

**Foreign words, particularly those from English are frequently shortened in Japanese.

Japanese has borrowed most extensively from Chinese. A study of spoken language reported in Hayashi, Miyajima, and Nomura (1982) showed that in spoken language 46.9% of lexical items were native Japanese words, 40% were of Chinese origin, 10.1% were foreign (Western languages, etc.), and 3.0% were a mixture from several or more roots. In a study of newspaper lexicon by the same institute, 44.3% of words were found to be of Chinese origin, whereas only 38.8% were found to be of native Japanese (National Language Research Institute 1971). Lexical items of Chinese origin are commonly referred to as Sino-Japanese words and are usually written in Chinese characters. In recent years, a large number of English words have entered the Japanese vocabulary, bringing the total number of words from Western languages

to at least 10% in spoken and written language. A small number of words from other East and South Asian languages, such as Korean, Thai, and Hindi, have entered the language in recent years. Borrowings from Asian languages most frequently refer to concrete nouns such as food and drink.

In general, native Japanese words and borrowed words cover different domains, as illustrated in the following table.

Table 5. Structure of the Japanese Lexicon

	Native	Sino-Japanese
Nouns	kome "uncooked rice"	beika "the price of rice"
Verbs	manabu "to learn"	benkyoo-suru "to study"
Adjectives	subarashii "wonderful"	rippa "admirable, elegant"
Adverbs	ikinari "suddenly"	totsuzen "suddenly," without warning"
	pata pata "lightly" (for rain)	guzen "by chance"

Native Japanese words are used for verbs and concrete nouns, whereas Sino-Japanese words and words from Western languages are used for concrete and abstract nouns. In a number of cases, native and Sino-Japanese synonyms exist, with the native word being more colloquial, which is similar to the distributive pattern of Anglo-Saxon words in English. The native Japanese verb *suru* ("to do") is frequently attached to a Sino-Japanese or Western-language noun to create a verb. This simple process makes it easy to integrate foreign lexical items into the language. Thus, the addition of *suru* to the Sino-Japanese noun *kenkyuu* ("research") makes *kenkyuu-suru* ("to do research"). In addition to the use of *suru*, other morphological endings can be attached to borrowed lexical items. One of the most interesting examples is the word

naoi ("trendy"), which combines the Japanese pronunciation of the English word "now" with *-i*, one of the several adjectival morphological endings.

The interplay between simplicity and complexity in Japanese also affects the lexicon. Compared with many other languages, Japanese verbs have a wide semantic range. To make verbs more specific, a variety of onomatopoeic expressions are placed before the verb. Shibatani (1990) gives the classic example of *ame ga furu* ("rain falls" = to rain) in which the addition of the onomatopoeic expression *patapata* (*ame ga patapata furu*) brings about the meaning "rain falls lightly" or "to drizzle," whereas *ame ga batabata furu* means "rain falls heavily." Another way to increase the specificity of verbs is to add suffixes that alter or intensify the meaning of the main verb. Thus, a combination of *uru* ("to sell") and *kiru* ("to cut") becomes *urikiru* ("to sell out" i.e, tickets, etc.).

2.1.1.5. Syntax

Syntactically, Japanese is an SOV language. The word order is relatively free, however, because post-positional grammatical particles indicate the function of various words much in the manner of case markings in Western languages, such as Latin or Russian, indicate the syntactic relationship among the elements of the sentence. Japanese grammatical particles, however, do not affect the words that they are attached to and have no allomorphic variants.

Another interesting aspect of Japanese syntax is the distinction between the topic particle *wa* and the subject particle *ga*. The topic particle sets the general topic of the speech event, whereas the subject particle denotes the grammatical subject of the sentence. In some cases, the two are used together in sentences such as *zoo wa*

hana ga nagai desu (elephant [TOP] nose [SU] long [COP]). A literal English translation would be "As for the elephant, the nose is long." The *wa* after elephant sets the topic of the sentence, whereas the *ga* after nose denotes the grammatical subject of the clause that "comments" on the topic. Altaic languages such as Korean and Mongolian also have this type of grammatical structure.

From this brief outline of the Japanese language, it is fair to conclude that Japanese is typified by the interplay between simplicity and complexity. Throughout the history of the Japanese language, simple and complex aspects of the language have maintained a balance that makes Japanese a "normal language." If Japanese is unique, its uniqueness lies in the degree of contrast between the simple and complex aspects. Thus, for example, it is a language with, according to most calculations, only 120 possible syllable combinations, but thousands of graphs from four scripts in its writing system.

2.1.2. Japanese Sociolinguistic Norms

The interplay between simplicity and complexity carries through to Japanese sociolinguistic norms, which are complex in form, but simple in function. In this section, I will describe two important aspects of Japanese sociolinguistics: Japanese speech varieties and "language life," the common term in Japanese sociolinguistics for the use of language in society.

2.1.2.1. Differences in Age and Social Class

In addition to dialect differences, Japanese sociolinguistic norms are affected

by age, sex, and social class, as are most other languages. Age has an important influence over the type of language that people use for two reasons. First, persons above the age of sixty retain many features of pre-World War II speech patterns. This includes more extensive use of honorific expressions, a heavier reliance on local dialects, and the use of fewer foreignisms. Younger generations, by contrast, use honorifics more loosely and code switch frequently from dialect to standard Japanese. The difference in "honorific proficiency" between the pre-war generation and the young generation has caused considerable discussion in the media of the "decline of honorifics." This change is important because many Western writers on Japanese sociolinguistic norms assume that they are static and base their discussions on how older generations use honorifics. In evaluating sociolinguistic transfer in learners of Japanese as a second or third language, it is important to take account of the type of input from instruction and from native speakers that they have received. Extensive contact with younger generations would yield considerably different input from contact with language teachers or older generations.

2.1.2.2. Female and Male Speech

Much has been made of the difference between female and male speech in Japan. Along with honorifics, this is one of the most heavily researched issues in Japanese sociolinguistics (e.g., Ide, 1979, 1982, Hori 1986). Japanese is one of the few languages in the world that has different first- and second person pronouns for men and women as show in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Overview of Female and Male Speech Differences

	Female	Male
1st Person Pronoun	watashi, atashi	watashi, boku, ore, washi
2nd Person Pronoun	anata	anata, kimi, omae
Verbal Endings	-ndayo, -ze, -zo	-noyo, -no, -wa, -wayo
Nominal prefixes	(o- added to food items)	(less frequent use of o-)

At the formal level, both men and women use *watakushi* or *watashi* for the first person, but at informal and intimate levels, the pronouns differ. Men use *boku* (informal) and *ore* (intimate/vulgar), and women use *watashi* (informal) or *atashi* (intimate). A number of other expressions, particularly for the male first-person pronoun, are used in various dialects and subcultures. The male-female distinction extends to second-person pronouns as well. Though *anata* is common to both men and women, men use *kimi* (informal) and *omae* (intimate/vulgar), whereas women use *anata* as an informal form and *anta* as an intimate form. The relaxing of speech levels since World War II has not affected the distinction between female and male pronouns.

In addition to pronoun differences, men and women use different verb suffixes. Unlike in the case of pronouns, however, this differs considerably across dialects and generations, with younger women using fewer "feminine endings" than older women do. The most common feminine endings are *yo*, *no*, *wa*, and *kashira*. Except for *kashira*, all are used by men in certain contexts. *Yo*, for example, is one of the most common verb suffixes in the language. The difference between men and women appears in the following example from Shibatani (1990):

1. *kare wa isha da yo*. (male)

He [TOP] doctor [COP] [EMPH]

2. *kare wa isha yo*. (female)

He [TOP] doctor [EMPH]

The use of *yo* without the copula is sign of feminine speech, whereas masculine speech would include the copula or make use of the more emphatic "*n* + *da*" form. In feminine speech, *yo* is often added to *no* and *wa* as in the following examples:

1. *sore wa okasii wa yo*.

(that [TOP] funny [PART] [EMPH])

"That's funny."

2. *atasi denwa shita no yo*.

(I phone made [PAST] [PART] [EMPH])

"I made a phone call."

It must be remembered, however, that *no* is used by both men (particularly younger men) and women as a question indicator and that *wa* is used as a masculine ending in the Kansai dialect. *Kashira* is an exclusively feminine form that is used mainly by middle-aged and older women in the Tokyo area. It is a self-questioning form used to indicate doubt or drop hints.

2.1.2.3. Social Class and Language

Since the economic boom in the post-war period, most surveys have shown that about 90% of Japanese consider themselves as members of the middle class. Compared to many other languages, class-based differences in speech are relatively weak in Japanese. Historically, however, Japan had clear distinctions between social classes and groups that affected the type of language used. In the Edo period (1603-1868), samurai and merchants living in the administrative capital of Edo (now Tokyo) used different varieties of language despite their close geographical proximity.

In general, members of the working class make greater use of the local dialect. Depending on educational background, they may use fewer Sino-Japanese forms, but more onomatopoeic expressions. Several large-scale studies conducted by the National Language Research Institute revealed that residents in upper-income areas use a more formal level of speech that includes more honorifics than residents do in higher density, lower income areas (reported in Shibata, et. al. 1980). The complexity of the male-female distinction, thus, contrasts with the simplicity of class-based distinctions. This situation is, in many ways, opposite to British sociolinguistic norms, where class distinctions are clear and male-female distinctions more difficult to discern.

2.1.2.4. Speech Levels and Honorifics

Speech levels in Japanese are largely determined by the use of honorific and humble forms that are commonly referred to in the literature as "honorifics." Humble forms are considered part of the repertoire of honorifics because they lower the speaker, which raises the addressee. Humble forms are almost always used in combination with honorific forms that refer to the addressee. Formulaic expressions and verbs of

giving and receiving work with honorifics in setting the level of speech. The number of speech levels has been the source of considerable controversy, but most researchers agree that there are three speech levels, which I will call the formal, standard, and informal. I prefer the term "standard" for the intermediate speech level because my definition of sociolinguistic appropriateness does not include normative issues such as politeness, respect, or deference. This issue will be discussed in greater detail in the section on sociolinguistic transfer in this chapter. This contrasts with the traditional classification of Japanese speech levels into the plain or neutral, polite, and deferential or honorific level (e.g., Martin 1964, Coulmas 1992). Vulgar expressions, which have received little attention in the literature, are used mostly as isolated expressions of create solidarity among intimates or peers (Minami 1987).

In addition to lexical choice and tone of voice, terms of address, pronouns, and verb suffixes differ considerably in each speech level. There is also considerable overlapping between speech levels, depending on the topic and frame of interaction. Honorific and humble forms, formulaic expressions, and verbs of giving and receiving play an important role in defining the speech level. At this point, a description of these forms is important to provide background information on how they work to indicate speech levels in Japanese. This information is also useful for a thorough understanding of the results of this study, which are reported in Chapter 4.

Descriptions of Japanese honorifics have been dominated by a four-part classification system, as illustrated in Table 7, that divides them into two types of addressee-related honorifics and two types of referent-related honorifics. This system forms the basis of the pedagogical grammar of honorifics that is used in Japanese schools, in business training programmes, and in popular guidebooks on honorific usage (Coulmas 1992). Addressee-related honorifics include *teineigo*

(polite forms) and *bikago* (beautifying forms). *Teineigo* include the *masu/desu* verbal forms that help differentiate the formal and standard speech levels from the informal speech level. *Bikago*, which were added to the classification system later, consist of stylistic additions, usually in the form of *o* or *go* prefixes that show the linguistic sensitivity of the speaker. Unlike *teineigo*, *bikago* may appear in all speech levels, but they are most common in the formal and informal speech levels and more common among women than men. Referent honorifics include *sonkeigo* (respectful honorifics) and *kenjoogo* (humble honorifics). *Sonkeigo* are designed to raise the subject of the sentence, whereas *kenjoogo* lower the subject to express a humble attitude toward the object referent.

Table 7. Traditional Four-Part Classification of Honorifics

Addressee	Example	Non-Honorific Form
Teineigo (polite)	iki-masu "to go"	iku
Bikago (beautification)	o-namae "name"	namae
Referent		
Sonkeigo (honorifics)	irassharu, ikareru "to go" (irrasshai-masu)	iku
Kenjoogo (humble forms)	mairu "to go" (mairi-masu)	iku

The four-part classification has come under some criticism in recent years. Harada (1976) has attempted to explain honorifics from the framework of generative grammar. He classifies honorifics into subject, object, and performative according their grammatical reference in the utterance. Kikuchi (1994) has developed a binary system of referent honorifics and addressee honorifics that focuses exclusively on

semantics. In this system, referent honorifics combine respectful and humble forms into one category, whereas addressee honorifics combine polite language and beautification expressions. The two categories form a grid that allows for a comprehensive classification of all honorific forms.

Table 8. Alternative Classification Systems for Honorifics

	Approach	Categories
Harada (1976)	Generative Grammar	Subject, Object, Performative
Kikuchi (1994)	Semantics, Sociolinguistics	Referent, Addressee

Ide (1982) takes elements from the traditional four-way classification system and syntactic systems, such as Harada's, to create what I think is the most balanced classification system. I thus base the following description of honorifics on Ide's (1982) classification, which is presented in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Overview of Ide's (1982) Classification of Honorifics

	Example	Non-Honorific Form
Nominal Honorifics		
Person Referents	watakushi "I"	(watashi, atashi for women; boku, ore for men)
	sensei "teacher"	(no non-honorific equivalent)
Nouns with o/go	o-tegami "letter"	tegami
Predicative Honorifics		
Referent Honorifics		
Subject Honorifics	o-kaki-ni-naru "to write"	kaku
Object Honorifics	o-kaki-suru "to write"	kaku
Addressee Honorifics	tabe-mashita "to eat [past]"	tabeta
Humble Forms	mairu "to go"	iku
	watakushi-domo "our"	watashi-tachi

Honorific and humble language in Japanese is composed of two main forms: nominal forms and predicative forms. Nominal forms are mainly person referents, such as the different pronouns that have already been discussed and honorific terms of address. The use of formal or informal pronouns and terms of honorific terms of address greatly affects the formality of the sentence. For example, using a person's professional title after the surname is more formal than using *-san*, the standard term of address for men and women that is suffixed to the surname. The word *sensei* ("teacher, lecturer, professor") is commonly used for teachers at all levels, but among colleagues, the term *-san* may be used to indicate intimacy with a certain degree of formality. In other cases, the term *-san* can be added to a title (though never to *sensei*) to indicate a greater degree of formality. Thus, the word for company president is *shachoo*, and the addition of the term of address suffix *-san* would yield *shachoo-san*. A more formal and honorific term for *-san* is *-sama*, which could also

be suffixed to *shachoo* to yield the very formal form *shachoo-sama*. At the informal level, on the other hand, the use of a person's name, either the surname or the given name, and the informal and intimate second-person pronouns is common. The formal second person pronoun, *anata*, is used in the standard speech level, but rarely in the formal speech level because many Japanese feel that it has a brusque, bureaucratic tone. Indeed, Ogino (1997) found that use of *anata* has declined among those under the age of 40. Ide (1982) does not refer to humble forms of pronouns, probably because they are used infrequently, but the humble plural suffix *-domo* is used to lower the speaker, thus raising the addressee.

Another important form of nominal honorific is the use of the *o-* or the *go-* prefix with the noun. With a few exceptions, *o-* is used with native Japanese words and *go-* is used with Sino-Japanese words. These prefixes are most frequently used in the formal level, but are also common in the standard level. Their function is to show deference to persons or things related to referents or addressees. Consider the difference in the following examples:

1. *o-tanjoobi wa itsu desu ka?*

([HON] birthday [TOP] when [COP] [Q])

"When is your birthday"

2. *Tanaka sensei no o-tanjoobi wa itsu desu ka?*

(Tanaka professor [GEN] [HON] birthday [TOP] when [COP] [Q])

"When is professor Tanaka's birthday?"

For example, a question such as *o-tanjoobi wa itsu desu ka?* would be understood as "When is your birthday" because the honorific prefix *o-* before *tanjoobi* indicates the

addressee. In a question such as *Tanaka sensei no o-tanjoobi wa itsu desu ka?* "When is professor Tanaka's birthday?" the *o* is used to show respect to the referent, Professor Tanaka. The use of *o-* or *go-* is common among strangers who do not know their respective social status because it allows the speaker to raise the addressee without using *anata* or an awkward term of address, which strangers usually do not know. It is also common in the language of service workers and in other business and public settings.

Honorification of predicative elements includes referent honorifics and addressee honorifics. Referent honorifics include respectful forms and humble forms. Respectful forms are composed of the regular and irregular forms that are designed to raise or exalt the subject of the sentence. The subject of the sentence may or may not be the addressee. The regular form consists of adding the prefix *o-* to the *masu* stem of the verb followed by the particle *ni* and the verb *naru*. Thus, the *masu* stem *kaki* of a verb such *kaku* becomes *o-kaki-ni-narimasu* (o-kaki-ni-naru). In a declarative sentence, this would become *o-kaki-ni-narimasu*. Another form of respectful predicate is the use of the prefix *go-* before and adjective. The following sentences illustrate the use of these forms:

1. *Tanaka sensei wa moo o-kaeri-ni-narimashita.*

Tanaka professor [TOP] already return home [PAST]

"Professor Tanaka has already gone home."

2. *Sensei wa o-genki desu ka?*

Professor [TOP] in good health [COP] [Q]

"How are you doing?" (lit. "Are you in good health?")

In addition to these regular forms, a number of irregular forms of the verb are used to create honorific forms. In general, the irregular forms are more common than the regular forms, and some regular forms have become set-phrases in formulaic expressions. In some dialects of Japanese, using the "*o- masu* stem + *ni naru"* form sounds excessively polite. The Kansai dialect spoken in the Osaka area has another form (*masu* stem + *haru*) of respectful honorific that speakers use in place of the "*o- masu* stem + *ni naru*" form. In standard Japanese and many dialects, another predicative honorific form is the use of the passive form in active sentences. Indeed, Yoshioka (1997) found significant regional variation in a study on how high school students address and a talk about their teachers. Those students in Osaka who used honorifics to their teachers preferred to use the "*masu* stem + *haru*" form. A high proportion of students in Kumamoto in western Japan used standard Japanese honorifics to their teachers, whereas students in Tokyo preferred the informal "plain form."

Humble forms, the second component of referent honorifics are designed to lower the speaker in an effort to raise the object referent. As with respectful terms, humble forms have regular and irregular forms. The regular form consists of the prefix *o-* added to the *masu* stem followed by the verb *suru* (*o- masu* stem + *suru*), which in declarative utterances would end in *shimasu* as in the following example:

1. *Watashi wa sensei ni shorui wo o-watashi-shimasita.*

I [TOP] professor [DAT] documents [ACC] give [HUM] [PAST] [POL]

"I gave the documents to you" (or, "I gave the documents to the professor.")

In the above example, the use of the humble form implicitly raises the professor. Notice that the word *sensei* (professor) can be translated as "you" or as "professor" depending on the context.

Addressee honorifics, or *teineigo*, raise the speech level of the utterance for the benefit of the addressee who may or may not be the referent. The following examples for "I gave the papers to the teacher," which all translate the same way in English, illustrate this difference:

1. *Watashi wa sensei ni shorui wo watashita.* (plain)

I [TOP] teacher [DAT] papers [ACC] gave [PAST]

2. *Watashi wa sensei ni shorui wo watashimashita.* (addressee honorific)

I [TOP] teacher [DAT] papers [ACC] gave [PAST] [POL]

3. *Watashi wa sensei ni shorui wo o-watashi-shita.* (humble form + plain)

I [TOP] teacher [DAT] papers [ACC] gave [HUM] [PAST]

4. *Watashi wa sensei ni shorui wo o-watashi-shimashita.* (humble form + addressee honorific)

I [TOP] teacher [DAT] papers [ACC] gave [HUM] [PAST] [POL]

In the above examples, the first sentence would be most common among peers and in-group members. The second sentence raises the level of speech for the benefit of the addressee, but does not raise the professor beyond the use of the term of address *sensei*. The third sentence lowers the speaker and, hence, raises the professor in the informal speech level. The fourth sentence humbles the speaker and raises the professor, which raises the overall speech level.

Formulaic expressions have received less attention in the literature than honorific and humble forms. This may be because their use is more idiosyncratic and thus harder to classify as a general phenomenon. Formulaic expressions, such as *tadaima* ("I've returned") and *okaeri* ("Welcome back") are common in Japanese family life. Others, such as *gochisoosama* ("Thanks for the meal") and *onegai shimasu* (literally, "I beg you the favour"), convey a sense of thanks and obligation that helps define the relationship between the speakers (Matsumoto 1988).

Verbs of giving and receiving have received more attention in the literature than formulaic expressions. Researchers on teaching Japanese as a foreign language, in particular, have focused on these forms because they are difficult for many learners of Japanese find them difficult. As illustrated in Table 10 below, verbs of giving and receiving work with other verbs to show the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. Giving is divided into "in-giving" forms and "out-giving" forms. There are three forms of "in-giving" verbs that are used to describe the action of the subject referent giving something to the speaker: the neutral *kureru*, the honorific *kudasaru*, and the informal *choodai*. Likewise, there are three "out-giving" verbs, the honorific *sasiageru*, the neutral *ageru*, and the informal (and sometimes crude) *yaru*. Verbs of receiving fit into two categories: the honorific *itadaku* and *choodaisuru* and the neutral *morau*.

Table 10. Overview of Verbs of Giving and Receiving

	Honorific	Non-Honorific
Out Giving	sashiageru	ageru, yaru (sometimes vulgar)
In Giving	kudasaru	kureru, choodai
Receiving from	itadaku, choodaisuru	morau

The difference between verbs of giving and receiving is the direction of the action. Verbs of giving are used when the speaker directs the action toward another person, whereas verbs of receiving are used when another person directs action toward the speaker. When combined with other verbs, verbs of giving and receiving help reveal the direction of favours and obligations. In many cases, the honorific form *itadaku* is preferred over the honorific form *sashiageru* because *itadaku* shows that the speaker is indebted to another person. *Itadaku* is also used alone as a formulaic expression used at the beginning of a meal or when people share food with another person. It is also used in combination with the causative form of verbs, as in *sasete itadaku* (*sasete* is the causative form of *suru* "to do"), to ask for permission. Mori (1993) discussed this form at length and concluded that it is also used to accept a favour with thanks as well as to ask for permission.

2.1.2.5. "Language Life"

Much of Japanese sociolinguistic research is based on the idea of "language life" (*gengo seikatsu*). Ide describes language life as: "the study of speech behaviour in daily life" (1986: 282). On this definition, speech behaviour is imbedded in the patterns and values of everyday life, usually within a group, such as the family or the company, or within a particular geographical area. Japanese sociolinguistics thus includes a strong emphasis on the frame in which communication takes place. Ide's definition of "language life" can thus be refined as "the study of the speech behaviour in frames of daily interaction." Any discussion of Japanese sociolinguistic norms needs to consider how speakers interpret a given frame and how that interpretation influences their choice of speech level.

A number of researchers have focused on describing the constraints on the use of various speech levels, but few have explained how these constraints fit into the broader patterns of communication in Japanese. Typical of descriptive theories is Ide's (1982) attempt to describe maxims of "polite behaviour," which are as follows: 1) be polite to a person of a higher social position; 2) be polite to a person with power; 3) be polite to an older person; and 4), the "overriding rule," be polite in a formal setting. The problem with this definition is that it attempts to set down absolute rules that transcend different frames of interaction. In most Japanese families, for example, grandchildren would use intimate forms with their grandparents, thus violating Ide's third rule.

Some researchers have placed honorifics in a wider theory of communication. Minami (1987) defines honorifics as speech level markers that include verbal dependent and non-verbal dependent gestures along with spoken language. He includes verbal details, such as *aizuchi* and tone of voice in determining speech levels. *Aizuchi* are sounds combined with head movements that indicate to the speaker that the hearer is interested and paying attention to the conversation. Neustupný (1979) developed the "Situational Set Rule" to explain Japanese speech levels. According to this rule, participants in linguistic interaction analyse the entire frame of communication before speaking. Neustupný's rule has much in common with Matsumoto's (1988) discussion of politeness in Japanese.

Matsumoto (1988) points out a number of serious problems with attempting to devise rigid rules that govern speech levels. Following Goffman, she emphasises the role of the frame in creating speaker expectations regarding the type of verbal and non-verbal communication that is appropriate for the frame. Interaction within a frame is designed to establish, confirm, and strengthen relations between the speakers,

rather than to protect face as in the Brown and Levinson (1987) model of politeness. She quotes the work of the well-known Japanese anthropologist Nakane Chie: "Nakane uses the Japanese word *ba* ("frame or location"), which she views as representing a concept that is basic to any description of Japanese society" (Matsumoto 1988: 406). The need to acknowledge relationships in a given frame is thus reflected in the use of formulaic expressions, verbs of giving and receiving, and speech levels. According to this scheme, honorifics are linguistic devices that raise the speech to the level appropriate for a given situation, whereas plain forms and colloquial expressions lower the speech level. Honorifics are thus neutral forms that function within the system of frame expectations that governs Japanese sociolinguistic norms. Matsumoto's work is important because it explains the most significant constraint on sociolinguistic norms, namely the appropriate interpretation of relations in a given frame, or "language life." Likewise, Okamoto (1997) conducted extensive research on the use of indexical expressions (honorifics, male-female speech, and other indicators of social status) in contemporary Japanese and found that speakers frequently shift speech levels and that use of "women's language" varies greatly among speakers. She says, "I argue that the choice of speech styles is a strategy based on a speaker's consideration of multiple social aspects of the context as well as the speaker's linguistic ideology, or beliefs and attitudes concerning language use" (Okamoto 1997: 809).

By interpreting language life as the composite frames in daily life, much of the mystical discussion of Japanese honorifics collapses. Their purpose is not to show normative notions of respect or politeness, but to acknowledge the relations underlying the given frame of interaction. The increase of honorifics, as noted by Shibata (1979), is closely connected with the rise of urban consumer culture in post-

war Japan because the number of frames involving formal, "service-industry" language has increased dramatically. Shibata classifies the *masu/desu* form as normal and honorific and plain forms as "special," or marked, forms in the public sphere in urban Japan. In a study of male and female speech, Hori (1986) concludes that the lower status of women in the work place forces women to use a higher speech level than men in many frames of interaction. She says, "male/female difference in Japanese is caused not so much by the apparent male/female difference *per se*, as by the different interactional spheres in which each sex is placed" (1986: 374). Though sociolinguistic norms have become more varied with changes in Japanese society since democratisation and the rise of the urban middle class since the 1950s, the need to acknowledge the human relations in a given frame of interaction is of overriding importance in determining the sociolinguistic appropriateness of the utterance. This makes Japanese little different from other languages.

2.1.2.6. Summary

In the foregoing section of this chapter, I have provided background information on the Japanese language with a focus on Japanese sociolinguistic norms. The information on the Japanese language showed that, although Japanese is a language isolate, Korean is the closest language typologically to Japanese. Both languages have SOV syntax, agglutinating morphological endings, and non-agglutinating grammatical particles. The modern Japanese writing system uses four scripts: Chinese characters, the two *kana* syllabary *hiragana* and *katakana*, both of which evolved from Chinese characters, and *romaji*, or Roman letters, which are used in

acronyms and abbreviations. Japanese also shares a large common lexicon based on Chinese characters with Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese.

Regarding Japanese sociolinguistic norms, I described the system of honorifics that distinguishes standard and formal speech levels from the informal speech level that is used in everyday life. As a working classification scheme for honorifics, I adopted Ide's (1982) classificiation that divides honorifics into nominal honorifics, predicative honorifics, and humble forms. Nominal honorifics include personal referents (e.g., personal pronouns and terms of address) and *o-*/*go-* prefixes that are added to nouns. Predicative honorifics include referent honorifics and addressee honorifics. Humble forms are specific forms that lower the speaker and his or her in-group, which raise the addressee. I concluded the discussion of honorifics by reviewing the literature on the role of speech levels as they relate to Japanese sociolinguistic norms.

2.2. General Language Transfer and Sociolinguistic Transfer

2.2.1. General Language Transfer

Language transfer has been a central issue in second language acquisition since the field emerged in the 1960s. It has also been subject to the most changes in intellectual fashion. As Kellerman (1995: 125) notes, "this story has been reviewed a number of times (e.g., Ringbom 1987, Odlin 1989, Ellis 1994), and it need not be repeated here." Language transfer is now accepted as a salient phenomenon in second language acquisition, but many questions remain about what is transferred from where and how transfer interacts with other variables in the course of the development of second-language proficiency. These questions are relevant to sociolinguistic transfer because sociolinguistics includes within its purview a wide range of social phenomena, including class, ethnicity, gender, power, and culture, that go beyond the linguistic relationship between L1 and other languages.

In an excellent review of recent research on language transfer, Kellerman (1995) argues that recent arguments for similarity as a source of transfer (e.g., Kellerman 1977, Anderson 1983, and Ringbom 1987) need to be amended to include the language-specific cognitive differences in the organisation of human experience. The inclusion of such cognitive differences in theories on language transfer implies that difference is an important source of transfer. As Kellerman (1995) put it:

> These language-specific ways of dealing with experience lead to transfer to nowhere. In this sense, learners may not be able to capitalise on cross-language correspondences

because some types of 'thinking for speaking' may be beyond individual awareness (1995: 143).

Kellerman's claim carries particular weight in sociolinguistic transfer because it helps explain why, despite obvious linguistic and cultural differences, some first language sociolinguistic norms exert a strong and highly variable influence on sociolinguistic competence in the target language. Some cultural values and perceptions of appropriate linguistic behaviour are an important part of unconscious social cognition that informs behaviour. Others, however, are very much a part of consciousness and form an important part of personal and ethnic identity. Beliefs about self, about language, and one's position as a language learner influence decisions about how to interact with speakers of the target language. Learners may, to varying degrees, transfer what they believe to be transferable, such as first-language norms that they believe to be universal, first-language norms that they want to retain, and perceptions of what they think is appropriate in the target language. The studies on sociolinguistic transfer evidenced by Japanese learners of English as an L2 and by learners of Japanese as an L2 reviewed below show that transfer of a variety of L1 sociolinguistic norms, cultural patterns of behaviour, and perceptions of the L2 affect learners' L2 sociolinguistic competence. Less clear, however, is the role of similarity and difference in sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese as an L2 because none of these studies has focused on more than one linguistic and cultural source (broadly defined) of transfer. Furthermore, most studies were conducted in a Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) environment, which makes it difficult to ascertain how social interaction with a wide range of native speakers affects sociolinguistic transfer and the development of sociolinguistic competence.

2.2.2. Sociolinguistic Transfer

In a 1992 article on pragmatic transfer, Gabriele Kasper declares that "interlanguage pragmatics ... lives an inconspicuous existence on the fringes of the field [second language acquisition]" (1992: 201). In the last several years, however, research on pragmatic and sociolinguistic issues in second language acquisition has attracted increasing attention. The bulk of research has focused on speech act realisation, but research on other sociolinguistic transfer phenomena, such as contrastive rhetoric, second language discourse, and subjective learner states has increased in recent years.

Most research on sociolinguistic transfer has been conducted on learners of English, both in ESL and in EFL environments. Fortunately for this thesis, a number of these studies have addressed sociolinguistic transfer from Japanese into English as an L2. These studies are important because they suggest patterns that may affect transfer from English to Japanese as an L2. What follows is a brief review of important studies on sociolinguistic transfer, with particular reference to transfer from Japanese as an L1 to English as an L2 (for extensive reviews of the literature on pragmatic and sociolinguistic transfer, see Kasper and Dahl 1991 and Kasper 1992).

Making a distinction between positive and negative sociolinguistic transfer is perhaps more problematic than in general language transfer research because it implies that sociocultural accommodation to native speaker norms is ideal. As Blum-Kulka (1991) has pointed out, many learners are not interested in conforming to native speaker norms for a variety of personal reasons that range from ethnic identity issues to "foreignness" as a communication strategy. Because sociolinguistic transfer leads to miscommunication and misunderstanding, researchers have rightly

focused on the negative effects of transfer. Researchers have yet to develop a satisfactory explanation for how transfer interacts with proficiency, instruction, learning environment, and affective and cognitive variables in developing sociolinguistic competence.

The majority of studies on sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese learners of EFL/ESL have focused on speech act realisation. Many of these studies were influenced by the methodology used in the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Patterns) research project led by an international team of researchers (for an overview of the project, see Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989). The project was designed to collect a large amount of native- and non-native-speaker data on the speech acts of requesting and apology around the world. To do so, the researchers developed a complete-the-dialogue DCT. Although this methodology has come under increasing criticism (e.g., Rose 1992, 1994, Beebe and Cummings 1996, Thomas 1996), it had shifted the centre of research from metalinguistic surveys of acceptability to speech act realisation. Table 11 gives a summary of studies relating to sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese learners of English discussed in this section. The nation in parentheses indicates the location where data on learners were gathered for learners and the type of English spoken by native speakers.

Table 11. Summary of Studies on Japanese Learners of English

Study	Speech Act	Participants	Method	Findings
Takahashi & Beebe (1987)	refusal	20 Japanese NS, 20 English NS, 20 Japanese learners (USA), 20 Japanese learners (Japan)	DCT: 12 situations	higher proficiency, more transfer occurs
Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz (1990)	refusal	20 Japanese NS, 20 English NS (USA), 20 Japanese learners (USA)	DCT: 12 situations	strong evidence of transfer
Takahashi & Beebe (1993)	face-threatening*	25 Japanese NS, 15 English NS (USA), 15 Japanese learners	DCT: 12 situations	transfer of register shifting patterns
Maeshiba, et al (1996)	refusal	30 Japanese NS, 30 English NS (USA) 30 Japanese learners (Japan)	DCT: 20 situations, appropriateness rating	higher proficiency, less transfer occurs
Barnlund & Araki (1985)	compliment	260 Japanese NS, 260 English NS (USA) (18 Japanese NS, 18 English NS in USA)	DCT: 16 situations, interviews with native speakers	clear differences in frame interpretation
Robinson (1992)	refusal	20 Japanese learners (USA)	DCT: 6 situations, talk aloud Protocol	talk-aloud protocols reveal reliance on L1 norms
Takahashi (1996)	indirect request	142 Japanese students (male)	questionnaire: appropriateness rating of Japanese and English utterances	perception of transferability induces transfer

*correction, disagreement, chastisement, and expressing embarrassing information

Following in the tradition of CCSARP, Leslie Beebe and Tomoko Takahashi have conducted a number of studies on Japanese learners of English. In one of their early studies (Takahashi and Beebe 1987), they investigated the influence of proficiency on sociolinguistic transfer. In this study, they used a DCT containing 12 speech acts of refusal to elicit data from 20 native speakers of Japanese, 20 native speakers of English, 20 Japanese learners of English in Japan, and 20 Japanese speakers of English, mostly university students, living in the United States. They divided the Japanese learners of English in Japan and the United States into undergraduate and postgraduate students and assumed that the graduate students had higher language proficiency. No proficiency test was given. The researchers found that higher levels of proficiency contributed to more transfer of "formal" Japanese refusals. They concluded that "higher proficiency ESL learners were more subject to native language transfer than lower proficiency learners" and that "their fluency gave them 'the rope to hang themselves with.'"

Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) focused on the use of refusals by 20 native speakers of Japanese, 20 native speakers of American English, and 20 Japanese learners of English, using a dialogue-completion or, as the researchers put it, a "role play" DCT containing 12 situations. The researchers coded the data according to social variables of power and dominance and the content of speech acts in the subjects' responses. Power and dominance were coded according to a binary scale of greater, indicated by a "+," and less dominance, indicated by a "-." The data produced ample evidence of transfer from Japanese patterns in the frequent use of "I'm sorry…." brevity of explanation for the refusal, and the formal tone. The researchers conclude with a problematic statement:

> Given the absence of this [pragmatic] competence and the social psychological motivation--perhaps even urge--to draw on one's deeply held native values, transfer will be complex and prevalent in second language refusals (1990: 68).

The researchers imply that to overcome sociolinguistic transfer, at least in refusals, learners need to dispense with "native values," but they fail to consider whether this is possible or even desirable.

Takahashi and Beebe (1993) expanded their research to address face-threatening speech acts between students and university lecturers. The researchers were mainly interested in how perceptions of status relations influenced the production of speech acts in English as an L2 by Japanese learners. The number of subjects was 55, of whom 15 were native speakers of American English, 15 were Japanese learners of English, and 25 were native speakers of Japanese. The researchers used a DCT containing 12 situations, 2 each for correction, disagreement, chastisement, announcing embarrassing information, and two controls. Each speech act had two encoded status relationships, one for higher status talking to lower status and the other for lower status talking to higher status. The researchers coded the learner responses for semantic formula and correlated the results with the encoded status relationships. The results of this study showed that Japanese and American English use different semantic formulas in these face-threatening speech acts. The Japanese speakers of English showed a mixture of both patterns in their L2 English, particularly in the use of softeners. The researchers also found evidence of transfer of Japanese register shifting patterns into L2 English. The vague definition of status in this study casts doubt on the findings because social distance, particularly in- and out-group relations, exerts a strong influence over Japanese communication patterns.

Of all of Beebe and Takahashi's studies, the 1987 study on proficiency and sociolinguistic transfer has been the most influential. Maeshiba, et. al. (1996) put Takahashi and Beebe's (1987) hypothesis to a new test in a study of the speech act of apology. The researcher used a modified form of DCT, called a "Dialogue Construction Questionnaire," that contained 20 situations to prompt an apology and a questionnaire in which subjects were asked to rate the degree of social distance between the interlocutors. The subjects were 30 Japanese learners of English with intermediate proficiency and 30 with high-level proficiency (as defined by TOEFL scores), 30 native speakers of English, and 30 native speakers of Japanese. The researchers coded the data according to semantic formulas and compared the results for each group of subjects. The results of this study ran counter to Takahashi and Beebe's hypothesis on proficiency: high-proficiency learners showed fewer instances of sociolinguistic transfer from Japanese into their L2 English. Intermediate-proficiency learners resorted to simpler apologies that reflected semantic formulas used in Japanese. The researchers speculated that the difference between EFL and ESL environments affects the degree of sociolinguistic transfer because ESL learners had a richer context for input and productive use of the language. It may be, however, that different speech acts influence sociolinguistic transfer to varying degrees depending on the sociolinguistic norms involved in the interaction.

Some researchers have used speech acts to investigate broader sociocultural constraints on frame perception and sociolinguistic transfer. Barnlund and Araki (1985) conducted an extensive study on sociolinguistic transfer in the use of compliments among Japanese learners of English. The study consisted of an interview and a DCT containing 16 situations. The researchers interviewed native speakers of American English, 18 native speakers of Japanese, and 18 Japanese

learners of English in the United States, and asked them questions about recent experiences in giving and receiving compliments; the DCT was given to 260 native speakers of Japanese and 260 native speakers of American English. The researchers analysed the data quantitatively to compare the sociolinguistic constraints on the use of compliments in Japanese and American English. The researchers found that Japanese compliment less frequently and compliment persons from whom they feel social distance; Americans compliment more frequently and compliment persons with whom they feel social intimacy. They conclude by arguing that these sociocultural constraints create underlying difference in frame perception and communicative styles.

To date, Robinson's (1992) study is one of the few studies to have used introspective methods with a DCT. Although her study was aimed at investigating the validity of using introspective methods with Japanese learners of English, the findings give clear evidence for transfer from Japanese to English. The researcher asked 20 Japanese learners of English to talk aloud as they completed a six-question DCT. Ten of the subjects had intermediate proficiency, and 10 had advanced proficiency. Robinson (1992) found that many learners were confused by the talk-aloud protocol methodology because they were not sure which language to speak in the protocol, even though the instructions stated that they could speak in Japanese or English. Regarding sociolinguistic transfer, a few intermediate female learners were reticent about refusing because they thought that it was not proper for women to do so. Many of the verbal reports contained phrases, such as "in Japan," which indicate that the situations on the DCT were interpreted according to Japanese sociolinguistic norms. In addition to confirming the existence of transfer, this suggests that caution is required in developing situations for DCTs.

Recent research by Takahashi (1996) has focused specifically on the issue of learner perceptions of transferability of pragmatic and sociolinguistic competence. To measure learner perceptions and performance, Takahashi gave 142 Japanese male university students a transferability judgement questionnaire consisting of two sections. The first section was a ranking of indirect requests for appropriateness on a seven-point scale; the second section was a ranking of appropriateness equivalence between Japanese and English on a seven-point scale. The subjects were tested for English proficiency and divided into low- and high-proficiency groups. The researcher correlated the results from the questionnaire with language proficiency and found that proficiency did not have a strong influence on subjects' judgements of appropriateness. Subjects ranked the Japanese pattern of using a combination of the honorific verb of receiving *itadaku* (discussed in the previous section) and a main verb as equivalent to the English expression "would you please" even in situations where this was not appropriate. Takahashi (1996) concluded that sociolinguistic transfer and English instruction in Japan combined to reinforce the perception of pragmalinguistic similarity between *itadaku* and "would" and "could." This study is useful because it is one of the few studies on sociolinguistic transferability, but the lack of data from native speakers of English makes it difficult for her to evaluate the subjects' L2 English judgements objectively.

2.2.3. Sociolinguistic Transfer in Japanese as a Second and Foreign Language

Research in English on sociolingistic transfer in Japanese as a second (JSL) and foreign language (JFL) has lagged behind research on Japanese learners of English as a second or foreign language. In Japanese and other Asian languages, however, a

number of studies have been conducted, mostly on Asian learners of Japanese as a second or foreign language. Although many of these studies are relatively small, when taken together, they provide useful insights into sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese, particularly as it relates to speech acts and honorifics. Table 12 gives a summary of important studies on sociolinguistic transfer in learners of Japanese as a foreign or second language discussed in this section.

Table 12. Summary of Studies on Learners of Japanese

Study	Speech Act	Participants	Instruments	Findings
Okada Yamashita (1996)	various	44 learners of Japanese, 3 NS informants	6 instruments	Frame interpretation causes transfer
Ikoma & Shimura (1994)	refusal	10 English NS learners, 10 Japanese NS, 10 English NS (USA)	DCT: 12 situations, personal info questionnaire	higher proficiency, less transfer
Moriuchi (1992)	request	149 Japanese NS, 81 English NS learners	acceptability questionnaire	L1 norms strongly influence frame interpretation
Kashiwazaki (1993)	conversational opener	110 Japanese NS interactions, 43 Japanese NS and English NS interactions	recorded conversations in natural setting	clear evidence of L1 transfer
Lee (1990)	request	70 Korean learners	appropriateness questionnaire	transfer of L1 norms occurs at advanced level
Fouser (1997)	various	1 Korean learner, 1 NS informant	7 instruments	irregular patterns of transfer at advanced level
Sawyer (1992)	--	11 learners (various L1's)	4 interviews during 1 year	acquisition of form occurs, but use differs from L1 norms
Siegal (1994)	--	4 English NS learners	ethnographic: interviews, observation	learner subjective states affect acquisition over time

As in general sociolinguistic transfer research, speech acts have received the greatest attention in the literature. One of the largest studies on speech acts in JFL was conducted at the University of Hawai'i by Okada Yamashita (1996). For this study, Okada Yamashita used the series of cross-cultural pragmatic measures developed by Hudson, Detmer, and Brown (1995) to compare how different measures affected the production of speech acts by learners of Japanese as a foreign language in Hawaii. The six measures were a self-assessment measure, an open-ended DCT, a role-play, a role-play self-assessment, and a multiple choice discourse completion test. Okada Yamashita (1996) used three native speakers of Japanese as informants and 44 learners of Japanese as subjects. Although the focus of this research was on comparing different research methods, she found that interpretation of the given situation affected speech act realisation and that learners at the intermediate and advanced levels produced more appropriate responses than beginners did. This contradicts Takahashi and Beebe's (1987) findings that higher proficiency leads to greater sociolinguistic transfer.

Ikoma and Shimura (1994) conducted a study on refusals in JFL by native speakers of English. The researchers used a personal information questionnaire and a DCT with 12 refusal situations. Ten learners were selected from an advanced level reading course in Japanese at the University of Hawai'i; 10 native speakers of Japanese and 10 native speakers of English were used as native-speaker informants. The researchers found evidence of transfer from English into JFL, particularly in the use of *kekkoo desu* as an equivalent for English "No, thank you." The authors concluded, "It seems that the AJs [American learners of Japanese] learned this expression as an equivalent of English 'No, thank you', but without learning when or how to use it." Though limited by the lack of L1 baseline data and the small size of

the sample, the study showed how learner perceptions of lexical equivalency between native and target language affected learner use of a common Japanese formulaic expression.

In one of the few Ph.D. theses on sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese, Moriuchi (1992) compared native speaker and American learner perceptions of acceptability of a variety of Japanese forms for the speech act of requesting. The researcher gave an acceptability questionnaire to 149 Japanese university students and 81 second-year learners of Japanese at the University of Texas at Austin. The questionnaire, which was modelled on a similar questionnaire by Ide (1986), consisted of questions seeking basic personal information and three types of acceptability evaluations of a request to borrow a pen. The first of the latter type was an evaluation of a list of request forms on a five-point scale ranging from "careful" to "inhibited" style. The second type was an evaluation on the same five-point scale of which style would be appropriate in communicating with people of different status. The third type was an evaluation of which forms one would use in speaking with a variety of different people. Moriuchi then analysed the results quantitatively and concluded that Japanese native speakers were more conscious of in- and out-group distinctions than American learners of Japanese. She found that although nearly all the American subjects were able to discriminate levels of formality among the expressions, they interpreted a number of situations from an American perspective, which tends to make fewer distinctions between in- and out-group members and levels of social hierarchy. The study is useful in providing information on perceptions of sociolinguistic variables, such as social distance and status, but it is limited by the lack of production data and the use of only one data-gathering instrument.

Kashiwazaki (1993) compared how native and non-native speakers of Japanese use conversational openers. She recorded conversations in an office for foreign students at a Japanese university. The resulting corpus consisted of 110 interactions between native speakers of Japanese and 43 interactions between foreign students and native speakers of Japanese. The study did not mention interactions in Japanese between non-native speakers. Using a semantically based coding scheme, the researcher classified the data into various types of conversational opening. She found that native speakers of Japanese used openers to elicit a reaction from the hearer before bringing up the purpose of the conversation. A number of non-native speakers of Japanese, on the other hand, moved quickly from the conversational opening to the point of the conversation without waiting for a reaction from the hearer. Kashiwazaki speculated that transfer of native-language discourse patterns and unfamiliarity with Japanese discourse patterns, which are usually not taught until more advanced stages of learning, contributed to these findings.

Most studies on Chinese and Korean learners of Japanese have focused on phonetic, syntactic, and lexical issues, but a growing number of studies have focused on sociolinguistic issues, particularly as they relate to honorific usage. A representative study on Korean learners of Japanese is Lee (1990). Lee investigated sociolinguistic transfer in 70 highly proficient Korean learners of Japanese. He compared L1 and L2 judgements of appropriateness of five verb forms in three situations containing requests with those of native speakers of Japanese. The results showed that Korean L2 judgements were similar to native speakers of Japanese in six cases, deviated slightly from native-speaker norms in five, and deviated greatly in four. The Korean learners chose Japanese forms that were grammatically and lexically similar to Korean L1 forms. The researcher concluded that L1 perceptions

of grammatical and lexical similarity greatly influence judgements of sociolinguistic appropriateness even at an advanced level.

Fouser (1997) conducted an extensive case study on sociolinguistic transfer in a Korean learner of Japanese with a high level of proficiency in the language. The researcher compared results from a C-test, a Japanese-to-Korean translation task, a DCT, a listening evaluation task, a short writing exercise, and a background questionnaire and interview. The learner was asked to verbalise his thoughts during the C-test, the translation task, and the DCT. A Japanese informant was given the same series of tests, except the background questionnaire and interview. Results showed that the learner's performance on the DCT, the listening exercise, and the short writing task was more variable in a given response than across responses or instruments and that it was more variable than his consistent performance on the C-test and translation exercise, whereas the native-speaker informant was more consistent in his use of register and formulaic expressions. A number of responses to the DCT, the listening exercise, and to the short writing task reflected the application of Korean sociolinguistic norms to Japanese. Fouser (1997) concludes that this creates "pragmatic dissonance" in which learners communicate effectively, but in a more variable pattern than their high level of proficiency would indicate to native speakers. The study is limited, however, by the lack of information on how native speakers react to the learner's pragmatic dissonance.

A number of studies have investigated other aspects of learners' sociolinguistic competence in Japanese. Although these studies do not focus on sociolinguistic transfer, their findings suggest sources of transfer and how other variables relate to transfer. Concerning speech acts, Miller (1994) criticises the view that Japanese is an "indirect language" and that English is a "direct language." She

videotaped conversations between Japanese and American co-workers in Japan and concluded that different interpretations of the situation led to different communicative strategies involving directness and indirectness. No information on the number of hours of data or under what conditions they were gathered is given in the study. As Miller states in her conclusion:

> The essential point is that people are not cultural beings who are always either direct or indirect and neither direct nor indirect speech are necessarily a regular, inherent aspect of any language, but are speech behaviours employed in some contexts for particular interactive functions (1994: 52).

Miller's argument is part of a growing number of criticisms (e.g., Wierzbicka 1991, Janney and Arndt 1993, Thomas 1995) of the use of subjective and potentially ethnocentric terminology in cross-cultural pragmatics and sociolinguistic research.

Sawyer (1992) conducted one of the few longitudinal studies on sociolinguistic competence in Japanese. He investigated the acquisition of sentence-final particle *ne* in 11 learners of Japanese as a second language at the International University of Japan. This particle is important in defining the relationship between the speakers and the information that is being exchanged. The learners were studying Japanese as part of an English-medium taught Master's degree in International Relations and International Management. They came from a variety of native language backgrounds (Bengali, Brazilian Portuguese, British English, Hindi, Thai, and Urdu). Data were gathered at four points over one year through a structured interview in which all learners were asked the same questions. The interviewers were all native speakers of Japanese. The researcher analysed the data quantitatively

for frequency, occurrence and type/token ratios, and concluded that all but one of his subjects developed fluency in the use of *ne* in a variety of contexts. The other learners used *ne* relatively infrequently and much less than native speaker in the sentence-final position. The infrequent use of *ne* makes learners look awkward to native speakers and may inhibit the development of sociolinguistic competence at an advanced level. The use of a longitudinal research design and semi-naturalistic data make this study useful, but the lack of native speaker informants and a comparison of *ne* usage with other areas of overall language proficiency and sociolinguistic competence limits the findings of the study.

J. V. Neustupný (1978, 1987, and 1995) has developed a theory of communicative competence aimed in an attempt to integrate various strands of research into a coherent whole. His work has been largely descriptive, but he has had a significant influence on the field, particularly in Australia. Although his discussion of communicative competence is applicable to other languages, most of Neustupný's work is based on research on teaching and learning Japanese as a second or foreign language. According to Neustupný's approach, communicative competence is one of four aspects of language proficiency: cultural competence, linguistic competence, contact situations, and communicative competence. Cultural competence is knowledge of customs and manners; linguistic competence is control over linguistic aspects of the language; contact situations refer to social dynamics that occur when people of different ethnic backgrounds come into contact. Communicative competence contains the following eight types of rules: switch-on rules, variety rules, setting rules, participant rules, content rules, message rules, channel rules, and management rules. Neustupný's emphasis on rules in communicative competence makes his theory a sociolinguistic theory, rather than a pragmatic theory, but his

inclusion of contact situations shows that "rules" can be subject to considerable modification in native- and non-native-speaker interactions. In researching sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese, particularly for those learners living in Japan, researchers need to consider carefully the type of language input and interactions with native speakers that learners have had and how this might influence the development of their sociolinguistic competence and subjective views of themselves as learners and speakers of Japanese.

Marriott (1993) tested Neustupný's approach by conducting a cross-sectional study on 11 Australian high school students who had just returned from a one-year home stay in Japan. Marriott conducted in-depth interviews with the students to see how closely their sociolinguistic proficiency fitted Neustupný's theory (e.g., 1978, 1987) of communicative competence. The interviews were conducted in Japanese with two interviewers and consisted of an open discussion on topics related to the students' stay in Japan and learning Japanese. The interviews varied slightly in content and length, but averaged 21 minutes. The researcher analysed the data for use of honorifics and knowledge of speech levels, use of dialect and colloquialisms, use of speech acts, such as opening and closing, and use of *aizuchi* and other conversational devices. The researcher found that, except in the case of one student with a number of years of prior Japanese language learning experience, prior language learning experience had little effect on sociolinguistic competence. All learners preferred the intimate plain form and exhibited a number of problems in using the neutral *masu/desu* register and honorific forms. Marriott used these findings to argue for a greater emphasis on teaching sociolinguistic norms in Japanese language course, but she failed to consider that age and the situation of

being a high school student in Japan strongly influenced the type of input received and the interactions that learners were exposed to.

Siegal (1994) conducted the most extensive longitudinal ethnographic study on Japanese language acquisition to date. She focused on four female learners, aged 21-45, of Japanese in Hiroshima over one year. She met frequently with the learners and used observation, recording, and interviews with the learners to study how their subjective state affected their acquisition and performance of Japanese. Three of the learners were recipients of a government scholarship, and one was an English instructor at a private language school. Siegel's study is one of the few studies that focuses on the interaction among age, race, gender, and social situation in the learner's evolving subjective state. Sociolinguistic issues, such as the use of the honorifics and the neutral *masu/desu* speech level by learners and native speakers, were important for all the learners in Siegal's discussion. To varying degrees, all the learners felt uncomfortable with the "female and foreign roles" ascribed to them in Japanese society, which influenced the degree to which they tried to accommodate to native speaker sociolinguistic norms. Foreigner talk and the feeling of being "different" exacerbated these feelings. Siegal concludes:

> Thus, the perpetuation of a foreigner status and language use work together, with forces from above and below, and cannot be disregarded in understanding sociolinguistic competency when learners are immersed in Japan for a year (1994: 409).

Though limited in scope, the above studies provide sufficient evidence to conclude that sociolinguistic transfer is a salient phenomenon in Japanese speech acts. What is less clear, however, is how sociolinguistic transfer affects learner use of

speech levels, including honorifics, and a number of conversational devices, such as sentence-final particles, *aizuchi*, and non-verbal communication. The work of Sawyer (1992), Marriott (1993), and Siegal (1994) makes an important contribution to expanding the range of studies on sociolinguistic competence in JSL and JFL. In addition, most of the above studies have focused on oral language production, either through DCTs, or semi-natural data. Little research has been conducted on sociolinguistic transfer in writing or in comprehension. More studies are needed on sociolinguistic transfer in writing and comprehension, in JSL and JFL environments, and among diverse groups of learners.

Evidence from Chinese as a second or foreign language presents a different picture of native- and non-native speaker interactions. Kasper and Zhang (1995) conducted a study of sociolinguistic and cross-cultural aspects of learning Chinese as a foreign language. The subjects were 21 advanced learners of Chinese at the University of Hawai'i. The researchers conducted 30-50 minute semi-structured interviews with a Chinese and a Western interviewer. The interviews were transcribed and analysed qualitatively. The interviews yielded a number of different views, but most learners felt that conforming to Chinese patterns of behaviour was warmly received by native speakers and that native speakers adjusted their expectations of learner conformity to native speaker norms according to learner proficiency. These findings differ from Siegel (1994) in which low native-speaker expectations affected learners' subjective states and the development of sociolinguistic competence. It is clear, however, that the "foreigner role" has a strong influence on native speaker expectations and attitudes toward learners, which in turn have a strong influence on how learners interact with native speakers. More research is needed on the foreigner role, but tentative conclusions from Japan suggest that it

plays a dominant role in mediating native and non-native interactions at all levels of proficiency and consciousness.

Finally, research on Arabic as native and second or foreign language is relevant to Japanese language acquisition because, like honorifics and formulaic expressions in Japanese, the use of religious terms in Arabic is an important "culture-specific" part of Arabic sociolinguistic competence. In a comparison between American English and Syrian Arabic compliment responses, Nelson, Al-Batal, and Echols (1996) found that both groups accept and mitigate compliments rather than rejecting them, but that they differed in how they accepted the compliments. Americans preferred to accept and add "thank you," whereas Syrians preferred to accept and use a formulaic expression, many of which refer to God (e.g., "by God" and "May God keep you safe"). Davies (1987) also noted the frequent references to God in formulaic expressions of politeness in Moroccan Arabic and suggested that such differences could cause serious miscommunication: "The English-speaking learner of Arabic is likely to be struck, sooner or later, by the proliferation of religious references in formulas whose English counterparts include no such references, and this may be considered to reflect a deeper difference between the two communities" (1987: 81-82). More recent work by Farghal (Farghal 1995, Farghal and Borni 1997) has confirmed the wide use of religious expression in Arabic as a sociolinguistic norm and the potential for these expressions to cause difficulties in communication for Arab learners of other languages and for learners of Arabic as a second or foreign language.

2.2.4. Summary

In this section, I have reviewed the literature on sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese learners of English and learners (various L1 backgrounds) of Japanese as a second language or foreign language. Studies on Japanese learners of English varied considerably and their design and findings, but most were conducted in an English-speaking country. Overall, they show that transfer of L1 sociolinguistic norms is evident in L2 English, but that the effects of sociolinguistic transfer are less in learners with a higher proficiency in English. In contrast to studies on Japanese learners of English, most of the studies on learners of Japanese were conducted outside of Japan and in a Japanese-as-a-foreign-language environment. These studies showed that sociolinguistic transfer is a salient phenomenon in learners' speech act realisation in Japanese. Because most studies on Japanese learners of English and learners of Japanese were based on the speech acts, it was difficult to determine how sociolinguistic transfer affected the perception and production of speech levels and, in the case of Japanese, honorifics and formulaic expressions.

2.3. L≥3 Acquisition Research

2.3.1. Introduction

Compared with research in other areas of second and foreign-language acquisition, research on L≥3 acquisition has been patchy at best. Researchers in other fields of SLA thus have a larger body of research to draw on in developing research questions and methodologies. Research on L≥3 acquisition has, however, increased in recent years; it can generally be classified into three broad categories: studies focussing on language transfer, studies on bilinguals learning an additional language, and studies focusing on the affective and cognitive effects of prior language learning experience on subsequent language learning. These categories cut across each other significantly and can be divided into several subcategories, such as studies that focus on language production, on language comprehension, on instructed L≥3 acquisition, and on natural L≥3 acquisition. A few studies have focused on learning additional languages beyond a third language and on sociolinguistic and pragmatic issues in L≥3 acquisition. The studies discussed in this section span more than thirty years, are of varying quality, and employ research methodology that ranges from casual interviews with language learners through quantitative error analysis to qualitative introspective research. The wide variation in methodology and research design in L≥3 studies can in part be explained by the lack of a core corpus of literature and of an established research paradigm. In this section, I present a detailed and critical review of existing studies to elucidate particular theoretical and methodological issues that relate to this thesis.

For third language acquisition research to realise its potential, several major problems in existing studies on L≥3 acquisition must be resolved: one, the lack of a commonly agreed upon definition of "third language acquisition"; two, the lack of effective research methodology; and three, the lack of clear hypotheses about the phenomena under investigation. These problems are not unique to L≥3 acquisition research; they reflect larger problems in SLA research that are symptomatic of any emerging field of study. In this section, I will review two broad areas: problems in definitions of L≥3 acquisition and research methodology in L≥3 acquisition studies; and results from studies on language transfer in L≥3 acquisition and from studies on the effect of prior language learning experience on the acquisition of subsequent languages.

2.3.2. Definitions of L≥3 Acquisition

The lack of a commonly agreed upon definition of "third language acquisition" creates unnecessary confusion. The most common definition of "third language" (L3) is a language that is learned after the acquisition of the first (L1) and the second language (L2). The L2 may be a "second language" or a "foreign language" and proficiency in the L2 may vary from near-native to beginner. This definition is wide enough to include a variety of L2 backgrounds and L3 learning situations. Most researchers (Chamot 1973, 1978, Bentahila 1975, LoCoco 1976, Ahukanna, Lund, and Gentile 1981, Ulijn, Wolfe, and Donn 1981, Mägiste 1984, Thomas 1988, Hufeisen 1991, Vogel 1992, Sikogukira 1993) who have written about third language acquisition have followed the L1-L2-L3 classification and thus refer to the target language as "L3." Several researchers have extended this numerical ordering to

describe a language or languages that are learned beyond the L3 as "L4" (Serrill 1985), or "L4" and "L5" (Mägiste 1984). Fouser (1994) argues that the term "third language" or "L3" is limiting because it implies only the acquisition of one additional language beyond L1 and L2. The term "L3" implies that new terms, such as "L4," "L5," "L6," etc., would be necessary to describe languages that are learned beyond the L3 accurately. Fouser (1994) proposes the term "L≥3" to refer to all languages beyond the L2 because the psycholinguistic processes of learning a language beyond the L≥3 are similar to those used in learning the L≥3, thus justifying a term that is based on how languages are learned as well as on the order in which they are learned.

Håkan Ringbom, one of the most productive researchers of the effects of language transfer in third language acquisition (e.g., Ringbom and Palmberg 1976, Ringbom 1985, 1986, 1987), adopted the term "L2" to refer to the target third language:

> It is obvious that the less the learner knows about the target language (L2), the more he is forced to draw upon any other knowledge he possesses. This other knowledge also includes other foreign languages (LN) previously learned, and such LN influence, like L1 influence, will be much more in evidence at the early stages of learning (Ringbom, 1986: 155-156).

Ringbom's use of the term "LN" comes from Vidomec (1963). Raabe (1986) modified this definition slightly by referring to the language that the learner has already acquired (the L2) as "L3" and the target language as "L2," as did Ringbom. More recently, Williams and Hammarberg (1998) used "L3" to refer to the target language and L2 to refer to several foreign languages that the subject in his case

study had acquired before learning German, the target language. Unfortunately, these attempts confuse more than they clarify because the term "third language," or "L3," is a more common and accurate term for a language that is learned after L1 and L2. In the interest of clarity, using "L2" to refer to the target third language or to several languages learned before the L≥3 should be abandoned.

Researchers who focus on the cognitive effects of prior language learning experience, prefer the term "multilinguals" to refer to learners who are learning a language beyond the second as in McLaughlin and Nayak (1989): "Nation and McLaughlin (1986) carried out an experiment in which they compared information processing in multilingual, bilingual, and monolingual subjects learning a miniature linguistic system" (McLaughlin and Nayak, 1989: 7). Zobl (1992) draws a distinction between unilinguals and monolinguals in his research on the acquisition of English as an L≥3:

> One avenue of research which may advance our understanding of this relationship, and thereby contribute to an eventual theory of the learnability of nonprimary languages, involves the systematic investigation of language acquisition by adult-age unilinguals (ULs) (i.e., true L2 acquisition) and multilinguals (MLs) (i.e., L3, L4, etc. acquisition) (1992: 177).

Provocative as the above definitions may be, they remain confusing because the terms "bilingual" and "multilingual" are themselves vague and controversial. "Bilingual" and "multilingual" often refer to two or more languages being taught and used in a given geo-political unit, or to a person who is highly proficient in two or more languages. These terms might best be confined to describing the state of language use in society and individuals. As noted above, the terms "L2" and "L≥3"

are proposed here to describe the order of acquisition in the language acquisition process, with "L3," "L4," "L5," etc. being used for greater specificity.

2.3.3. Methodological Problems

A second major problem in third language acquisition research is the lack of methodological rigour in many studies. Methodological problems are not unique to third language acquisition research, but they are more acute because researchers must rely on a much smaller literature for guidance on methodological issues that relate specifically to researching third language acquisition. The most aberrant methodological problems lie in the overall research design, the instruments used, and how variables, such as L1 and L2, are controlled.

2.3.3.1. Research Design

The research design of many studies does not provide the researcher with an adequate framework to address his or her stated research questions. This is particularly true in studies of language transfer from L1 and/or L2 into L3, in which researchers make claims about how learners make decisions about transferability on the basis of limited data. Longitudinal studies are rare, as is common in SLA research. Only two longitudinal studies on adult L≥3 acquisition have been conducted: Vogel (1992) conducted a one-year study of transfer in an adult third language learner, a native-speaker of Chinese who knew English and who was learning German as an L≥3; and Williams and Hammarberg (1998) conducted a two-year study on Williams's acquisition of German as an L≥3. Reddinguis (1999) conducted a semi-longitudinal

study of intensive adult L4 acquisition using learning diary notes taken during a three-week intensive Spanish course in Mexico. Longitudinal studies of L≥3 acquisition in children have been more prevalent. Chamot (1973, 1978), for example, investigated child third language acquisition in a case study of a bilingual child (French and Spanish) learning English as an L3 over nine months. Murrell (1966) and Hoffmann (1985) focused on the acquisition of three languages in a trilingual environment over eight months and eight years respectively. Researching language transfer phenomena longitudinally gives researchers more data from which a more consistent pattern of transfer can be established. Both Chamot (1973, 1978) and Vogel (1992) used evidence from their findings to argue that L2 interferes with L≥3 acquisition; Chamot argues that a closely related L2 hinders L≥3 acquisition, whereas Vogel argues that interference from L2 diminishes over time. By interference, these researchers mean learner produced errors in the target L≥3 that are caused by transfer from L1 and/or L2 linguistic structures and cultural constructs. In contrast, Hoffmann (1985) concludes that childhood trilingualism does not have a negative effect on overall language or personal development.

Whereas the above studies are all case studies, Sanders and Meijers (1995) conducted the only longitudinal study of instructed child L≥3 acquisition. They investigated the acquisition of English as a third language in Dutch elementary schools over two years by comparing 46 learners of English as an L2 with 46 learners of English as an L3. The learners of English as an L3 were bilingual in Turkish or Moroccan Arabic and Dutch. The researchers used a variety of data elicitation instruments to elicit data on grammatical competence; each instrument was administered at the end of the first and second years of the research period. Like Raabe (1985), they also incorporated classroom observation into their research design.

In respect of their research question on the role of bilingualism in subsequent language learning, they found no significant difference between the two groups of learners.

Triangulation, particularly as it refers to different skill areas and languages, is relatively rare in L≥3 research. Sanders and Meijer (1995) used triangulation to focus on discrete points of syntactical and lexical competence in production and comprehension. In his study of Australian learners of German, Voorwinde (1981) used a background interview, a picture description test, and an oral preposition test in L1, L2, and L3 to elicit data. The background interview and picture description were tape-recorded, whereas the oral preposition test was not. He compared 20 bilingual Dutch and English learners of German as an L≥3 and 20 monolingual English speakers learning German as a foreign language. The results of this research showed little difference between the two groups overall scores on the German tests. By combining these different instruments, he was able to measure grammatical competence in oral production and elicit information on metalinguistic attitudes in the interview. Cenoz and Valencia (1994) and Lasagabaster (1998) used a variety of instruments, such as IQ tests and diverse questionnaires to gain a wide-range of information on cognitive and affective variables that affect the acquisition of English by bilingual (Basque-Spanish) learners in the Basque Country. The authors used this information to analyse results from a series of five proficiency tests in speaking, writing, listening, reading, and grammar and vocabulary.

Woo (1995) is an example of an *ex post facto* research design that correlated results from a self-assessment questionnaire with past performance on standardised language proficiency and language aptitude tests in his study of 231 learners of Korean as a third language at the U.S. Defence Language Academy in Monterey,

California. Woo was interested in how language aptitude and no prior language learning experience and self-assessed L2 proficiency correlated with L3 Korean proficiency. He divided his subjects into three groups: learners with no prior language learning experience, learners with a low level of proficiency in an L2, and learners with a high proficiency in L2. He found that learners with low proficiency in L2 and low language learning aptitude had the lowest level of Korean proficiency, whereas language-learning aptitude affected Korean proficiency of learners in the other two groups.

Think-aloud protocols, another common research method, are relatively rare in L≥3 acquisition research. Færch and Kasper's (1986) case study of a native speaker of Danish who was proficient in English and German at the high school level is the one of the few to use them as the primary source of data. The authors claim that this is a study on simultaneous second language acquisition because the learner is studying the two languages simultaneously. However, in the Danish curriculum, English starts a full two years ahead of German, which makes German an L≥3 in Denmark. In this study, Færch and Kasper asked the learner to translate three passages from Danish into English and German and think-aloud as she was doing each translation. The think-aloud protocols showed that the learner verbalised lexical decisions regarding the German text more than she did for the English text. She relied heavily on metalinguistic explanations for the German text, but used more intuition for the English text. The authors concluded that this difference came from a combination of the interaction of lexico-grammatical difference in English and German with Danish, greater exposure to English in school and in society, and a greater emphasis on grammar and metalinguistic activities in school German classes. Fouser (1997) used a think-aloud protocol with a translation task, a DCT, and a short

writing task in his study of an advanced Korean learner of Japanese as an L≥3. Results showed that the learner drew on his L1 Korean extensively in lexical searchers and subsequent word choice during the translation task and that his decisions regarding sociolinguistic appropriateness in the DCT and writing task showed were frequently influenced by Korean sociolinguistic norms.

Despite the limitations of the lack of longitudinal studies and introspective methods found in mainstream SLA, researchers on L≥3 acquisition have to grapple with the complexity of additional linguistic, cognitive, and affective variables. Developing a broadly accepted research paradigm for managing these variables is critical for L≥3 acquisition research to move forward.

2.3.3.2. Instruments

Problems in research design are exacerbated by problems in data elicitation instruments. Most studies base their findings on results from one, or at most two, research instruments, thus precluding a discussion of L≥3 acquisition in both production and comprehension, or in each of the four traditional skill areas. In his study of native-speakers of Arabic learning English as an L2 or L≥3, Bentahila (1975) composed a list of correct English utterances that are often difficult for native speakers of Arabic to produce. He then asked English teachers in Morocco and Algeria, where French is the dominant L2, and in Iraq and Kuwait, where relatively little French is learned, to describe what types of errors their respective students commonly made in producing the listed English utterances. Results from this test became the basis of his study. Thus, instead of focusing on learner language, Bentahila focused on what their teachers thought learners would do in learning

English as an L2 or L≥3. Bentahila concluded that knowledge of French both facilitated and interfered with the acquisition of English, despite having initially proposed that French would mainly interfere with English.

Instruments that are supposed to test linguistic production and comprehension are also problematic. Ulijn, Wolfe, and Donn (1981) claimed that their lexical acceptability judgement test was valid in testing production and "recognition" (comprehension) in testing lexical transfer in Vietnamese learners of English as an L3 who had basic ("beginning") proficiency in French as an L2. The researchers chose 30 English words, 10 cognates in French, 10 formal contrasts with French, and 10 *faux amis*, to test lexical transfer from French into English. These words were circled and placed in Vietnamese sentences, either in English or in Vietnamese, and circled. The researchers asked learners to translate a word into English and French when it appeared in Vietnamese and into Vietnamese and French when it appeared in English. From this the authors claimed that their results showed that cognate words in French and English facilitated acquisition of English, whereas formal contrasts and *faux amis* interfered with it. Although this conclusion is tenable from the data given, the instruments focused only on word-to-word translations, rather than chunks of written or spoken language related to real-life contexts.

Sikogukira's (1993) study of lexical transfer from L2 French into L≥3 English in Burundi used similar instruments--a fill-in-the-blank English translation with a French prompt and an acceptability test of underlined words in an English sentence--but concluded, in opposition to Ulijn, Wolfe, and Donn (1981), that learners transferred cognate lexical items with different meanings and avoided transferring cognates with the same meaning in both languages. In a recent study on learners of English as an L≥3 in Burkina Faso, another West African Francophone

country, Kambou (1997) measured the use of English articles with a cloze test and an error-identification and correction test. A short background questionnaire was also used. This is the only L≥3 study to date to focus on a discrete point of grammar, though such studies are common in SLA research.

Many studies that use research instruments to elicit natural data focus on one area of language and attempt to extrapolate conclusions from a corpus of data that is tied to only one area of language. One such study is Hufeisen's (1991) extensive study of errors of beginning learners of German as an L≥3 from non-Indo-European backgrounds (Arabic, Indian, Japanese, Thai, Hungarian, and Turkish) who had an unspecified level of proficiency in English as an L2. Hufeisen used a picture story as a prompt to stimulate learners to write. Four hundred and fifty scripts based on this story were collected and evaluated by four native speakers of German. Errors were classified into several categories such as syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic errors. From this corpus of data, Hufeisen concluded that transfer from English was considerable in all the above categories. On the basis of this conclusion, she suggested that learner knowledge of English be used as a facilitating "bridge" to German and as a source of metalinguistic knowledge on language learning. This study should be commended for its diversity of L1 backgrounds, reliance on an open-ended data elicitation instrument, and detailed description of the pedagogical implications of the findings. The conclusions of this study, however, are based only on written production data and an analysis of learner errors. Extending Hufeisen's study to include oral production and comprehension skills would strengthen the validity of her findings considerably.

Mulamba's (1991) extensive study of sociolinguistic patterns and transfer

trilingual Zairians also used oral responses to a six-situation DCT in Ciluba, French, and English. Mulamba gathered data from 50 native speakers of each of the languages in question and 50 trilingual speakers in Zaire. Each group was divided evenly into 25 members of each sex. To avoid possible effects from ethnocentricity, Mulamba developed the situations for the DCT from a written questionnaire on language use and basic background information. The Ciluba and French speakers in this study were bilingual, which may have caused the researcher to dispense with proficiency tests in those languages, but no proficiency test was given in English, the L3 either, which made it impossible for the researcher to show how proficiency in English related to sociolinguistic performance in that language. Mulamba did find patterns of transfer from L1 Ciluba into the L2 and L3 and examples of transfer from L2 into L3, which he attributed to the closeness of French to English. He also found evidence of French sociolinguistic patterns in the trilingual Ciluba speakers compared with monolingual Ciluba speakers. He concluded that this difference was because the trilinguals were educated and urban, whereas the monolingual Ciluba speakers were mainly farmers in villages. This study is useful because it is the only study of trilingual sociolinguistic competence and transfer, but the findings are limited by the use of just one data-gathering instrument and a lack of background information how L3 sociolinguistic performance correlates with other areas of L3 proficiency.

2.3.3.3. Control over Variables

This leads to the final major problem in L≥3 acquisition research methodology: the lack of control over important cognitive and affective variables, such as L2

proficiency, L3 proficiency, and previous language learning experience. Most studies have set clear typological controls over L1, L2, and L≥3 to test hypotheses regarding the relationship among the three languages. These studies can be divided into two groups: studies that investigate the relationship among three relatively close Indo-European languages and those that investigate the relationship among a non-Indo-European L1, an Asian or African language, and an Indo-European L2 and L≥3. To date, no study has investigated the relationship among languages from three different language families, nor has any study investigated the influence of various L1's and L2's on a specific L≥3 to allow for greater comparisons between language groups (Ard and Homburg 1983). Michael Clyne has conducted an extensive project on trilinguals, English being the L3, in Australia (Clyne 1997, Clyne and Cassia 1999). Though each component of the study focuses on a specific set of language combinations, together they show three different L1 and L2 combinations (Hungarian-German, Dutch-German, and Italian-Spanish) perform in oral interviews in L1, L2, and L3 English.

Despite having set clearly defined typological controls over the languages in question, many researchers have neglected to address the issue of L2 proficiency in the overall research design and thus had to resort to educated guesses of L2 proficiency. Controlling for L2 proficiency, whether by proficiency tests or self-assessment, is critical in determining the level of linguistic resources that a learner can draw on in the acquisition of a third language. Previous research has shown that L2 proficiency influences not only the amount, but also the type of language transfer that takes place in acquiring a third language. Ringbom (1986) stresses the importance of L2 ("LN") proficiency in lexical transfer into L3:

> Crosslinguistic influence between LN [L2] and L2 [L3] is generally restricted to learners making use of obvious formal similarities between individual lexical items, unless their LN proficiency is native-like or highly fluent and automatized. There appears to be a threshold of LN proficiency which the learner must reach in order to apply his LN knowledge to any significant extent. ... the higher the learner's standard of LN proficiency and the more vivid the LN is in his mind, the more there is of other LN influence on L2 (1986: 160).

Khaldi's (1981) study of native Arabic-speaking learners of English as an L≥3 who are bilingual in French is one of the more ambitious attempts to control for L2 proficiency. Khaldi divided his learners into a group that had a bilingual primary and secondary school education and another group that had an Arabic-centred education with French taught as a foreign language from the third grade in primary school. Khaldi tested his hypothesis that transfer from French would be the preferred source of transfer in learning English as an L≥3 at three different levels of English proficiency. The results of this study indicated that the level of French L2 proficiency did not significantly affect the amount of apparent transfer in English as a third language, but that learners from a bilingual educational background were somewhat more suspicious of perceived similarities between French and English. Khaldi concludes his analysis of the differences in transfer patterns between the two groups:

> This behaviour constitutes further evidence that with increasing sophistication in the knowledge of the TL [English], precise areas in which transfer will be seen to be possible will become clearer and more well-defined" (1981: 208).

These results underscore the importance of researching the influence of L2 proficiency at various stages of L3 acquisition.

Khaldi's (1981) reliance on educational background to control for L2 proficiency is one the most common methods of controlling for L2 proficiency. Some researchers have augmented this information by distributing a short language-background questionnaire, as did Khaldi. Many researchers, however, use educational background as the only indicator of learner L2 proficiency. Ulijn, Wolfe, and Donn (1981) attempted to control for L2 French proficiency in their study of lexical transfer from French into English as an L3 in Vietnamese immigrants to the United States by correlating French education in Vietnam with the age of the learners. In the "method" section of this study, they describes how they controlled for French proficiency:

> Their [the subjects'] average age was 30.06 years (with a range of 17-63 years) and they have been in this country [the United States] for an average of 6.54 months. For those knowing French, the average length of French study was 6.35 years (1981: 31).

The researchers do not define what they mean by "knowing French" and what constitutes "French study." Hufeisen (1991) also used a brief questionnaire in her study of overall language transfer from English as an L2 into German as an L3. The questionnaire asked learners to list their native language and the foreign languages that they "knew" along with the number of years that they studied each language. This small amount of information on L2 English proficiency is problematic in her study because it attempts to make comparisons among groups of learners from widely varying native language backgrounds.

The most extreme case of lack of control over L2 proficiency is Dole's (1983) study of immigrant learners of English as an L3 in Quebec who use French as an L2 and who come from three language backgrounds: German, Polish, and Spanish. The researcher makes no reference to learner L2 proficiency, only to motivation to learn French:

> First, there is the fact that the immigrants in question live in the Saguenay Valley, where English is considered more of a foreign language than it is in many continental European capitals. Secondly, there is the reality of continuing Gallicization of business, education, and culture in the province of Quebec .... (1983: 70).

Clearly researchers need to pay more attention to the linguistic background that learners bring to the task of learning an L3 so that the results of such research can reveal more varied patterns of interaction.

2.3.4. Studies on Language Transfer in L≥3

The distinction between interference and facilitation in L≥3 acquisition research relates directly to my assumption that learners are cognitively engaged with the language learning task at hand, and that, therefore, they develop strategies that allow them to apply these cognitive skills to the language learning task. I will therefore, discuss L≥3 acquisition literature in terms of "interference" studies and "facilitation" studies. Such a discussion will also help to show how L≥3 acquisition literature reflects broader changes in the view of language transfer since the 1970s (see reviews in Odlin 1989 and Kellerman 1995). Within these categories, it would be useful to

make a further distinction between language production and language comprehension. Making such a distinction is difficult, however, because few studies have focused on language comprehension in any category. It seems more useful, therefore, to discern trends within the categories of interference and facilitation, and then to discuss commonalities between studies in either category.

2.3.4.1. Interference in L≥3 Acquisition

For the most part, early interference studies were influenced to various degrees by the behaviourist paradigm of language learning as imitation of target language norms. Errors and other deviations from target-language structure that could be attributed to the influence of previously acquired languages were considered signs of interference, rather than as evidence of processing using connections to existing background knowledge. Typical of this approach is Chamot's (1973) longitudinal study of child L3 acquisition. She concludes that phonological deviance in a French and Spanish bilingual beginning learner of English as an L3 is a result of interference from French and Spanish. She recorded the learner, a ten-year-old boy, talking at the dinner table twice a month for nine months. Chamot concludes that "even though he had the advantage of being in an environment of native speakers of English and thus had constant models for imitation, phonological habits of French and Spanish made it more difficult for him to master some parts of the English sound system" (Chamot 1973:250).

Azevedo (1978) also concluded that Spanish caused interference in oral production of native-speakers of English learning Portuguese as an L3 at an American university. According to Azevedo, this phenomenon, called "Portuñol,"

was well known to teachers of Portuguese in the United States because many learners of Portuguese study Spanish as a major language.

> Anyone who has taught Portuguese at American colleges is familiar with the type of *Portuñol* (italics in original) sentences students are likely to produce" (Azevedo, 1978:18).

Azevedo's study is purely descriptive; he gives few details on the methods used to gather the data, where the data were gathered, or on the proficiency of the learners in Portuguese or Spanish.

Ahukanna, Lund, and Gentile (1981) focus on interference in their study of Nigerian university learners of French as an L3:

> It appears, however, that a potential for interference increases with the number of languages a student knows.... Fortunately, the more skills students develop in the target language, the more resistant they become to all of these sources of transfer (Ahukanna, Lund, and Gentile 1981: 286).

The study focused on 40 native speakers of Igbo in the Department of French at Alvan Ikoku College of Education in eastern Nigeria. All of the learners were learning French as an L3 and were proficient in English as an L2; the learners spoke no other combination of languages. The learners were divided into two groups of 20 each: those (beginning) who knew no French before entering college and those (advanced) who had had five years of French instruction in secondary school. The learners were given a French grammar test, which was designed to test their overall grammatical knowledge of French, without knowing that they were participating in

the experiment. In this study, the researchers controlled all of the language variables strictly by limiting the L1 and L2 to two languages that were common to all learners and by excluding those who had knowledge of languages other than English or Igbo. The problem with the research design of this and similar studies is that they are built around the assumption that linguistically deviant forms--"errors"--provide adequate insight into the process of language transfer. Errors are no doubt useful in determining which linguistic forms and aspects cause the learner, or group of learners, difficulty, but they tell us little about what learners do well in L≥3 acquisition.

The reappraisal of audiolingualism and behaviourist notions of learning in the 1970s did not cause researchers to lose interest in interference from other languages in L≥3 acquisition. Chumbrow (1981), for example, revised contrastive analysis to argue that language distance and social function of the base language (Chandrasekhar 1978)--a language that serves as the main source of language transfer--can be used as a predictor of "interference" in L≥3. By "social function," he meant the social status and function of the language as a relevant means of communication in society. He based his research on studies on language transfer from L2 English into L3 French in Nigeria and from L2 French into L3 English in Cameroon. In this theoretical paper, he argues that the base language, French in this case, serves the "mother tongue function" as the source of transfer.

In the only study to date on learners of Japanese as an L3 in the United States, Sakurai (1994) hypothesised that knowledge of an L2 that is closer typologically to Japanese increased interference in the acquisition of Japanese as an L3:

> When one has to use some structure in one language, a few different structures in different languages may merge in one's head and one may choose an inappropriate structure (1994: 2-3).

She gathered data on 20 natives speakers of English learning Japanese as an L2 (13 first year; 7 second year) and 19 Chinese and Korean students learning Japanese as an L≥3 (13 first year; 6 second year). She used a combination of instruments to gather data on the use of negative questions in Japanese and on grammaticality judgements. From her data on learners of Japanese as an L3 in the first and second year of university, she concludes that learners with L1 Chinese or Korean and L2 English make the same mistakes as native speakers of English learning Japanese as an L2. By the second year, however, this "interference from English" lessens and the native speakers of Chinese and Korean show higher accuracy and greater fluency than native speakers of English. The findings of this study are limited because it ignores the effects of the large common lexicon in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, which is based on Chinese characters, in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3.

2.3.4.2. Facilitation Studies

Research on third language acquisition has revealed much about the role of language transfer from L1 and/or L2 in learning a third language. Recent studies in particular have found that transfer in L≥3 acquisition is generally productive and that it helps facilitate learning most when the target L≥3 is closely related to one of the two (or more) languages that the learner already knows. Many researchers working in this line of research have focused on the facilitative effects of lexical transfer in learning

an L≥3. Ringbom (1985, 1986) found that transfer from L2 to L≥3 is most facilitative in the lexicon:

> The results [of previous L3 acquisition studies] so far point in the same direction: where crosslinguistic influence is found, usually between two related foreign languages, this influence is generally confined to the area of lexis. Influence from languages other than the L1 seems to be insignificant in the area of grammar and non-existent in phonology (1986: 156).

Ringbom (1985) based this conclusion on his review of the literature and on his research on the differences between native speakers of Finnish and native speakers of Swedish in learning English as an L3 in Finland, which is officially bilingual in Finnish and Swedish. On the basis of a categorisation of errors, Ringbom (1985) found that more errors could be traced to influence of Swedish than to Finnish; very few errors could be attributed to the influence of German, which is less popular than English. Ringbom (1985) concluded that learners preferred to draw on their knowledge of Swedish in writing English because they perceived Swedish to be typologically closer to English than Finnish. Although this study focused on errors, the so-called negative effects of language transfer, Ringbom (1986), speculated on the facilitative potential of language transfer:

> Especially for the beginner, one obvious way of facilitating the foreign language learning process is to rely upon his L1 or other languages he may know. The extent of crosslinguistic influence will naturally vary greatly from one learning situation, even from one learner, to another (1986: 150).

How learners use this pool of "potential linguistic knowledge" is what researchers point to as evidence of the generally facilitative effects of language transfer in L≥3 acquisition.

The importance of facilitation in L≥3 acquisition, particularly among closely related languages, was revealed most strongly in Singleton's (1987) case study of a relatively fluent learner of French as an L5. Singleton (1987) interviewed the learner, Philip, and later analysed the source of his errors in spoken French in terms of their source language: English (native language), Spanish, Latin, or Irish (proficiency in these languages varied from "school" Latin and Irish, which the learner rarely used, to intermediate level proficiency in Spanish, a language the learner acquired while living in Spain). Singleton hypothesised that the majority of errors were the result of transfer from Spanish, with English a close second, and Latin and Irish being the sources of relatively few errors. These results indicated that the learner drew various existing linguistic resources to compensate for lack of knowledge of or control over the target language. Philip's preference for Spanish as a source of transfer provides confirmation for the Kellerman's (e.g., 1978, 1979) psychotypological hypothesis, which argues that learners make decisions about which linguistic items and structures are transferable based on their perception of the distance between the languages in question and that they will draw on linguistic resources in the language that they perceive to be closest to the target language.

The psychotypological hypothesis also gains support from Möhle's (1989) study of native-speakers of German learning Spanish as an L4 or L5. Möhle asked university learners of Spanish as an additional language, half of whom were majoring in English and half of whom were majoring in French, to summarise a silent film, "the pear film," orally in Spanish. Results of learner summaries indicated a

considerable amount of "interaction," a term that Möhle prefers over "transfer," from French among the learners who were majoring in French and relatively little influence from L1 German and L2 English. Learners who were majoring in English showed less influence from English than those who were majoring in French. Interestingly enough, learners whose major subject was English showed some influence from French. Möhle concludes that interaction among various languages is a complex and spontaneous phenomenon, but that "The most important condition for linguistic interaction to take place is obviously the degree of formal relationship between the languages" (1989: 193). These results, along with Singleton's (1987), show that the additional linguistic resources that L≥3 learners possess facilitate subsequent L≥3 acquisition, particularly if the languages in question are typologically close.

In a case study of a learner of Korean as an L5, Fouser (1999) showed that the learner drew actively and consciously on his knowledge of Japanese as an L4 in acquiring Korean, which is far closer to Japanese than the other languages that the learner had acquired before learning Korean (English L1, French L2, and German L3). Results showed clear evidence of influence from Japanese, but almost none from the other languages, including L1 English. The study also showed that the learner believed that his experience of learning French as an L2 in high school, which included a year-long home stay in Belgium, helped him learn how to think in another language and motivated him to learn subsequent languages. This confirms the psychotypological hypothesis, but also confirms findings from Dewaele (1998) and Williams and Hammarberg (1998), who argue that learners tend to block transfer from L1 and use L2 as, in the words of Dewaele, the "active language," which serves as the main source of lexical information. The languages involved in Dawaele

(1998) and Williams and Hammarberg (1998) were all Western European languages, which are much more similar to each other than English is to Korean, as discussed in Fouser (1999).

The psychotypological hypothesis has also been tested on learners who have no knowledge of the target language in studies by Singleton and Little (1984) and Palmberg (1985). Singleton and Little compared learner performance on a test of Dutch listening and reading comprehension. Native speakers of English who had a reasonable command of German were compared with those who knew no other Germanic language(s) besides their native English. Results indicated that the group with knowledge of German understood more Dutch than the group that did not know any German (most learners in this group, however, received instruction in Irish and French before entering Trinity College Dublin), which Singleton and Little attributed to learners making use of their knowledge of German to understand the incoming Dutch input. These findings also provide support for Ringbom's hypothesis that transfer from L2 to L≥3 is most salient in the lexicon and in comprehension.

Palmberg (1985) investigated the "potential" English L3 lexicon of native-Swedish speaking children in Finland who study Finnish as an L2 in school before they begin to study English, usually at the end of their fourth year of school. His test consisted of listening to 40 English words and 14 English expressions and a written test where learners were asked to write down as many English words as they could and provide an appropriate Swedish equivalent. Results indicated that learners identified 52% of the words and 58% of the expressions correctly and that they produced a variety of correct English words. Overall, this study indicated that learners understood more words than they could produce and that learners drew on their knowledge of Swedish as a source of information on the English lexicon.

Together, these studies indicate that learners already possess a significant amount of knowledge about a new target language that is typologically close to one or more of the languages that they already and that learners make dynamic decisions about what is and is not transferable from one language to another when confronted with difficult linguistic input.

Results from studies on phonetic and phonological transfer reveal conflicting patterns of transfer. Some studies have shown that transfer occurs from the language that they perceive to be phonetically and phonologically closest to the target L≥3. Singh and Carroll (1979), for example, found that learners from India transferred from English in their pronunciation of French. The researchers gathered data from oral interviews with nine learners of French from various language backgrounds (Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, German, Punjabi, and Turkish). The researchers then correlated an analysis of learner errors in pronunciation with results from an attitudes and motivation questionnaire. From this analysis, Singh and Carroll concluded that learners transferred English phonetic patterns into French because they perceived English to be a prestige international language in India. Learners from other language backgrounds tended to transfer mainly from their respective L1s.

A study by Martine-Daudeu and Llisterri (1990) showed that 7 bilingual (Spanish and Catalan) learners of French as an L≥3 transferred the Spanish light lateral [l] in L≥3 French instead of the Catalan dark lateral. The researchers concluded that constant contact with Spanish in school, regardless of which language was spoken at home and with friends, made it easy for learners to compare the Spanish and Catalan laterals with the French lateral. This suggests that learners

successfully map L≥3 phonemes with those that they perceive to be similar in the L1 or L2.

Other studies have been equivocal on the source of phonological transfer. In an extensive study of phonological transfer in L3 Swedish by native speakers of Korean with intermediate proficiency in English as an L2, Pyun (1987) asked learners (18 first year; 18 second year) of Swedish to read 45 key words from their textbooks and 32 short sentences aloud. He recorded and transcribed deviations from Swedish phonological norms. He found that transfer from Korean accounted for about 42% of the deviations, whereas transfer from English accounted for 33% of the deviations. Transfer from both language and idiosyncratic errors accounted for 25% of the deviations. He concluded that perceived and actual similarity between English and Swedish encouraged learners to transfer from English. Pyun's findings are limited because he did not show how L2 English proficiency and other variables influenced Swedish proficiency. He also did not show how patterns of deviation varied among individuals in the group.

In opposition to Singh and Carroll (1979), however, Haggis (1973) found that Ghanaian native speakers of Twi relied heavily on Twi (L1) in pronouncing French as an L3, despite being relatively fluent in English as an L2. Haggis based his findings on 62 oral interviews of five to ten minutes (depending on the language) in all three languages that the learners knew, making this study one of the few that is based a large corpus of oral-interview data. Haggis concluded that Twi influenced learner pronunciation of French more than did English because of the strong influence of the tonal phonology in Twi. Vildomec (1963) conducted an extensive series of interviews with multilingual people in Europe. Most of the responses dealt with phonological transfer. From these interviews, which were not transcribed, he

concluded that transfer in all areas of language occurs among languages learned in a similar environment and emotional state. More studies on phonetic and phonological transfer are needed to augment the tentative findings of the studies discussed above.

2.3.5. Studies on the Effects of Prior Language Learning Experiences

Another area of promising research on L≥3 acquisition is research on the cognitive and affective effects of previous language learning experience on the acquisition of an L≥3. Research in this area has typically compared language learning ability of bilinguals learning an L≥3 with monolinguals learning an L2 to see whether the previous language learning experience of bilinguals helps them learn a new language more efficiently than monolinguals. The theoretical impetus for this research has come from interest in how previous language learning experience affects--positive, negative, or equivocal--present language acquisition. Thomas (1988) showed that English-Spanish bilinguals have an advantage over English monolinguals in learning French and that those learners who had formal training in Spanish as an L2 performed better than those who had learned Spanish "naturally." Learners were given French grammar and vocabulary tests after one semester of instruction, the short version of the Modern Language Aptitude Test, and a modified version of the Gardner and Lambert attitude and motivation questionnaire. From the results on these tests, Thomas concluded that previous language learning experience helped in the acquisition of a new language, but that previous language learning experience in formal settings in particular helped the most because formal language instruction increased learner metalinguistic awareness. Thomas attributed the superior

performance of bilinguals to their metalinguistic skills rather than to the close typological relationship between Spanish and French:

> Cognates and grammatically similar structures may exist in the target language, but unless students are trained to be aware of the rules and forms of language and to recognise similarities among languages, they cannot develop metalinguistic awareness, exploit positive transfer, and avoid interference (1988: 240).

These views stand in contrast to researchers, such as Kellerman (1978, 1979), Ringbom (1986), and Singleton (1987) who view learner judgements on language distance and transferability as creative, idiosyncratic, and not necessarily related to formal language instruction.

Results from Eisenstein's (1980) study of the effect of childhood bi- and multilingualism on language learning aptitude showed that multilinguals, most of whom had learned several languages in a formal setting, performed best on the short version of the Modern Language Aptitude Test. This suggests that extensive formal education in languages develops learning strategies that help facilitate future language learning. Cenoz and Valencia (1994) used several data elicitation instruments--an IQ test, a background and attitudes questionnaire, several English (L3) proficiency tests, and an oral interview in English--to investigate the effects of a bilingualism on learning an L3 by 165 bilingual Basque and Spanish and 155 monoloingual Spanish speakers. They conclude that instruction in Basque as a heritage language had a positive influence on attitudes and cognitive skills that learners used in acquiring English as an L3. Only 27% of people in the Basque Country are proficient in the language, so many of learners are learning it for the first time at school; for those who use Basque at home, instruction in Basque is first

language reinforcement. A study by Swain, Lapkin, Rowen, and Hart (1990) came to similar conclusions. The authors found that bilingual immigrants with literacy in their heritage language perform better in French as an L3 immersion courses than those with no literacy in their heritage language.

Other researchers in this area focus more specifically on the cognitive effects of previous language learning experience. Mägiste (1984) conducted a study of the effect of bilingualism on the acquisition of English as an L3 by immigrants in Sweden. She investigated results of a standardised English test given to 2,736 eight-grade immigrant learners and 67,162 Swedish learners, who were (presumably) monolingual. Results from this study indicated that active use of the native, or "home," language by bilingual learners was a slightly negative influence on L3 English proficiency, whereas passive use of the "home" language was a positive influence. Monolingual Swedish learners score roughly in between both groups of bilinguals. Like Thomas (1988), Mägiste (1984) concluded that "passive bilingualism" helped develop learner metalinguistic knowledge, but that "active bilingualism" increased the potential for interference. Unlike Thomas (1988), however, Mägiste (1984) left the door open to the possibility of transfer in L3 acquisition:

> Another factor in learning a language is the similarity between the mother tongue and the language to be learned. In related languages, the learner is able to recognise and understand familiar concepts, which facilitates learning, at least at initial and intermediate stages (1984: 421).

Zobl (1992) focused on the effects of prior language learning experience in

accessing knowledge of Universal Grammar (UG). In a study that compared 15 learners of English as an L≥3 (multilinguals) with 18 learners of English as an L2 (unilinguals), Zobl used a 50-question cloze test that was rated according to the acceptable word method and a test of grammaticality judgements. Zobl found that learners of English as an L≥3 accepted more sentences that were generated according to a more marked grammar. He concluded that L2 learners used a more conservative learning procedure than L≥3 learners, which suggests "an inverse relationship between the conservatism of the learning procedure and the pool of linguistic knowledge available to it" (1992: 193).

In a study on the difference between L2 and L≥3 acquisition, Klein (1995) compared 17 learners of English as an L2 with 15 learners of English as an L≥3 on tests of grammaticality judgements and grammatical corrections. The tests were given orally and in written form. Klein used results from these tests to determine how previous language learning experience triggers UG parameters. Klein concluded that the difference between the two groups was small in syntactical domain, such as preposition stranding, but that the L≥3 learners performed better in the lexical domain, such as the use of postpositional complements to verbs. Like Zobl (1992), he found that they used a less conservative learning procedure in making judgements. From this, Klein cautiously concluded that prior language learning experience facilitates the acquisition of a subsequent language acquisition because of heightened metalinguistic awareness and a less conservative learning procedure.

Several studies, however, have cast doubt on the above findings. In a study comparing language aptitude for learning artificial linguistic structures, Nayak, Hansen, Krueger, and McLaughlin (1990) found that bilinguals with various

combinations of languages did not have superior language learning abilities over monolinguals, but that bilinguals were more flexible in adjusting their learning strategies to the requirements of the given task. They concluded that previous language learning experience helped learners develop the ability to switch learning strategies to fit the type of linguistic task at hand.

In a study of 39 learners of Italian as an L≥3, Serrill (1985) elicited data on writing in Italian. She then correlated the grammatical errors in each T-unit with background information, such as sex, course in university, SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) score (American university entrance exam) and grade point average. A T-unit is a main clause, including modifiers and subordinate clauses, that constitutes a meaningful unit of discourse. Serrill divided her subjects into three groups, those with no previous language learning experience, and those with one and two language learning experiences respectively. She concluded that, although learners with prior language learning experience did not produce more accurate writing in Italian, they wrote more and used more sophisticated vocabulary. Experienced language learners also attempted more diverse grammatical structures than did those with no previous language learning experience. Findings from this study are limited, however, because Serrill collected data only on writing and used simple data on previous language learning background. Likewise, Woo (1995) concluded that language aptitude had a greater effect on achieved proficiency than prior language learning experience.

2.3.6. Summary

Despite the inconsistencies in definitions, methodology, research questions and conclusions of much L≥3 acquisition research, this review of the literature leads to several tentative conclusions about L≥3 acquisition:

1. Learner perception of language distance between the target L≥3 and L1 and/or L2 influences learner decisions, consciously and unconsciously, about what and how much to transfer from L1 and/or L2 into the L≥3. In most cases, learner perceptions of language distance conform to the actual linguistic relationship among the languages in question.

2. Transfer from the language(s) perceived to be closely related to the target L≥3 occurs mainly in listening and reading comprehension through lexical transfer, and generally facilitates acquisition. Phonological transfer is a more complicated process in which transfer from L1 and/or L2 varies greatly among individuals.

3. Proficiency in L2 and/or another L≥3 significantly influences what is transferred into the target L≥3. Because learners with a high proficiency in an L2 or another L≥3 that they perceive to be close to the target L≥3 have more linguistic resources at their disposal, transfer occurs in more areas of language, but is limited to areas of perceived and actual linguistic affinity between the L2, another L≥3, and the target L≥3.

4. Interference from other languages (L1, L2, and/or another L≥3) in learning an L≥3 occurs with greater frequency at the beginning of the learning process and reflects

learners' attempts to use various forms of linguistic knowledge to solve cognitively demanding tasks in the L≥3.

5. Prior language learning experience, formal or informal, influences the learning strategies and approaches to learning the L≥3, regardless of language distance. This suggests that metalinguistic cognitive skills enhance subsequent language acquisition.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

3.1.1. Overview

This thesis is based on a research design that includes quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. I chose a descriptive research design because researching sociolinguistic transfer in L≥3 acquisition includes a large number of variables that would be difficult to control using an experimental research design. I also wanted to focus of intermediate- to advanced-level learners with different L1s, L2s, and other L≥3s (i.e., other languages beyond the L2 that learners might know or have been exposed to before learning Japanese as an L≥3) who had acquired the L≥3 under similar conditions. Ard and Homburg (1983) argue, taking a range of subjects of this kind allows researchers to look at how differing language backgrounds affect the acquisition of a common target language. This made it difficult to divide the learners into an experimental group and a control group as is common in experimental research designs.

Descriptive research design provides sufficient information to test the hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1 because it delivers a clear description of the relationship between, on the one hand, prior language proficiency, and target L≥3 global language proficiency and, on the other, prior sociolinguistic competence and target L≥3 sociolinguistic competence. Discussions of qualitative results from individual learners and of patterns elucidated by quantitative analysis have been used

to deduce causation from the given data. Once general trends of causation have been established, they have been set against the hypotheses, and from this relevant conclusions have been drawn.

The large number of variables and the goals of this research require the use of triangulation in data collection and both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data analysis. Triangulation involves the use of several different data elicitation and collection methods to collect data on the same phenomena (Matsumoto 1993). In the present study, data have been collected on sociolinguistic transfer in L≥3 comprehension and production so that results could be compared within individuals and within the group. Consistent patterns within individuals have been taken to indicate the general validity of the data elicitation and collection methods. This is particularly important when new or controversial methods are used with Japanese for the first time.

A longitudinal study is ideal to investigate L≥3 acquisition and development in relation to evolving L2 and L≥3 proficiency. Hufeisen (1996), for example, reports that developing L≥3 proficiency surpasses proficiency in L2 and another previously acquired L≥3, either through target L≥3 development or attrition of previously acquired languages. In such cases, it is possible that language users will draw on target L≥3 proficiency to communicate more effectively in the L2 or another L≥3. From this perspective, L≥3 acquisition adds another linguistic and cultural knowledge base to the learners' composite language proficiency, which is composed of all languages that learners know or have been exposed to. The acquisition of non-native languages is thus a dynamic process that involves a variable evolution in language proficiency over time.

Despite the merits of a longitudinal study, I was forced to follow a cross-sectional research design for several reasons. First, to ensure the validity of the study, I had to obtain data from learners who had sufficient proficiency in Japanese as L≥3 and familiarity with basic sociolinguistic forms in Japanese. In Australia, where the data were obtained, this required that data on third year learners be gathered, because honorific forms and different speech levels are not taught until the middle of the second year. The third year is the final year of undergraduate education in Australia, which would have made it logistically difficult to follow learners for a year or two beyond the initial data collection. Second, I was invited to Australia as a visiting scholar for six months specifically in order to gather data for this thesis. Extending the period of research would have been difficult because my visa was limited to six months and I did not have sufficient funds to spend a year in Australia without working, which was prohibited according to my visa status at the time.

3.1.2. Pilot Study

The pilot phase of this study was conducted in October of 1994 at Insearch, a language institute connected to the University of Technology Sydney. During the pilot phase, I collected data from eight intermediate learners of Japanese. Most of these learners had followed the Insearch curriculum and many had been to Japan for varying lengths of time. The curriculum at Insearch placed a greater emphasis on the development of speaking and listening proficiency than the University of Sydney, but less emphasis on literacy. Most learners at Insearch knew about 100 or so Chinese characters. Most of the learners at Insearch worked full-time, and the average age was 37. In contrast, all learners at the University of Sydney were full-time students,

and the average age was 25.5. Despite these differences, the similarity in oral proficiency, length of time studying Japanese, and the combination of L1s, L2s, and other L≥3s between Insearch and the Japanese language programme at the University of Sydney meant that findings from the pilot study would be applicable to the main study.

To check the validity of the instruments and procedures, I also gathered data from 10 native speakers of Japanese in Sydney. This was particularly important regarding the C-test because it had not been used with Japanese in any published studies. The native speakers of Japanese also provided valuable information on native-speaker norms that could be compared with responses from learners of Japanese. Relying only on previously published research on Japanese native-speaker norms would have reduced the validity of the study because the study was not a replication of any previous study.

The native-speaker informants were students and professional people living in Sydney. Six were women and four were men; the age ranged from mid-20s to early 40s. They were given the same set of tasks to complete as the learners of Japanese, except for a questionnaire on previous language learning experience. They were asked to complete the tasks at their leisure and return them directly to me. It took about a month and a half to collect data from the native speakers. When I collected the materials from the native speakers, I asked them to point out any typographical or other errors in the Japanese.

3.1.3. Variables

Two dependent variables were investigated in this research: global language proficiency in L≥3 Japanese and sociolinguistic competence in L≥3 Japanese. Because L≥3 acquisition involves a large number of independent variables, it is necessary to isolate the variables that are salient in investigating the hypothesis. The following variables have been taken in the present study to be relevant in showing the relationship between prior language proficiency and L≥3 global language proficiency and between prior sociolinguistic competence and L≥3 sociolinguistic competence: proficiency in L1, L2, and other L≥3s, perceived relationship between L1, L2, and other L≥3s and Japanese, attitudes towards previous language learning, type of previous educational experience, time spent in Japan, years of Japanese language education, reason for studying Japanese, attitudes toward particular aspects of learning Japanese, age, and sex. These variables have been treated through a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis.

3.2. Methodology

3.2.1. Subjects

The subjects for this study were 24 learners of Japanese as an L≥3 in the School of Asian Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia. The learners were members of the third year, "B-Stream" class, which was composed of learners of Japanese who began learning Japanese after entering the University of Sydney. The third year is the final year of a standard (i.e., non-honours) undergraduate degree in the Australian university system. "A-Stream" classes were designed for learners of Japanese who

began acquiring the language in secondary school, or who had begun to acquire the language naturally at home or in Japan before entering university. I decided to focus on B-stream students because most of the students in question had started learning Japanese at a similar age and had followed the University of Sydney's Japanese language programme.

Although most of the learners were in their 20s, they varied significantly in L1, L2, and previously acquired L≥3 background. They also varied considerably according to the course that they were taking in the university. Most of those born in Australia were native speakers of English who had taken one or more Indo-European languages during secondary school. Among the non-native speakers of English, there were two groups: immigrants who had come to Australia in childhood or as teenagers, and recent immigrants and overseas students. Most learners in both groups were bilingual in their native language and English, but had not studied another language during secondary school. The following Table 13 summarises the relevant background of the learners in this study. Different dialects of modern Chinese, some of which are not mutually intelligible, are included in the category "Chinese" because the written language is the same across dialects, some of which are considered different languages. Mandarin Chinese, the standard variety of Chinese based on the Beijing dialect and used in China and Taiwan, is understood throughout Chinese-speaking areas, but Taiwanese, the native language of most people in Taiwan, and Cantonese, the native language of Hong Kong and surrounding areas are not mutually intelligible with each other or with Mandarin. The learners in this study came from one of these three dialect/language groups, and a number of learners from Taiwan were fluent in Mandarin and Taiwanese. In Table 13, some of the numbers do not

equal 24, the number of learners in this study, because only 21 learners were learning Japanese as an L3, 18 as an L4, 5 as an L5, and 2 as an L6.

Table 13. Background Information on Learners

Birth Place	Australia 10, Hong Kong 4, Taiwan 3, Korea 2, Czech Rep. 1, Malaysia 1, Singapore 1, Sri Lanka 1, UK 1 (n = 24)
Sex	female 23, male 1 (n =24)
Age Range	20-40 (average = 25.5)
Pre-Univ Ed.	Australia 10, Hong Kong-Australia 3, Hong Kong 2, Korea 2, Taiwan 2, Australia-UK 1, Czech Rep 1, Sri Lanka 1, Taiwan-Australia 1, UK 1 (n = 24)
Major at Univ.	arts 21, commerce 2, communication 1 (n = 24)
L1	English 12, Chinese 8, Korean 2, Czech 1, Sinhala 1 (n = 24)
L2	English 10, Italian 3, Japanese 3, Chinese 2, German 2, Latin 2, Arabic 1, French 1 (n = 24)
L3	Japanese 7, French 5, Chinese 3, Classical Chinese 3, English 1, German 1, Latin 1 (n = 21)
L4	Japanese 10, Chinese 1, Classical Chinese 1, French 1, German 2, Hindi 1, Italian 1, Scottish Gaelic 1 (n = 18)
L5	Japanese 4, German 1 (n = 5)
L6	Classical Japanese 1, Korean 1 (n = 2)

One caveat is in order before continuing the discussion. Of the 24 learners, 23 were female, which raises questions about the validity of the sample. A rough balance between female and male subjects would have been ideal, but would have required that I abandon the class-based structure of the data sample because the class formed the data sample was the only B-stream class at the University of Sydney when the data were gathered. Surveying other universities in the Sydney area would have been difficult because it would have required access to subjects and would have made it difficult to control for previous classroom instruction. Given that gender

distinctions in language use is a common sociolinguistic phenomenon, the gender imbalance in sample thus suggests caution in generalizing the results of this thesis for male learners from any other language groups discussed above. The issue would be more salient if the learners in question had acquired Japanese in Japan where they would no doubt have had direct exposure to differences in female and male speech in Japanese.

Learners for this study were selected because they were members of the only third-year B-Stream class at the university in 1995. Learners were asked by their Japanese teachers to volunteer for the research project. All but two learners in the class volunteered for the study. All learners who volunteered for the study were given the same combination of questionnaire and data elicitation instruments. None of the learners received financial compensation for their participation in this project.

3.2.2. Instruments

Through triangulation, the instruments in this study were designed to collect data on learners of Japanese as an L≥3. Because learners came from a variety of L1, L2, and previously acquired L≥3 backgrounds, data elicitation in those languages would have been extremely cumbersome and difficult to analyse. I would have needed an instrument for at least all the L1s and other languages that learners knew before acquiring Japanese. This would have required working with native-speaker informants in each language at all levels of research. Even gathering L1 baseline data would have required working with native speakers of Chinese, Czech, Korean, and Sinhala in developing the data elicitation instruments and in the analysis. The issue of developing appropriate controls for L1 and L2 in the acquisition of a

common L≥3 by learners from different language groups needs greater research, preferably by a team of researchers who together have a sufficient knowledge of all the languages in question.

Spoken data from naturalistic interaction with native speakers of Japanese would have been desirable to evaluate language and sociolinguistic transfer in production. I decided against including a speaking component in the data collection for several reasons. First, it would have been extremely difficult to gather naturalistic data from all the learners in the study because their interaction with native speakers of Japanese varied greatly. Some learners had almost no interaction with native speakers outside class, whereas others often met Japanese friends in Sydney. Second, it would have been difficult to record interactions in Japanese without intruding into the private life of learners. Third, though the option of recording interviews in Japanese was considered, several interviews involving different interlocutors would have been required to capture the full range of sociolinguistic phenomena in Japanese. Because I was not able to pay learners for their co-operation requesting them to come to a series of interviews or think-aloud data elicitation sessions would have been too great an imposition on their time, which might have made it difficult to get interviews from all the learners in the study.

The following instruments were used: a Language Learning Experience Questionnaire; a C-test, Discourse Completion Task (DCT); Discourse Evaluation Task (DET); Short Writing Task (SWT). The following table summarises the data elicitation instruments and procedures. No written introspection was used with the C-test because, based on my experience with the item in the pilot study, I did not want to burden the learners with additional time constraints. In addition, the focus of

this study was on sociolinguistic transfer and a section for introspective comments was added to the three instruments relating to sociolinguistic transfer.

Table 14. Overview of Data Elicitation Instruments and Procedures

Instrument	C-Test	DCT	DET	SWT
Purpose	global proficiency	speech act production (speaking)	speech act comprehension (listening)	speech act production (writing)
Type	4 passages 100 deletions	8 speech acts	6 speech acts	1 speech act
Written	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Introspection				

The University of Sydney required that all researchers submit their data gathering and elicitation instruments to the Human Ethics Committee for approval. All the above instruments were approved by the Human Ethics Committee in November of 1994 before the data were collected. All the instruments were checked for accuracy several times by a Japanese researcher in applied linguistics at the University of Sydney before they were administered in the pilot study. The same Japanese researcher checked them again after the pilot study was completed.

3.2.2.1. Language Learning Experience Questionnaire

The language learning experience questionnaire was modelled on the questionnaires used by Gardner and Lambert (1972), Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978), and in the Modern Languages Research Project at Trinity College Dublin (Singleton

1999). To ensure that responses would be easily comparable across learners and with other quantitative measures in this study, I developed a system of scaled responses of three to five levels. Questions containing five levels were designed to elicit more detail than those with three levels do. I also included a "not applicable" category, indicated by an "NA," so that learners did not feel forced to answer questions that they did not feel applied to them or that they did not want to answer. This was added in response to the experience of the pilot study, in which some learners were confused about how to answer questions that were not applicable to them. The "NA" category also gave learners a chance to ignore the question if they did not want to answer it.

Although in-depth background interviews would have allowed for more individual diversity in the responses, I wanted data that was comparable so that it could be used in the quantitative analysis section of this study. To compensate for the lack of an interview, several sections of the questionnaire were designed specifically for this project. The section of the questionnaire dealing with perceptions of difficulty of various areas of learning Japanese was designed to reveal learner perceptions of similarity between L1, L2, and a previously acquired L≥3 and Japanese.

3.2.2.2. C-test

The C-test was chosen because it correlates well with other measures of global language proficiency (Klein-Braley 1985). It has been used to elicit data on processing strategies (Feldmann and Stemmer 1987) and as a source of information on multilingual interaction in the lexicon (Singleton and Little 1991, Chapelle 1994).

Although some learners in the pilot study filled in only a few blanks, which invalidates the results of the test, I persevered with the C-test for the main study because the learners in this study had a higher level of proficiency in reading and writing Japanese and had been exposed to a much larger number of Chinese characters.

Constructing the C-test for Japanese was difficult because Japanese is an agglutinating language with no spaces between words in a sentence in the written language. This made it more difficult to determine where word boundaries lie, or even what constitutes a "word." I decided to follow a phonological definition of a word as a *bunsetsu* because Japanese textbooks commonly separate elements in a Japanese sentence into *bunsetsu*. A *bunsetsu* is a phonologically determined element composed of a lexical item and a suffixed grammatical particle that Japanese linguists use to define word boundaries (Hattori 1960, Shibatani 1990). Using the *bunsetsu* also allows for the use of grammatical particles to be tested in context with the lexical item that that precedes them. Omitting every other single *kana* graph or Chinese character would have mutilated the text too much, while omitting a set number would have turned the text into a cloze test instead of a C-test. Table 15 presents a comparison of a sample of an English C-test with the Japanese C-test used in this study. Proper nouns have been skipped in sequence of deletions because I felt that they were too difficult for learners, particularly those who had not been to Japan. Deleted portions are noted in the boxed area; a slash in the Japanese example indicates a *bunsetsu* division.

Table 15. Comparison between an English and a Japanese C-test

English	Starting with Ueno Park, places famous for cherry blossoms are full of flower viewers.
Japanese	上野公園を / 始め、/ あちこちの / サクラの / 名所は、/ お花見の / 人で/ にぎやかに / なります。

The mixed orthographic system in Japanese presented also some problems in C-test construction because Chinese characters represent a differing number of phonetic syllables. Under certain conditions, a character may be pronounced with three phonetic syllables; under other conditions it may be pronounced with only one. The character for "I," for example, is pronounced as "*watashi*," three syllables, when used alone, but as "*sa"* when used in a compound of characters that make up one lexical item. Because of these complications, I decided to treat each distinct orthographic element in the text as an equal element and delete the element regardless of how many syllables it represented or whether it was a Chinese character or *kana* graph. For example, the *bunesetu* "*watashi-wa*" is composed of two orthographic elements: one Chinese character for "*watashi*" and one *hiragana* graph for "*wa*." The last half of the *bunsetsu* ("*wa*") would thus be deleted.

Several other methods could have been used in adapting the C-test to Japanese. Instead of using a mixture of *kana* and Chinese characters, I could have transliterated the passages into *kana* so that phonetic syllables in each *bunsetsu* could be omitted. I decided against this method because it would have encouraged learners to write only in *kana*, which would have made it difficult to discern differences between learners who knew Chinese characters in L1 and L2 and those who did not. It would have also made the test unnatural, because only books for children are

written solely in *kana*. An important principle of the C-test is that passages be as natural as possible. Another choice would have been to romanise the Japanese passages, which would have revealed all the phonetic components of each *bunsetsu*. Romanisation is commonly used in Japanese language education in Australia, and to a lesser degree in Europe and North America. The textbook used in the first two years of education at the University of Sydney uses romanisation, so the learners who participated in this research project would have had no difficulty reading romanised Japanese. They were taught *kana* and Chinese characters in a separate reading class in the first two years. I decided against romanisation because it would have made the test even more unnatural than using only *kana* and it would have made it impossible to determine how proficiency in Chinese characters affects language proficiency. Romanisation might have made it easier cognitively for learners to complete the C-test because they had extensive previous exposure to romanised Japanese. I decided, however, that using mixed Japanese script was not a problem because the learners had sufficient exposure to it by the middle of the third year when the data were collected. Using mixed script would also generate information on the effect of L1 and L2 background on the processing of *kana* and Chinese characters (Chikamatsu 1996).

The C-test in this study was composed of four passages with a total of 100 deletions. I selected passages about subjects that learners had most likely been exposed to in written Japanese at some point and ensured that each included different tenses and a variety of honorifics and formulaic expressions. The topics were: cherry blossom season in Tokyo (third person, present tense, 16 deletions), daily routine (first person, present tense, 31 deletions), reflections on a part-time job (first person, present and past tense, 24 deletions), letter of invitation (first person, present tense,

29 deletions). The passages were taken from a textbook for learners of Japanese, which contained only those Chinese characters among the 500 most frequently used characters. About 2,000 Chinese characters are used commonly used in Japanese.

Learners in the Japanese program at the University of Sydney were introduced to the 500 most frequently used characters by the third year of instruction. Proficiency in reading and writing, however, varied greatly among learners because learners with Chinese as an L1 or L2 may know many more characters, depending on when they came to Australia. Some Korean learners may also know more Chinese characters depending on when they came to Australia and on their educational background because Chinese characters are also taught in Korea. All learners from other language backgrounds started out learning Chinese characters when they started to learn Japanese at the University of Sydney.

3.2.2.3. Discourse Completion Task (DCT)

Although recent research (Hinkel 1997, Thomas 1996, Rose 1994) has raised questions about the validity of DCTs, I chose the DCT for this study so that the data could be compared with previous interlanguage speech act realisation studies based on DCTs (e.g., studies in Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989; studies review in Kasper and Dahl 1991). Mulamba's (1991) study of speech act realisation in trilinguals, the only such study to date, is based entirely on DCTs. Instead of using DCTs as a measure of spoken language production, I decided to use the DCT as a measure of sociolinguistic competency, and the accompanying written introspection as a measure of metalinguistic awareness of sociolinguistic norms in Japanese. Thus, instead of revealing what learners might actually say in a given situation, I interpreted

DCTs as providing useful information on their knowledge of sociolinguistic norms and perceptions of these norms. This clearly does not involve acceptance of Kasper and Dahl's (1991) argument that DCTs elicit linguistic production data. Using DCTs also allowed me to compare my findings with studies on Japanese native-speaker norms and on sociolinguistic transfer in Japanese.

Critics of DCTs have noted a variety of weaknesses in the use of DCTs in previous research. The most common complaint (Hinkel 1997, Thomas 1996) is that they are not a valid measure of verbal linguistic production in the situation given. Hinkel (1997) and Rose (1994) argue that DCTs are suspect because subjects may not interpret the situation as the researcher intends. They suggest that providing multiple-choice responses provides a more accurate measure of how subjects index speech act realisation, which offers insight into how they would realise speech acts in a given situation. Thomas (1996) argues that DCTs force learners into unnatural roles (i.e., pretending to be the opposite sex) and force them to realise a speech act in one distinct turn.

Using DCTs to study interlanguage Japanese is particularly problematic because of the important role that gestures and *aizuchi*, short utterances that the hearer interjects to show interest in the conversation, in speech act realisation (LoCastro 1987). The lack of such interaction makes native speakers of Japanese feel as if they have made a mistake or have offended their interlocutor. Another problem with using DCTs on Japanese is that Japanese speakers often take a visual clue from their interlocutor before speaking. In cases such as an apology, the interlocutor often speaks first or offers a visual sign that the apology will be accepted before it is offered verbally. These tendencies are by no means unique to Japanese, but they have a strong influence over Japanese verbal interaction that affects the

validity of DCTs as tests of linguistic production. In this study, some native-speaker informants mentioned that they felt uncomfortable with the DCT because they did not have enough visual information about their interlocutor or the situation.

The mixed system of writing in Japanese also causes difficulties in constructing and interpreting DCTs. Responses can be written in *kana* only, mixed writing (*kana* and Chinese-characters), and *romaji* (Roman letters). As in the case of the C-test, I offered learners the option of writing exclusively in *kana* or in any mixture of *kana* and Chinese characters that they felt comfortable with. This was a good compromise because it freed learners to focus on coming up with an appropriate response while providing some insight into how knowledge of Chinese characters influences learner responses.

Each of the eight situations was designed to elicit data on sociolinguistic competence in the speech acts: asking for permission, refusals, invitations, making promises, apologies, expressing thanks, expressing opinions, and requests. The situations were taken from everyday life in Sydney and were described in more detail than in most DCTs. The detail was necessary to give learners as much information as possible on the communicative frame in which the situation was set. All the situations omitted the hearer's response so as not to prejudice the results. All the situations were checked for naturalness and appropriateness with people who had lived most of their lives in Australia. An introspection section, which will be discussed later, was added at the end of each situation for optional learner introspection. Table 16 shows an example of one of the DCT situations used in this study.

Table 16. Example of a DCT Situation

(Learners read the situation and write responses in space given)

1. You have to write a cover letter to send your resume in response to an advertisement for a good job. You need to finish the cover letter tonight, but don't have a computer. The public computer room at your university is closed at this time. You ring a Japanese friend who has a computer and a printer, and after exchanging greetings, you ask him or her to let you use his or her computer.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

_____

In addition to reinterpreting the DCT as a measure of sociolinguistic competence, I made several other changes that were designed to overcome previous limitations of DCTs. First, I gave learners the choice of opting out if they did not want to, or normally would not, say anything in the given frame. Second, I asked learners to decide the sex of the interlocutor in each situation because sex affects sociolinguistic norms in Japanese. Allowing learners to choose the sex of their interlocutor also reveals individual views of roles of men and women in certain situations, which can then be interpreted as transfer of L1 or L2 sociolinguistic and sociocultural norms to the given frame. These choices can then be correlated with previous language background to reveal patterns of sociocultural transfer. This is important because in many cultures, the word "friend" is associated with same-sex friends. Choosing the sex of their interlocutor may have encouraged learners to think of someone they knew while completing the task. This contrasts with the method

used in studies in Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989) in which the name and sex of the interlocutor were given in the situation.

3.2.2.4. Discourse Evaluation Task (DET)

The DET was designed to elicit data on listening comprehension proficiency and perception of various sociolinguistic forms and sociocultural norms in speech realisation between two native speakers of Japanese. Exploring learner perceptions of native-speaker sociolinguistic norms provides valuable information on how they use their existing linguistic and world knowledge to interpret and communicate in various frames of interaction in Japanese. O'Malley, Chamot, and Küpper (1989), for example, found that learners who draw on their existing world knowledge to listening comprehension understand more than learners who focus on particular lexical items. With reading, Steffensen (1986) found that different schemata in American and Indian readers affected their comprehension of an English text.

The DET is a new instrument designed for this study. It is, however based on the instrument used in Koike's (1989) study of oral comprehension of Spanish speech acts by English-speaking learners of Spanish in the United States. Koike's study is one of the few studies that investigated the link between learners' understanding of speech act frames and subsequent production of speech acts. In describing one of his hypotheses, Koike stated, "The hypothesis here is that learners readily recognize speech act frames, which serve as a kind of 'advance organizer' and prepare learners to interpret the rest of what they will hear" (1989: 282). The DET was included in this study because information on how learners perceive speech act frames is critical to discerning possible causes of transfer in speech act realisation.

The DET consisted of six short speech-act dialogues followed by questions in English about the relationship between the speakers and the type of language (e.g., informal, male, female, etc.) used in the dialogue. Each dialogue included one of the following speech acts: invitations, expressing thanks, expressing disagreement, making promises, apologies, requests, and expressing emotion. Some of these speech acts were the same speech acts that appeared in the DCT, which allowed the results from the two instruments to be compared. Other speech acts, such as expressing emotion, were used because these speech acts are more frequent in informal speech levels than formal ones in Japanese. They also made it possible to test learner perceptions of informal speech levels. As with the DCT, an optional introspection section followed the questions after each situation. Each dialogue was between a man and a woman. The dialogues were proofread and recorded by two native-speaker tutors of Japanese at the University of Sydney. Table 17 shows an example DET dialogue and questions.

Table 17. Example of a DET Dialogue and Questions

Script and Questions for Dialogue 1

(Learners hear the following conversation)
W: 映画の切符が二枚あるんでが、いっしょに行きませんか。
M: いいですね。
W: 今晩はどうですか。
M: じゃ、5時半に大丸デパートの前で会いましょう。

(Learners hear the following questions)

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is another way of saying いっしょに行きませんか in Japanese?
3. What is a more informal form of 会いましょう in Japanese?

Answer Sheet for Dialogue 1 (Learners see the following answer sheet and fill in responses)

Dialogue 1: 'Let's go to the cinema'

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

_____

Choosing dialogues for this instrument was difficult because the Japanese programme at the University of Sydney did not emphasise speaking and listening proficiency and because most learners had not spent much time in Japan. Thus, passages at natural speed and with extended dialogue or a series of honorific constructions might have been too difficult for learners to understand. My purpose in this task was to capture general listening ability and learner perceptions of sociolinguisic norms instead of discrete points of honorific usage. I decided that simple dialogues that revealed common sociolinguistic norms would make it possible for most learners to complete the tasks.

The dialogues were taken from an introductory Japanese conversation textbook written by native-speaker teachers of Japanese at Hokkaido University in Sapporo, Japan. Because the dialogues were short and simple in grammatical structure, and slightly slower than natural speed, some native-speaker informants felt

that they were unnatural. To have used completely natural dialogues would have made the task much more difficult and might have made it too difficult for most learners to answer the questions. Even so, some learners found the simplified dialogues too difficult. Learners in the pilot study generally understood the dialogues, but had trouble answering the questions after each dialogue. Accordingly, I was forced to compromise between the need to obtain responses to natural input and the need to ensure that the instruments elicited valid and usable data.

3.2.2.5. Short Writing Task (SWT)

The SWT was designed to elicit data on language in production under relatively natural conditions. This instrument was important to the overall research design because of the lack of natural spoken data in the sample. Although writing differs considerably from speaking, writing provides important insight into learner sociolinguistic competence in language production and into interlanguage rhetorical patterns. The findings from this instrument can be used to validate results on language proficiency and sociolinguistic transfer. Findings can also be compared with research on cross-cultural rhetoric (Hinds and Jenkins 1987; see studies in Connor and Kaplan 1987 and studies in Purves 1988) to deduce patterns of sociolinguistic and rhetorical transfer.

As Coulmas (1989) noted, people in East Asia have traditionally placed importance on the power of the written word, which places a heavy burden on the writer to use sociolinguistically appropriate forms in a socioculturally appropriate rhetorical structure. For the present research project, investigating interlanguage writing offers insight into possible sources of sociolinguistic transfer into L≥3

Japanese. It also helps reveal the role of prior knowledge of Chinese characters in producing written Japanese. Differences in Chinese character proficiency can also be used to verify results from other instruments such as the C-test and the DCT.

To ensure that results would be comparable across the sample, I decided to give all learners the same topic. I asked learners to write a short note to their Japanese teacher apologising for not being able to keep an appointment. The description was detailed so that learners were given adequate knowledge of the communicative frame. I chose the student-teacher relationship because all learners were familiar with this relationship and had been exposed to the types of honorifics that would be appropriate for speaking or writing to their teacher. Experience of speaking and writing to teachers, however, varied among the learners. In the instructions, I mentioned that learners were free to write as much or as little as they wished. This was to encourage learners to write only what they wanted to write without feeling pressure to fill the entire page. I also included an introspection section similar to those in the DCT and the DET at the bottom of the page. This will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

In the pilot study, I gave the short writing task as homework and collected it the following week because I did not want to take up class time for the task. Learners were allowed to use dictionaries and other reference material. Though learners were pleased to have the extra time to finish the task, the results did not reflect spontaneous performance. For the main study, I decided to give the task to learners in one sitting with an informal time limit and to prevent them from using dictionaries or reference material. This helped make the results more indicative of existing Japanese language proficiency and provided information on how learners

from different L1, L2, and other L≥3 backgrounds dealt with sociolinguistic norms and Chinese characters under time pressure.

3.2.3. Written Introspection

Three instruments in this study--the DCT, the DET, and the SWT--contained sections for a written introspection. I worded the instructions so that learners felt free to write whatever they wanted, or nothing at all. The introspection was designed to gather information not only on what the learners might have been thinking as they completed the task, but also on their subjective opinions on their language learning, the data collection instruments, or anything else that they wanted to write. This information can be used in the quantitative analysis to show, for example, strategies learners used in solving the tasks and learner perceptions of Japanese sociolinguistic norms. A similar type of written introspection has been used in studies based on C-tests in the Modern Languages Research Project at Trinity College Dublin (e.g., Singleton 1999; Singleton and Little 1991).

Matsumoto (1993) outlined a variety of methods to gather verbal reports and introspective data. The written introspections used in this research belong to the category of task based on retrospective reports. I decided against using concurrent verbal reports in this research for several reasons. First, I did not want to place excessive demand on learners' time because all learners in this study were volunteers. Second, I did not want to place an excessive cognitive burden on learners during the task because this may have affected the results. Chinese characters are difficult for many learners (and even native speakers of Japanese) to write, and adding another

cognitive burden might have caused some learners to write in *kana* instead of Chinese characters.

3.3. Procedure

3.3.1. Background

All learners who volunteered to participate in this project were asked to sign a consent form before the data collection began. Learners were given an information sheet that described the project and the estimated time that each of the data elicitation instruments would take.

Several lecturers and tutors in the Japanese programme were asked to help with the data gathering process because they were more familiar with learner class schedules and could, depending on the instrument, integrate some of the instruments into their teaching syllabus. They could also arrange for make-up sessions for those learners who missed one or more sessions. Including lecturers and tutors in the research project also gave me a chance to discuss learner reaction to the instruments with people who knew the learners for most, if not all, of the three-year program.

3.3.2. Data Collection

The following table summarises the data collection procedures for each of the instruments.

Table 18. Overview of Data Collection Procedures

Instrument	Questionnaire	C-Test	DCT	DET	SWT
Place	home	after-class 1 sitting	after-class 1 sitting	in-class, 4 sittings	after class, 1 sitting
Time	no limit	25-30 min.	20-30 min.	7-9 min. each sitting	20-30 min.

Learners were requested to complete the questionnaire at home and give it to one of their lectures one week later. They were informed in advance that it would take about 20 to 30 minutes. Although this method included the risk that some learners would not return questionnaires, I wanted to give learners the chance to answer the questions at their own pace and to reflect on their answers if need be. Having learners complete the questionnaire in a group would have meant the imposition of an additional group session on teacher and learner time. The other instruments--the C-test, the DCT, the DET, and the short writing task--were administered in group or class sessions in classrooms at the University of Sydney.

The C-test was administered in one group session after class. The C-test was expected to take 25 minutes, but because some learners found it difficult, they were given five more minutes. Although learners had never been given a C-test before, the instructions were generally clear. Learners in the pilot study completed the C-test at home without dictionaries because I could not take time away from their class to conduct the test in class. This was not satisfactory because I could not monitor the test and because learners were not under pressure to fill in as many blanks as possible.

The DCT was administered in one group session after class. Learners were given roughly 20 minutes to complete the task. Some learners were confused about why they were asked to write what they would say, an indication that learners were well aware of the differences in sociolinguistic form between spoken and written Japanese. I responded to such questions by saying that the instrument was designed to elicit information on spoken language, and I asked them to imagine that they were speaking to the person or persons described in the situation. This concern could also be a sign of transfer of sociocultural expectations because many of the learners in the study were from East Asian (Chinese and Korean) cultural backgrounds. Except for confusion about how to write verbal responses, learners found the instructions on the DCT and the introspection easy to understand. Learners were not allowed to use dictionaries or other reference material during this task.

The DET was administered in-class once for four weeks as a listening comprehension exercise. It took a total of about 30 minutes over the four weeks. The lecturers played two dialogues during each class session and gave learners as much time as they needed to answer the questions on the answer sheet provided. The answer sheets were collected and distributed to learners again during the next class session. The learners found the instructions easy to understand and the dialogues similar in difficulty to what they had encountered in their textbooks and in classroom listening activities.

The SWT was administered in one group session after class. Learners were given 20 minutes to complete the activity, but those who needed more time were allowed to take five to ten extra minutes. Learners were not allowed to use dictionaries or other reference material during this task. Learners found the situation

natural and the instructions easy to follow, which contrasts with the negative feelings that some learners had towards the DCT.

3.4. Analysis

The method of analysis used in this thesis is composed of two levels: quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative level was used to provide a statistical summary of the results and to show relationships and correlations among groups and variables. A statistical summary is useful in this study because of the number of subjects and linguistic, cognitive, and affective variables, such as Japanese and L2 and other L≥3 proficiency, use of honorifics, and length of time spent in Japan. It also provides a clear and accessible picture of the data on which the qualitative analysis was based.

The qualitative analysis consists of a presentation of learner responses to the tasks and a discussion of elements in the data that appear to relate to learners' L1 and L2 in the light of Japanese sociolinguistic norms. The discussion also refers extensively to learner introspections on the various tasks. This combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis gives a detailed picture of sources of sociolinguistic transfer and the metalinguistic views of Japanese sociolinguistic norms that inform learner decisions on what is transferable in Japanese frames of interaction.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I will combine a presentation of the results and a discussion of their significance under four categories: language proficiency, language transfer and perceptions of Japanese, sociolinguistic proficiency, and sociolinguistic transfer. Each section will begin with a presentation of the results from learners and native-speaker informants followed by a discussion and conclusions. The order of the sections is designed to follow the order of ideas and questions raised in the hypotheses posed in this thesis. To focus the discussion on questions that relate directly to the hypotheses, a thematic organisation for this chapter was chosen over the traditional results-followed-by-discussion format.

4.2. Japanese Language Proficiency

The main instrument used to analyse language proficiency was the C-test. However, other instruments used and information gathered here can be used to measure proficiency, and thereby to check the validity of the C-test as a gauge of proficiency. The DCT, the DET, and the SWT can be used as measurements of overall volume and Chinese character use, two indirect indications of proficiency. From the questionnaire, self-evaluation of language proficiency and other responses can also be used to measure language proficiency. Class grades could also have been used, but because the Japanese language programme at the University of Sydney

emphasised grammar and reading, such information would have provided a somewhat skewed picture of proficiency. With the C-test as the main measure of proficiency, I decided that I did not need to pry too deeply to get personal information on learner past performance in Japanese class at the University of Sydney. This information would be useful in evaluating the Japanese programme, but this is not one of the goals of the present research project.

4.2.1. The C-test

As noted in Chapter 3, research on the C-test has shown it to be a valid measure of global language proficiency. Although this is the first study to use the C-test as a measure of proficiency in Japanese, results from this study found the C-test to be a valid measure of language proficiency. Descriptive statistics for the C-test are described in Table 19 below. The total number of deletions was 100, with each deletion counting as 1% of the total score.

Table 19. Learner C-test Descriptive Statistics

Statistic	Composite	#1	#2	#3	#4
Number of Characters		157	272	192	286
Number of Deletions	100	16	31	24	29
Percent correct	36%	40.6%	25.8%	41.6%	37.9%
Mean	36.458	6.417	9.292	9.625	11.500
Median	36.500	6.500	8.00	10.00	11.000
Standard Deviation	10.823	2.518	3.884	2.568	3.718
Range	41.00	10.00	16.00	9.00	18.00
Maximum	61.00	11.00	20.00	14.00	22.00
Minimum	20.00	1.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
Skewness	.981	.196	1.134	-.031	.830
Kurtosis	.734	-.189	1.142	-1.193	2.077

Several issues are of concern here. First, the mean of 36.458 is relatively low out a perfect score of 100. Such a low mean could yield relatively flat results that do not distinguish significant differences in proficiency among the learners. This concern is balanced by a relatively large standard deviation of 10.823 and the relatively wide range of 41, from a maximum of 61 to a minimum of 20. The median (36.500) and the mean (36.458) are close; the skewness is .891, and the kurtosis .734. Skewness indicates the degree to the distribution of scores is shifted toward one of the tails, thus deviating from a normal distribution. Kurtosis is the degree to which the curve in the middle of the distribution deviates from a curve in normal distribution by being peaked or flat. Skewness and kurtosis figures in a perfectly normal distribution would be zero; the figures here indicate that the pattern of distribution is skewed to toward the lower end the distribution and that the peak of the curve is somewhat higher than in a normal distribution. This shows that the test yielded a distribution that, while not an ideal normal distribution, differentiates significantly among the learners.

Statistics for each of the passages need to be treated with caution because the number of deletions is relatively small in each passage. This problem is compounded by the small sample size in this study. Under such conditions, one response that deviates considerably from the mean could skew the overall results in one direction. Though the skewness for Passage 3 and the kurtosis figures for Passage 1 are closest to an ideal normal distribution, the composite score for all four passages is more reliable because the greater number of test items (100 deletions) yields a more balanced score.

Correlating the results of each of the four passages and with the composite score is one way to check whether the variation in descriptive statistics discussed

above affected the validity of the composite score negatively. Correlation for each of the four passages of the C-test shows that each passage correlated well with the others and with the composite score for all four passages. Of the four passages, Passage 4 showed the strongest positive correlation with the composite score at .8886 ($p<.01$) and Passage 3 showed the weakest positive correlation with the composite score at .6323 ($p<.01$). All of the other passages correlated positively with each other at the $p<.01$ level of significance, except Passage 3, which correlated with Passage 2 at .4387 and Passage 4 at .4987, both at $p<.05$. The following table shows correlation statistics for the four passages.

Table 20. Correlation of Learner C-test Results

	Composite	#1	#2	#3	#4
Composite	1.000	.7984**	.8635**	.6323**	.8886**
#1	.7984**	1.000	.5561**	.5229**	.7291**
#2	.8635**	.5561**	1.000	.4387*	.6397**
#3	.6323**	.5229**	.4387*	1.000	.4987*
#4	.8886**	.7291**	.6397**	.4987*	1.000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

The strong positive correlation among the four passages and with the composite score for all four passages indicates that each passage was valid and that the integrity of the test was strong. With the C-test, if the difficulty of or the genre of the language used in the passages varies, the results among passages might vary considerably, which would make it difficult to decide which passage is a more accurate reflection of overall language proficiency. Of the C-test passages in this study, Passage 3 correlates somewhat less positively with the other passages and with

the composite score, but it still correlates positively with the other passages and the composite score. A look at the means for each passage (Table 20) shows that learners performed best on Passage 3 and worst on Passage 2. The large number of deletions in Passage 2, however, pulled down the average for the entire test, which explains why the high score on Passage 3 correlated least positively with the overall score and with Passage 2 in particular. These findings suggest that a better balance in terms of the number of deletions among the four passages is important to maintaining the integrity of the test. The imbalance here did not affect the validity of the test, but it could in other situations.

Results for the C-test by L1 and L2 language group reveal several important patterns. First, with regard to crosstabulations by L1 group, we find that the mean of composite scores was highest for native speakers of Korean at 47.5, and lowest for the native speaker of Czech at 25.0. Native speakers of Chinese languages (Cantonese, Mandarin, etc.) and native speakers of English had similar means: 37.5 and 35.67, respectively. Though there were only two native speakers of Korean in the sample, their high scores indicate that Korean speakers in the sample outperformed all other L1 groups by a wide margin. In looking at learners by L2 group, which did not include any learners of Korean as an L2, the means were similar among all groups, except the Arabic group, which was composed of one learner. Table 21 presents descriptive statistics for learners by language group.

Table 21. C-test Statistics by L1 and L2 Group

Group	Lang	N	Mean	Std Dev	Range	Max	Min
L1	Korean	2	47.5	14.849	21	58	37
	Chinese	8	37.5	11.199	38	61	23
	English	12	35.666	10.066	39	59	20
	Sinhala	1	27.0	--	--	--	--
	Czech	1	25.0	--	--	--	--
L2							
	Japanese**	3	40.0	13.515	22	59	37
	French	2	39.0	1.414	2	40	38
	English	9	37.0	13.784	35	58	23
	Italian	3	37.0	5.291	10	41	31
	Latin	1	36.0	--	--	--	--
	German	2	30.0	9.899	14	37	23
	Chinese*	2	28.5	6.3640	10	43	34
	Arabic	1	20.0	--	--	--	--

*Includes speakers who have a Chinese language other than Mandarin as an L1.

**Learners of Japanese as an L2 who had no other L2.

The strong performance of native speakers of Korean in the L1 group and the lack of variation among the L2 groups shows that Koreans performed better than all other L1 and L2 language groups by a wide margin. The problem here is that the Korean L1 group is composed of only two learners, one who received a 58%, the third highest composite score on the C-test of all learners, and another who received a 37%, only 0.5% above the mean composite score of 36.458%. Still, both members of the Korean L1 group performed higher than the median for the entire group of learners. No other L1 language group of any size matched this achievement.

For native speakers, the C-test should yield near perfect scores to validate a perfect score as a measurement of native-speaker proficiency. The same C-test that

learners took was administered to the 10 native-speaker informants, which yielded the results described in Table 22.

Table 22. Native Speaker C-test Descriptive Statistics

Statistic	Composite	#1	#2	#3	#4
Number of Characters		157	272	192	286
Number of Deletions	100	16	31	24	29
Percent correct	93.75%	94.8%	91.7%	92.4%	96.3%
Mean	93.750	15.167	28.417	22.167	27.917
Median	95.000	15.000	29.000	23.000	28.000
Mode	96.000	16.000	29.000	23.000	28.000
Standard Deviation	3.415	.835	.609	1.528	1.084
Range	10.000	2.000	7.000	5.000	3.000
Maximum	98.000	16.000	31.000	24.000	29.000
Minimum	88.000	14.000	24.000	19.000	26.000
Skewness	-.714	-.354	-1.012	-.701	-.837
Kurtosis	-.973	-1.447	.849	-.185	-.238

With a mean score of 93.75% of the 100 deletions filled in correctly, the results showed that native speakers do achieve a near perfect score on the C-test. Indeed, seven of the 10 native speakers scored 95% or higher on the test. The three native-speakers who scored 88% and 89% lowered the average of the entire group. The small standard deviation of 3.415 on a mean of 93.750 is very low, which shows that the test produced little differentiation among native speakers. These results are desirable because native speakers should have consistent near-perfect scores to confirm that a near-perfect score on the C-test is equal to native-speaker competence.

The results show a few possible problems with the C-test. The three scores in the high 80% range are slightly lower than is expected of native speakers. Lack of

familiarity with the C-test and the limited use of Chinese characters in the passages might have confused these respondents, which could have caused them to make errors that do not reflect their language proficiency. Another issue that may have caused these lower scores is varying levels of literacy in Japanese. Although Japan reports a near 100% literacy rate, proficiency in Chinese characters, particularly in writing Chinese characters, varies with age and level of educational attainment. A lower level of proficiency in Chinese characters combined with lack of familiarity with the C-test can thus cause some native speakers to perform below the 90% level. While this does not invalidate the C-test as a measure of language proficiency, it suggests that researchers need to take as much care in administering the C-test to native speakers as in administering it to non-native speakers.

By passage, the results for native speakers differed somewhat from those for the learners, which raises questions about the validity of the test. A correlation of each of the four passages with the composite scores yields the following pattern:

Table 23. Correlation of Native Speaker C-test Results

	Composite	#1	#2	#3	#4
Composite	1.0000	.2073	.7102**	.6362*	.6327*
#1	.2073	1.0000	-.0430	-.0950	.0167
#2	.7102**	-.0430	1.0000	.0894	.2155
#3	.6362*	-.0950	.0894	1.0000	.3936
#4	.6327*	.0167	.2155	.3936	1.0000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

Of the four passages, only Passage 2 showed a similar pattern between native speakers and learners. It was the most difficult test for both groups, but correlated

positively with the composite score for both groups. For the native speakers, Passage 2 correlated most significantly with the composite score at .7140 ($p<.01$); for the learners, it correlated second most significantly at .8635 ($p<.01$), which is only slightly below the significance level for Passage 4 at .8886. The biggest difference between the native speakers and learners was in the result for Passage 1. For native speakers, this passage correlated positively, but not significantly with the composite score at .2073, and (barely) with Passage 4 at .0167. With Passages 2 and 3, the correlation was negative. For the learners, however, they correlated positively and significantly with the composite score and with the other three passages on the test. The reason for this pattern is the same as that for the learners: the mean score on Passage 2, the passage with the largest number of deletions was the lowest, which pulled the average for the entire test down. This suggests that Passage 2 was the most difficult passage for both groups and that greater balance among the passages, while not necessarily changing the results, might have yielded greater statistical consistency among the four passages.

Another way to look at the C-test is do an item-by-item analysis that compares responses and type of item (lexical item, grammatical particle, or a combination of both) with variables such as L1 background, or overall C-test score. I will report on the results of analysis in the section on language transfer because they are more relevant to that discussion than they are here.

4.2.2. Other Proficiency Measures

The other measures of proficiency used in this study are more subjective and indirect that than the C-test. These include self-evaluation of language proficiency and data

taken based on results from the other data elicitation instruments used in the study. Results presented in this section will be compared with results from the C-test and discussed in the following section.

4.2.2.1. Self-evaluation of Japanese Proficiency

Self-evaluation is frequently used on questionnaires to get a rough approximation of learner language proficiency. Any self-evaluation, however, reveals what learners think about and how they perceive their language proficiency. As such, it is inherently subjective. Subjectivity does not necessarily decrease the importance of such information, but it does mean that such data should be treated with caution, particularly when a valid measure of language proficiency is available. With Japanese, the issue of self-evaluation of language proficiency is complicated by a number of linguistic and cultural factors that affect learner self-perception in divergent ways. Among these, learner views of and proficiency in Chinese characters and familiarity with Japanese culture may cause learners to under- or overestimate their proficiency in certain areas of language.

Results of self-evaluation of language proficiency were taken from the Language Learning Experience Questionnaire. The questionnaire, which is presented in full in Appendix B, asked learners to describe their language proficiency in five areas (speaking, listening, reading, writing, translating) on a five-point scale (1 for the lowest proficiency; 5 for the highest proficiency) using the terms, in descending order of proficiency, "excellent," "good," "average," "basic," "poor." Translation was included in the traditional four categories because I particularly wanted to see how native speakers of Chinese and Korean answered the question,

and the Japanese programme at the University of Sydney included some practice in translation. Crosstabulated by L1 and L2 group, the results of self-evaluation of proficiency mirrored those of the C-test, as shown in Table 24.

Table 24. Self-Evaluation by L1 and L2 Group

Group	Language	N	Mean	Std Dev
Overall		24	2.641	.621
L1	Korean	2	3.6	.283
	English	12	2.65	.592
	Chinese	8	2.6	.478
	Sinhala	1	2.0	--
	Czech	1	1.6	--
L2				
	French	1	2.8	--
	Japanese**	3	2.75	.444
	Italian	3	2.733	.702
	Chinese*	2	2.6	.283
	Arabic	1	2.6	--
	English	9	2.55	.733
	German	2	2.4	.000
	Latin	2	1.9	.707

The Korean native speakers as a group evidenced the highest evaluation of their proficiency, and the Czech native speaker the lowest, which is exactly the same result as yielded by the C-test. Both native speakers of Korean rated their proficiency at a higher level than the mean for the group. And their range of scores was relatively small at 0.4. Native speakers of Chinese and English again showed very similar results, but, in contrast to the C-test results, English speakers produced a slightly higher score than Chinese speakers. The L2 groups were similar to each other in

their self-evaluations. Of all groups, the learner of French as an L2 gave the highest rating of her Japanese at 2.8. The three learners who were learning Japanese as an L2 rated their Japanese fairly high (2.75), but this figure was actually only slightly higher than that supplied by the L2 learners of Italian (2.73), the next ranking group.

Though the overall pattern of self-evaluations based on L1 was similar to that of results from the C-test, the two measures do not have a significant positive correlation. Results from the two measures correlate positively at .2492, but this is not statistically significant at the $p<.05$ or .01 levels. The weak positive correlation suggests that self-evaluation of proficiency is a predictor of broad trends in C-test performance, but that it is not a statistically valid in predicting the C-test results or in evaluating proficiency. The lack of a clear trend among L2 groups indicates that, at least according to this measure, L2 background did not play an important role in determining how learners evaluated their Japanese proficiency. The two learners in the Chinese L2 group were native speakers of another Chinese language, so these results do not reflect how learners of Chinese as an L2 with a non-Chinese L1 would rate their Japanese proficiency.

One of reasons for the discrepancy between the C-test results and self-evaluation could be the tendency of Asian learners to be modest in evaluating their own language proficiency. The competitive educational system in which members of the educated elite have high proficiency in at least one foreign language no doubt has some influence on how learners evaluate their proficiency compared with others in society. More research on self-evaluation of proficiency among Asian learners is needed to determine how such socio-cultural factors affect self-evaluation of proficiency. Another reason is that native speakers of Chinese and Korean who know Chinese characters focus on the difficulties that they have with Japanese usage

of Chinese characters, which causes them to be slightly more critical of their proficiency in evaluating reading and writing than learners from other groups. A comparison between native speakers of Chinese and English as shown in Table 25, shows that Chinese speakers evaluate themselves higher than English speakers in reading, writing, and translating, whereas English speakers evaluate themselves higher than Chinese speakers in listening and speaking.

Table 25. Comparison of Average Self-Evaluation between Native Speakers of English and Chinese

Group	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing	Translating
Chinese	1.86	2.00	3.25	3.00	3.00
English	2.66	2.83	2.58	2.41	2.76

This suggests that Chinese learners are more confident of their reading and writing ability than English speakers, but that they might not be confident enough to evaluate proficiency at a valid level or that the English speakers evaluated their speaking and listening ability too high. Taken together, these factors help explain why self-evaluation does not show a statistically significant correlation with the C-test.

I included translation as a fifth skill in the questionnaire because the curriculum at the University of Sydney included a number of translation activities. Translation is arguably a fifth skill because the boundary between comprehension and production is much more difficult to define in translation than it is in the traditional four-skill paradigm. I also wanted to see how learners with and without knowledge of Chinese characters viewed translation compared to the traditional four

skills. This information also provides additional confirmation of how knowledge of Chinese characters affects learners' views of their translation proficiency.

Results showed that the average self-evaluation for Chinese speakers in respect of translation was only 0.24 higher than that for English speakers. Though this higher result was expected given the importance of Chinese characters in Japanese, the gap in self-evaluation of proficiency between Chinese and English native speakers was the smallest of the five skill areas. Results from introspection sections on the DCT, the DET, and the SWT, which will be discussed in greater detail in Section 4.4, showed that native speakers of English are more sensitive to difficulty and concerned about sociolinguistic appropriateness than non-English speakers. This indicates that native speakers of English have stronger metalinguistic awareness than non-English speaking learners do. With translation, metalinguistic sensitivity could give English speakers greater confidence in dealing with tasks that they have had extensive practice with in the classroom, or that translation activities could have helped English learners develop more metalinguistic awareness than Chinese learners who drew on their native language to process and produce Chinese-character-based lexical items in Japanese.

4.2.2.2. DCT and SWT Chinese Character Density

Another measure of language proficiency is an evaluation of learner responses to the DCT, the DET, and the SWT. Because all of the data concerned are written, they yield more information about writing and, to a lesser extent, reading proficiency than they do about speaking and listening. Two objective measures of proficiency from responses to these instruments is volume, or the number of characters (*kana* and

Chinese characters), and "Chinese-character density," the percentage of Chinese characters (some of which may be repeated) of the total number of characters in any given text. Of the three instruments, the DCT and the SWT were selected because they elicited enough writing to analyse and were the most open-ended. Volume and Chinese character results for these two instruments are given in Table 26.

Table 26. Writing Volume and Chinese-Character Density for the DCT and the SWT by L1 Group

	DCT Vol*	DCT Kanji Vol	Density	SWT Vol	SWT Kanji Vol	Density
Overall	258.62	28.29	10.93%	95.54	22.79	23.85%
Chinese	254.5	48.5	19.06%	98.0	31.7	32.35%
Czech	245.0	18.0	7.34%	0.0	0.0	0.0%
English	248.25	16.0	6.45%	95.0	13.83	14.56%
Korean	400.5	38.5	9.61%	154.5	45.5	29.45%
Sinhala	146.0	4.0	2.74%	60.0	8.0	13.33%

*Total volume for the eight situations given on the DCT.

The above pattern of results for DCT volume is similar to that of the C-test in that Korean native speakers outperformed all other groups by a wide margin and in that native speakers of Chinese outperformed English speakers by a narrow margin. Indeed, results for volume correlate significantly with those of the C-test at .6580 at $p<.01$. This indicates that the volume of writing is a valid predictor of C-test performance. Volume from the SWT showed the same pattern and correlated even more significantly with scores from the C-test at .7997 at $p<.01$.

Results from an analysis of Chinese-character use on the C-test are more variable than results for the test as a whole. This is no doubt because many native

speakers of Chinese already had substantial proficiency in Chinese characters and thus made greater use of them in responses. All the Chinese native speakers in this study received their primary and secondary education in Chinese, which indicates that they are highly proficient in Chinese characters. In the pilot study, however, some native speakers of Chinese had immigrated to Australia in their teens and were bilingual in English and Chinese, but not proficient in reading and writing Chinese characters. Thus, using Chinese characters as a measure of L1 proficiency is only valid for those native speakers of Chinese who have completed most of their primary and secondary education in Chinese, or who have reached sufficient literacy in Chinese through private study or home education.

Results from the DCT indicate that Chinese learners outperformed all other groups in overall volume of characters and even more so in Chinese-character density, or the percentage of characters in total volume. Results from the SWT indicate that Korean native speakers used a greater total number of Chinese characters, but that Chinese learners used a higher percentage of Chinese characters. In terms of density of Chinese character use, however, the gap between Chinese and Korean native speakers was smaller in SWT (32.35% versus 29.45%) than in the DCT (19.06% versus 9.61%).

These findings lead to an important question: which is a better indicator of performance on the C-test, total volume, or the number of Chinese characters? Results from correlation of the two items, which are given in Table 27, indicate that volume is a more accurate indicator of C-test performance.

Table 27. Correlation of C-test, Writing Volume, and Chinese-Character (Kanji) Volume for Learners

	C-test	DCT Vol	DCT Kanji Vol	SWT Vol	SWT Kanji Vol
C-test	1.000	.6580**	.3693	.7997**	.5437**
DCT Vol	.6580**	1.000	.4630*	.7244**	.5049*
DCT Kanji	.3693	.4630*	1.000	.3353	.6293**
SWT Vol	.7997**	.7244**	.3353	1.000	.5486**
SWT Kanji	.5437**	.5049*	.6293**	.5486**	1.000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

The two volume-based measures correlate significantly with the C-test results at .6580 for the DCT and .7997 for the SWT ($p<.01$). Results of Chinese character volume form the SWT also correlate significantly with the C-test at .5427 ($p<.01$), but results from the DCT correlate positively, but not significantly at .3693. A correlation of Chinese-character volume from both instruments is statistically significant at .6294 ($p<.01$), which indicates that learners used Chinese characters consistently across the two instruments. Together, the above figures suggest that the comparatively heavy reliance on Chinese characters by Chinese native speakers in completing the DCT is not a useful predictor of their overall proficiency in Japanese as measured by the C-test. The correlation remains positive, however, which suggests that knowledge of Chinese characters before acquiring Japanese has a positive influence on overall proficiency, but that other linguistic and individual factors intervene to determine whether this knowledge has a salient effect on overall proficiency.

Results from the DCT and the SWT for native speakers provide additional information that is useful in analysing learner proficiency. Correlation for C-test

score, DCT and SWT volume, and DCT and SWT Chinese character volume shows that volume and Chinese character use do not correlate significantly with C-test scores.

Table 28. Correlation of C-test, Writing Volume, and Chinese-Character (Kanji) Volume for Native Speakers

	C-test	DCT Vol	DCT Kanji Vol	SWT Vol	SWT Kanji Vol
C-test	1.0000	.4524	.4307	.5132	.4750
DCT Vol	.4524	1.0000	.9480**	.8376**	.5826
DCT Kanji	.4307	.9480**	1.0000	.7577**	.4494
SWT Vol	.5132	.8376**	.7577**	1.0000	.8935**
SWT Kanji	.4750	.5826	.4494	.8935**	1.0000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

This result is interesting because it shows that total volume and Chinese character use are not as salient in predicting C-test scores as they are for the non-native-speaker learners. Also of interest is the high correlation between DCT volume and DCT Chinese character use (.9480 at $p<.01$) and between SWT volume and Chinese character use (.8935 at $p<.01$). This reveals a high degree of consistency among individuals in responding to the two instruments.

A comparison among native speakers, Chinese and Korean learners, and other learners, as described in Table 29 reveals several interesting trends.

Table 29. Comparison of Native and Non-native Writing Volume and Chinese-Character Density for DCT and SWT

	DCT Vol	DCT Kanji Vol	Density	SWT Vol	SWT Kanji Vol	Density
Native	314.73	59.91	19.04%	117.79	33.75	28.65%
Chinese	254.5	48.5	19.06%	98.0	31.7	32.35%
Korean	400.5	38.5	9.61%	154.5	45.5	29.45%
English	248.25	16.0	6.45%	95.0	13.83	14.56%
Native Speakers by Sex						
Men	235.20	46.20	19.64%	81.40	24.00	29.48%
Women	381.00	71.33	18.72%	145.43	40.71	27.99%

Results from this study show that native speakers of Chinese approximated native speakers of Japanese in Chinese character use very closely. The density of Chinese characters was almost identical on the DCT, and very close on the SWT. This shows that Chinese speakers use their knowledge of Chinese characters to approximate native-speaker norms. It is conceivable that they could have used more Chinese characters than native speakers as a way to make up for deficiency in lexical knowledge, but the results here do not support such an explanation because they are so close to native-speaker norms. Chinese-character use also followed the same pattern across the two instruments, with a higher density in the SWT than in the DCT, which indicates that Chinese characters are more common as a percentage of total volume in the SWT. The difference between the two instruments and the consistency of the results across groups of learners shows that, to some extent, learners perceive the DCT as a measure of oral language production. This is because some of the most common native Japanese lexical items (as opposed to Sino-Japanese lexical items), such as the verb *suru* ("to do"), do not have Chinese character equivalents.

Results for other groups of learners also reveal patterns that support the hypothesis that prior Chinese-character proficiency affects the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3. The average for Korean learners is closer to the native speakers than any other group except the native speakers of Chinese. On the DCT, overall volume for the Korean native speakers is the highest of all groups at 400.5 characters for all eight situations on the DCT. The density of Chinese characters is lower at 9.61%, but this is still higher than for English speakers, none of whom had acquired a Chinese-character language prior to learning Japanese, at 6.45%. Figures for the SWT were closer to native-speaker norms than for the Chinese speakers. The volume of writing was closer at an average of 154.5 and the density of Chinese character use was slightly higher than native speakers at 29.45%.

The lower density of Chinese character use for Korean learners reflects the position of Chinese characters in the Korean language. Chinese characters are taught in junior and senior high school in Korea, but achievement levels vary because Chinese characters are not used regularly in Korean script as they are in Japanese. Age also influences Chinese-character achievement in Korea because the Korean government attempted to eradicate Chinese characters in the 1970s. Increased interest in learning Japanese and Chinese in the 1980s and 1990s caused a revival in Chinese character education by the time the two Korean learners, both of whom were born in the early 1970s, reached middle and senior high school. The similarity in volume between the Korean native speakers and the native speakers shows that Korean learners are able to produce more language under the time constraints for each instrument than other groups of learners. This indicates that Korean learners may be using knowledge of a number of syntactic, lexical, and even stylistic similarities between Korean and Japanese to increase their fluency. Indeed the

greater average volume on the SWT is similar to findings from a study by Blum-Kulka (1986) in which learners produced more language on a DCT than native speakers did. The researchers interpreted the results as a sign of pragmatic failure because the length of the utterances caused deviation from native-speaker pragmatic norms. This issue will be discussed in further detail in the section on sociolinguistic transfer.

Results from native speakers of English show that learners who have no prior knowledge of Chinese characters produced less volume and used fewer Chinese characters than Chinese or Korean learners. The gap in volume between English-speaking learners and Chinese speaking learners is narrow (254.5 versus 248.25 on the DCT and 98.0 versus 95.0 on the SWT), but the gap in Chinese character use between English learners and other groups is much wider. The density of Chinese character use was lower than for Korean learners (6.45% versus 9.61% on the DCT and 14.56% versus 29.45% on the SWT). These findings indicate that the lack of a common Chinese character lexicon and other linguistic similarities caused English speakers to produce less language and use far fewer Chinese characters than Chinese and Korean learners and native speakers. Of particular interest, however, is the similarity in volume between the English and Chinese learners. This indicates that Chinese learners used their knowledge of Chinese characters to approach native-speaker norms, but that the lack of similar grammatical structures between Chinese and Japanese caused them to produce almost the same amount of language as native speakers of English.

Results from native-speaker informants reveal differences between men and women in volume of writing in the DCT and the SWT. On the DCT, men wrote an average of 235.2 characters, whereas women wrote an average of 381.0 characters.

On the SWT, men wrote and average of 81.40 characters and woman an average of 145.43. These figures call into question the idea of a set native-speaker norm for volume in response to such questions because the average volume for women was so much greater than for men. Thus, while volume figures for the Korean learners are higher than the average for the entire group of Japanese learners, they are only slightly higher than the norm for female Japanese native speakers (400.5 versus 381.0 and 154.5 versus 145.43). Since the two Korean learners in this study are both women, the greater volume of these learners could be interpreted as an attempt to approximate to female native-speaker norms, rather than as evidence of "too many words" as described by Blum-Kulka (1986). The density of Chinese character use between men and women is similar because both genders receive the same literacy education in the Japanese school system. Any major differences in Chinese character use would most likely occur among groups with different levels of education or perhaps among different age groups. In this study, all of the native speakers were university educated and between the ages of 21 and 32. In discussing Japanese native-speaker norms, it is clear that gender differences contribute to gender-specific norms that affect how the results for learners should be interpreted. Of the 24 non-native learners of Japanese in this study, only one English-speaking learner was male, which makes it impossible to determine any differences between male and female learners as a group. For the discussion of sociolinguistic transfer that follows in Section 4.4 of this chapter, the gender imbalance also means that findings from this study are limited mainly to sociolinguistic transfer phenomena in female learners.

4.2.3. Concluding Discussion of Language Proficiency

Before concluding the discussion of language proficiency, the effects of age, gender, prior visits to Japan, and major course at university need to be considered. Research on these variables has shown that they influence the level of attained proficiency to varying degrees. As mentioned above, the data on gender distinctions in this study are incomplete because only one of the 24 learners in the study was male. The group of learners was diverse enough, however, to offer insights into the effect of age when exposure to Japanese began, residency in Japan, and major course in university on proficiency.

Results from the study, which are summarised in Table 30, showed that residency in Japan influenced proficiency more than age when exposure to Japanese began and major course, but these findings are only tentative because only a few of the learners in the data sample had spent more than a few months in Japan. In Table 30, data on age indicates date of birth, but all learners began learning Japanese three years before the data were gathered, so those learners born in the 1970s would have started learning Japanese in their late teens or early twenties. None of the learners began learning Japanese before entering university.

Table 30. Mean C-test Scores by Age, Residency in Japan, and Major Course Group

Age*	Number	Mean	Std Dev
Overall	24	36.458	10.823
1940s	1	31.000	--
1950s	1	61.000	--
1960s	4	39.750	16.112
1970s	18	34.667	8.338
Residency in Japan			
Overall	24	36.458	10.823
None/Short Visit**	19	34.0526	9.294
1 Month	2	44.5000	19.092
2 Months	1	41.0000	--
6 Months	1	39.0000	--
60 Months	1	59.0000	--
Major Course			
Overall	24	36.458	10.823
Arts	21	36.619	11.535
Commerce	2	34.500	4.949
Communication	1	37.000	--

*Age categorised according to decade of birth.

**Includes learners who visited Japan for a few days or weeks as tourists.

Mean performance based on age shows that the one learner who was born in the 1950s achieved the highest score (61.0) of the entire group and that the learners born in the 1960s achieved a mean (39.75) that were higher than the those born in the 1970s (34.667) or mean for the entire group (36.358). The small number of learners in the 1950s and 1960s group makes it impossible to make a statistically valid conclusion on the influence of age on proficiency. This conclusion is reinforced by

results from the learner who was born in the 1940s. Her score of 31.0 was below the mean for entire group.

Figures for the length of residency should also be treated with caution, except for those for the learner who had spent 60 months in Japan prior to learning Japanese. This learner was a native speaker of English who achieved a 59.0, the second highest score in the group and the highest score for a native speaker of English. The third highest scoring learner, a native-speaker of Korean, had spent one month in Japan, which helped raise the mean for the group of two learners in the one-month category. The learner who had spent two months in Japan also learned Japanese in high school, so it is difficult to determine whether residency in Japan or high-school Japanese education contributed to her relatively high score of 41.0. The learner who had spent six months in Japan attended a Japanese high school through an exchange programme. This would have given her considerable exposure to Japanese, but her score on the C-test was only slightly above the mean. A number things can explain this, but given the linguistic background of the learners in this study, the inclusion of Chinese characters in the C-test allowed Chinese and, to a lesser extent, Korean learners to apply their knowledge of Chinese characters to achieving a higher score on the test. The results may tentatively be taken to suggest that short visits and residency of less than one year have relatively little effect on proficiency, whereas extended residency greatly increases proficiency. Because only one learner in this study had lived in Japan for more than one year before or during acquisition of Japanese, it is impossible to compare her results with other learners from a variety of language backgrounds who had similarly long residency in Japan. This discussion leads to an important question for longitudinal studies on the development of proficiency in Japanese: how do prior language background and

learning experience and residency in Japan affect learners at various stages of acquisition and in various learning environments?

As shown in Table 30 above, results analysed according to university course show no clear pattern of distribution, most probably because of the 24 learners, 21 were majored in Japanese in connection with another arts course. The mean score on the C-test for the arts majors was 36.619, which is almost identical to the overall mean of 36.458. The lowest mean (34.50) was for the two learners who majored in commerce, but the small sample size makes it difficult to deduce any meaningful trend from the results. A caveat about major course is order here because none of the learners in this group were honours students in Japanese. The Australian higher education is similar to the British in that most students graduate in three years, with honours students spending an additional year in university. Students who choose the honours course often spend their third or fourth year taking courses in Japan, as is common for language majors in the UK and Ireland. Honours students were not included in this study because there were no honours students in the particular class chosen for the study and because others were studying in Japan or doing research. Had honours students been included, however, it is likely that the results would have shown important differences between honours students and non-honours students because most honours students spend at least one year at a Japanese university.

From this presentation and discussion of results on proficiency in **Japa**nese as an L≥3, the following conclusions can be obtained:

1. The C-test is a valid instrument for evaluating learner Japanese proficiency. Native-speaker results show that the test sets a valid standard of native-speaker proficiency with a high mean of 93.75. For learners, the mean is low and distribution

of scores is not ideal, but the test yields enough distinction between the learners to validate its use as a measurement of proficiency. Other objective measures, such as writing volume and Chinese character use correlate positively and significantly with the C-test. Self-evaluation of proficiency was not a valid indicator of C-test performance and should be used with caution, particularly in dealing with learners from a diverse L1 and L2 background.

2. Learners who speak Chinese-character languages (Chinese or Korean) as an L1 closely approximated to native-speaker norms on the DCT and the SWT in Chinese character density, i.e., the number of Chinese characters per total volume of text, but only Korean learners approximated to native-speaker norms on the same measures in total volume. These findings indicate that in the case of Chinese and Korean, lexical similarity and, in the case of Korean, syntactic similarity between the learners L1 and Japanese affects Chinese character use and volume of language production, which in turn correlate positively and significantly with the C-test. This suggests that L1 background has a strong influence on global language proficiency as determined by the C-test.

3. Native-speaker results from the DCT and the SWT correlated positively and significantly for volume and Chinese character use and between the two instruments. Results from these instruments correlated positively, but not significantly with the C-test, which shows that the standard of native competence set by the C-test is independent of individual tendencies in language production and Chinese character use. Among native speakers, a difference between men and women in volume

showed that gender differences affected native-speaker norms in language production. Chinese character use was almost the same between the men and women.

4. The relatively small number of learners in this study limited the findings in several areas. First, because only one of the 24 learners was male, results from male learners as a group could not be compared with those of male native speakers and gender differences among learners could not be discussed. Second, it was difficult to deduce patterns regarding age, residency in Japan, major course, and other cognitive variables because some groups in important categories consisted of only one or two learners. Finally, though findings from the native speakers of Korean are important and relevant to the thesis, they are limited by that fact that there were only two native speakers of Korean and no L2 learners of Korean in the data set.

4.3. Language Transfer and Perceptions of Japanese

In this section, I will discuss what the results of this study reveal about language transfer and perceptions of language distance between Japanese as an L≥3 and other languages that learners have already acquired or learned to varying degrees of proficiency before learning Japanese. This study includes two hypotheses about language transfer and perceived language distance. As stated in Chapter 1, they are:

1. Language transfer is a salient phenomenon in L≥3 acquisition in written production and listening comprehension of speech acts.

2. Learner perceptions of L≥3 relatedness or closeness to the L1 and L2 will increase the likelihood of language transfer.

Each hypothesis will be discussed in light of the results in the subsections below. The final subsection will present a concluding discussion of the two hypotheses and the methods used to investigate them.

4.3.1. Language Transfer

A preliminary step to determining whether language transfer is salient or not, is to determine whether it even exists. On the basis of the analysis in Section 4.2 on language proficiency, the following tentative conclusion about language transfer can be stated in respect to the present data: learners who know a language with syntactical, morphological, and lexical similarities to Japanese evinced higher overall

language proficiency than learners who know an unrelated language. Specifically, Korean learners, whose native language shares a number of syntactic, morphological, and lexical similarities with Japanese, outperformed all other groups of learners significantly. Chinese learners, whose native language shares a common writing system with Japanese performed only slightly better than other groups. This suggests that the greater the similarity between Japanese and the learner's native language, the higher that the learner's level of proficiency in Japanese is likely to be. It also suggests that syntactical and morphological similarities contribute more to increasing overall language proficiency in learners who have received largely similar instruction (i.e., same course and instructional material, but different instructors) than do a large number of cognate written lexical forms.

4.3.1.1. Effects of Multiple Language Learning

Though results from the discussion on language proficiency confirm the first hypothesis regarding L1, they say little about L2 or other languages that learners know before they learn Japanese. Results from the analysis of proficiency, however, show that L2 exerted little or no effect on the results. No significant L2 pattern could be established. A look at C-test performance according to the number of languages acquired or learned before learning Japanese, however, lends support to the folk-linguistic notion that learners who learn a number of languages do well in learning subsequent languages. I am not talking here about evidence of transfer from one of the L≥3s into Japanese, but rather of evidence that acquiring a number of languages contributes to or perhaps facilitates subsequent acquisition. Table 31 lists means on the C-test according to the number of languages acquired or learned before

learning Japanese.

Table 31. C-test Performance according to Number of Foreign or Non-Native Languages Learned before Learning Japanese

	None	1	2	3
Number	24	21	14	4
Mean	36.458	35.809	38.214	44.5

The pattern of results by number of languages learned is somewhat irregular because one of the three learners of Japanese as an L2 in this study achieved a 59%, the second-highest score in the group, on the C-test. She is the only learner in the data sample who had lived in Japan for at least a year before the data were collected. Without this score, the mean for the group would have been 35.478, only slightly lower than the group of learners who knew one foreign language before learning Japanese. Learners who knew three languages before learning Japanese did marginally better than those who knew two, whereas those who knew four languages performed significantly better than all other groups. This group included the first, fourth, and one of the two fifth highest-ranking learners from the entire group. The second highest-ranking learner was the L2 learner of Japanese referred to above who received a 59% on the C-test.

Of the learners in this group, three were native speakers of English and one, the learner with the highest score on the C-test, was a native speaker of Chinese. The three native speakers of English had all studied three Western languages from a combination of French, German, Italian, and Latin, and one of the learners was studying classical Japanese simultaneously with modern Japanese. The Chinese

learner was a native speaker of Cantonese who had studied Mandarin and classical Chinese, as well as English, before studying Japanese. She was also taking Korean while she was studying Japanese. Compared to results by native language group, results by number of languages learned suggest that the facilitative effects of transfer from an L1 that is related to some degree to Japanese are diluted as the number of languages learned increases. Results from an item analysis of the C-test in the next section and from the discussion on perceived language distance show that subconscious transfer is more salient than conscious borrowing in influencing achieved proficiency.

4.3.1.2. C-test Item Analysis and Sources of Transfer

Results from an item analysis of the C-test are also helpful in elucidating possible sources of transfer. Several methods were employed in this connection. First, responses were rated for accuracy on a dichotomous correct-incorrect scale, with a rating of 1.0 standing for "correct" and a rating of 2.0 standing for "incorrect." Responses that differed from the original, but could be considered grammatically and stylistically correct were classified as such. Second, responses were classified according to type of deletion, i.e., lexical item, grammatical particle, etc., and L1 and L2 group. To determine whether prior language learning background yielded different patterns of response, an average score for each deletion by language group was obtained. Third, selected individual responses were examined qualitatively to determine important patterns among learners from different L1 and L2 groups. Particular attention was given to "lexical creations" and the use of grammatical particles. Grammatical particles (i.e., *wa, ga, wo, ni,* etc.) in Japanese denote the

grammatical function of a word or group of words in the sentence. Some particles, such as *wa*, can be used with other particles to show mood. Consideration was also given to whether learners wrote Chinese characters and how accurate they were in writing them.

The notion of accuracy in C-test responses can vary. In this study, I considered all orthographic and grammatical deviations from the original passage or from an acceptable response as errors. In some responses, minor orthographic errors yield an incorrect response even though it was clear that the learner had responded with an accurate lexical or grammatical response. I chose this route because giving learners the benefit of the doubt would call into question the validity of the test in comparison with languages in which small orthographic deviations, such as the omission of and accent or an umlaut, could indicate a misunderstanding of important linguistic features. In Japanese, the use of the *hiragana* character *u* and a dash in *katakana* to indicate long vowels reflect important features of Japanese phonology. Omitting these items could be an oversight under the time pressure to finish the test, but it could also be a sign of a lack of understanding of the important difference between long and short vowels in Japanese phonology. Use of romanisation, however, accurate the response, was also considered an error because the instructions specified that all answers be in any mixture of *kana* and Chinese characters that the learner deemed appropriate.

Several caveats need to be added before continuing the discussion. First, the C-test used in this study used right-end deletions, as is common in the C-test in Western languages. Because Japanese is an agglutinating language with a large number of morphological suffixes and grammatical particles, the emphasis of the test was on *bunsetsu* (word)-final suffixes. Many of the deletions included part of the

main lexical item, so the test included a number of lexical deletions. In subsequent studies on Japanese using the C-test, Fouser (1997) used a C-test that alternated *bunsetsu*-initial and -final deletions. The alternating pattern of deletions included more deletions related to lexical items than the C-test used in this study. It is unclear, however, whether the alternating pattern of deletions yields a more accurate measure of overall language proficiency than a *bunsetsu*-final or, indeed, a *bunsetsu*-initial C-test. Future studies comparing different C-test formats in Japanese are needed to clarify this issue.

The second caveat concerns introspective methods with the C-test in Japanese. In Chapter 3, I mentioned that I did not use think-aloud protocols in this study because the comparatively large number of learners in this study made it logistically difficult to arrange private meetings to conduct think-aloud protocols. With the C-test, learners in the pilot study had trouble understanding the format of the test and found the test extremely difficult. The relatively low mean and the difficulty that some learners in the main study had with the test show that any additional cognitive burden would have been difficult for the learners and may have affected their performance on the C-test. In discerning sources of transfer, however, such information might have been helpful. It would have been interesting, for example, had native speakers of Chinese or Korean pronounced Chinese characters in the prompt in their native languages as a way to recall which character to put in the blank. Fouser (1997) conducted a think-aloud protocol on a 100-delection C-test with an advanced Korean learner of Japanese, but found that the learner did not read any Chinese characters in Korean or translate them or any other phrases to and from Korean. This may, of course, have been because the learner in that study had a much higher level of proficiency and did not need to rely on his knowledge of

Korean to compete the task. Another way to include an introspective component in the C-test would have been to use a written introspection similar to those in the DCT, the DET, the SWT, and to those used with the C-test in the Trinity College Modern Language Research Project. I decided against this because I wanted to conduct a full 100-deletion test in a reasonable amount of time. Adding introspective comments to each deletion would have lengthened the test excessively, and adding an overall introspective comment at the end of each passage would most likely have yielded overall comments about the test instead of about individual items.

The following Table 32 gives a summary of the accuracy of selected C-test items that are discussed in this section. A score of 1.0 indicates that all of the learners in the given language group filled in the blank correctly, whereas a score of 2.0 indicates that none of the learners in the language group filled in the blank correctly. A score of 1.5 indicates an even balance within the language group.

Table 32. Analysis of Selected C-test Items

No.	Type	Overall	Chinese	Czech	English	Korean	Sinhala
Passage 1							
1	adv.	1.875	1.875	2.0	1.833	2.0	2.0
2	poss. *no*	1.417	1.375	1.0	1.417	1.5	2.0
6	noun-kanji	1.875	1.875	2.0	1.917	1.5	2.0
7	adj.	1.708	2.0	2.0	1.417	2.0	2.0
9	obj. *wo*	1.708	1.75	2.0	1.667	1.5	2.0
16	*desu*	1.458	1.25	2.0	1.5	1.5	2.0
Passage 2							
17	loc. *ni*	1.417	1.5	1.0	1.417	1.5	1.0
27	top. *wa*	1.625	1.75	1.0	1.667	1.0	2.0
30	*desu*	1.458	1.5	1.0	1.583	1.0	1.0
32	*masu*	1.417	1.375	2.0	1.333	1.5	2.0
33	noun-kanji	1.75	1.375	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
36	noun-kanji	1.625	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
47	if clause	1.542	1.625	2.0	1.417	1.5	2.0

Passage 3							
49	noun	1.583	1.625	1.0	1.75	1.0	1.0
52	verb form	1.542	1.75	2.0	1.333	1.5	2.0
58	subj. *ga*	1.625	1.875	1.0	1.583	1.0	2.0
67	pronoun	1.208	1.375	1.0	1.167	1.0	1.0
68	acc. *ni*	1.708	1.875	1.0	1.667	1.5	2.0
69	verb form	1.375	1.25	2.0	1.417	1.0	2.0
Passage 4							
77	verb past	1.708	1.75	2.0	1.667	1.5	2.0
78	noun-kanji	1.958	1.875	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
81	noun-kanji	1.792	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
82	top. *wa*	1.667	1.75	2.0	1.667	1.5	1.0
88	neg. *masu*	1.583	1.625	2.0	1.5	1.5	2.0
92	verb form	1.5	1.625	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.0
96	acc. *ni*	1.75	1.75	2.0	1.833	1.5	1.0
98	adv.	1.792	1.625	2.0	1.917	1.5	2.0

Because the Czech and Sinhala groups consisted of only one learner each and the Korean group of two learners, results from these groups must be treated with caution. These groups, however, will be discussed as additional information for the discussion on the Chinese and Anglophone groups. Despite the imbalance in the size of groups, several trends emerge. First, the Korean speakers were most accurate in areas of syntax and morphology and Chinese speakers in lexical areas that include a Chinese character. Anglophone speakers performed better than Chinese speakers in grammatical areas, but worse than Korean speakers in the same areas did. In only a few cases did Anglophone speakers perform better than Korean speakers. The native speaker of Czech and the native speaker of Sinhala performed poorly in all areas, which is reflected in low overall C-test scores. Table 33 presents a summary of these overall trends, with 1.0 representing a correct response and 2.0 representing an incorrect response to an item.

Table 33. C-test Item Analysis: Comparison among Chinese, Anglophone, and Korean Learners

Type	Chinese	English	Korean
noun-kanji	1.525	1.983	1.6
verb form	1.593	1.504	1.375
particle	1.703	1.614	1.375
grammar	1.517	1.361	1.333
masu/desu	1.375	1.472	1.333

The above trends are additional confirmation of language transfer from L1 into Japanese as an L≥3. The native speakers of Chinese and Korean filled in blanks that contained a Chinese-character deletion from a noun composed of Chinese characters correctly more frequently than the native speakers of English. Indeed, nearly all of the native speakers of English filled in such blanks incorrectly as indicated by their average score of 1.983. Prior native-language knowledge of Chinese characters no doubt helped these two groups perform better than Anglophone learners. Responses to deletions involving a verb form also confirm language transfer because the native speakers of Korean answered such questions more accurately than did the native speakers of Chinese or English. Of the L1s in question, only Korean is an agglutinating language with a large number of verbal suffixes. Results for grammatical particles mirror those for verb forms and this can be related to the fact that Korean functions in a similar way to Japanese in respect of particles.

Responses to blanks that indicate the overall syntactic structure and the *masu/desu* speech level showed a more complicated pattern of language transfer. In contrast to Japanese and Korean, Chinese, and English are both isolating languages

with a strict word order. Though Chinese and English have a number of syntactic differences, they are closer in basic syntax and morphology to each other than either is to Japanese. The relatively high score for accuracy of the Anglophone learners compared with the Chinese learners is surprising. Though none of the Anglophone learners had learned an Altaic language before learning Japanese, they had all had learned a European language in a formal setting before learning Japanese. The emphasis on grammar in formal school education (e.g., "school French") and in the Japanese language programme at the University of Sydney may have helped Anglophone learners develop the metalinguistic skills needed to analyse syntactic aspects of language more effectively than other areas of language. Native speakers of Chinese and Korean responded more accurately to blanks that related to *masu/desu* than native speakers of English. The presence of distinct speech levels helps explain the high score for Korean learners in this area, but Chinese does not have clearly market speech levels using a complex system of honorifics. Aside from formal terms of address, Chinese speech levels are indicated through word choice and tone of voice. Sociolinguistically, Chinese and Anglophone learners should have scores that are closer to each other than to the native speakers of Korean. Perceived language distance as it affects this study will be discussed in the Section 4.3.2 of this chapter.

Given the common Chinese-character-based lexicon among Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, and the similar syntax and morphology between Japanese and Korean, it is possible to argue that native speakers of Chinese and Korean should have responded correctly to more blanks in these areas than they did. Individual factors and variations in L1 proficiency explain this discrepancy. Previous studies have shown (e.g. Kellerman 1983, Ringbom 1987, Singleton 1987) that transfer is

more frequent when learners perceive something in the native language or another language that they know as transferable to the target language. The Chinese and Korean learners in this study were all learning Japanese through English, their L2, and this might have complicated perceptions of similarity and transfer. Instructors at the University of Sydney were composed of native-Japanese and (for the most part) Australian English speaking members of staff and native-Japanese tutors. Few had extensive knowledge of Chinese or Korean, which meant that they were not in a position to heighten metalinguistic awareness of similarities between these language and Japanese. Chinese and Korean learners who developed heightened awareness of the similarities between their L1 and Japanese thus did so on their own, either through "discovery" or through, as is common among Koreans, advice from friends and family who had learned Japanese (Lee 1990). Another possible explanation for the relatively low accuracy of Chinese learners in responding to blanks relating to Chinese-character-based nouns is the difference in Chinese-character usage between Chinese and Japanese. Although all of the 1850 characters used in Japanese are found in Chinese, the compounds of two or three characters that form distinct lexical items often differ between the two languages. Some Chinese learners may have used their L1 knowledge to fill in the deletion in such compounds with the wrong character. Others may not have been able to use the prompt as a clue to fill in the blank because of difference in usage between the two languages.

4.3.1.3. Lexical Creations

Previous studies (Singleton 1987, Dewaele 1998) have shown that lexical creations provide insight into the possible sources and effects of language transfer into the

target language. In this study, most deletions included a lexical component, usually as part of a Chinese-character compound or a main verb. Deletions that contained a grammatical particle were divided into two categories: those that had a particle as part of a deletion and those in which only the particle itself was deleted. **Only** relevant deletions with a clear lexical component and sole-particle deletions will be discussed in this section. This addresses Chapelle's (1994) concern that items from the C-test used in lexicon research contain sufficient contextual information to be a valid measure of lexical proficiency. Table 34 provides an overview of the linguistic environment of selected lexical deletions. The deleted portion and correct response are given in the boxed area; uppercase letters indicates the use of a Chinese character in the response; an English gloss is given in parentheses. These conventions also apply throughout the text below.

Table 34. Environment of Selected Lexical Deletions

MAN[KAIni] ("to bloom fully")	oHANA[MIno] ("flower viewing")
oBEN[TOOwo] ("boxed lunch")	taku[san] ("many/much")
KEN[BUTSUwo] ("to sightsee")	GAK[KOOmo] ("school")
SAN[PO] ("a walk")	KAI[MONO] ("shopping")
EI[GA] ("a film")	HIRU[ni] ("at lunch time")
A[ku] ("to open, to hold")	HITO[wa] ("people" top.)
HE[YAwa] ("a room" top.)	SHICHIJIka[radesu] ("from 7:00")
SHOO[TAI] ("to invite")	HIma[deni] ("by the day [before]")
one[gai] ("to request")	ze[hi] ("by all means")

Incorrect responses to lexical deletions varied considerably, but can be organised broadly into several categories: phonetic approximations, lexical creations, and

blanks left unfilled. Table 35 gives examples of the first two of these categories. L1 is given in parentheses.

Table 35. Examples of Lexical Approximations and Creations

	Approximations	Creations
MANKAIni	MANKA (Korean)	MANsakini (Chinese)
		MANIN (Chinese)
		MANENni (Chinese)
oHANAMIno	oHANAMIsuru (English)	oHANAKANKOOsuru (Chinese)
	oHANAwo miru (Chinese)	oHANAwo KANSHOOno (Chinese)
Aku	Akeru (Chinese, English, Korean)	Ameru (Chinese)
	Akiru (Chinese)	Aru (English)
	Atte (English)	
SHOOTAI	SHOOTAI (Korean)	SHOOKO (Chinese)
zehi	zenzen (Chinese)	
		zenbun (Chinese)
		zebu (English, Korean)

Note: More than one language listed in parentheses indicates the same responses among learners from different language groups.

Phonetic approximations are those that sound similar to the correct Japanese lexical item. The Korean learner's use of the Chinese character for flower (KA/HANA) after *MAN* in *MANKAIni* to create *MANKA* is a lexical approximation that also sounds similar to the correct form. The word *MANKA* is not a Korean word, but the use of Chinese characters to create a new word that approximates to the meaning and sound of the correct word reflects the learner's L1 knowledge of Chinese characters. With the word *Aku* ("to open, to hold"), Chinese, English, and

Korean learners filled in the blank with *keru* to make *Akeru* ("to be opened"), which is the intransitive form of *Aku*. Though *Akeru* is correct in terms of number of deletions, it is incorrect grammatically because the blank called for a transitive form of the verb. This type of approximation shows that learners are using their knowledge of Japanese to come up with an answer that "sounds right" in the blank. It may also be evidence of transfer of native language grammatical concepts to Japanese because, with few exceptions, Chinese and Korean do not distinguish clearly between transitive and intransitive verbs, and the distinction is irregular in English. Another type of phonetic approximation is to create a word that sounds right, but has no semantic relationship with the rest of the sentence. In the *Aku* blank, one Chinese learner used *Akiru*. The creation sounds right because Japanese has a word *Akiru* ("to get tired of something"), but it is written with a different Chinese character.

Some approximations resulted from shifts in part of speech. With the noun phrase *oHANAMIno* ("flower viewing"), some learners turned the noun phrase into a verb phrase, such as *oHANAMIsuru* ("to view flowers") or *oHANAwo miru* ("to see flowers"). The first example had the noun correct, but turned it into a verb with the addition of *suru* ("to do"). The second example turns *MI* into the verb *miru* ("to see") and uses *HANA* ("flower") as the noun. Both approximations are acceptable grammatically and lexically, but they exceed the two-character limit on what can be filled into the blank in the C-test (the prompt is only one character long, which means that the deleted section contains one or two characters). A number of approximations and creations exceed the de facto character-limit for a given blank, which suggests a lack of familiarity with the C-test format and a desire to use existing linguistic knowledge to solve the task at hand. The instructions stated

clearly that the last half of each word (*bunsetsu*) was deleted and that in the case of an odd number of characters, the greater number of characters was deleted. Other approximations confused sound and meaning. Several Chinese learners, for example, filled in the blank for adverb *zehi* ("by all means") with the adverb *zenzen* ("absolutely [not]"). Though not semantic opposites in the strict sense, *zehi* and *zenzen* have diametrically opposed effects. Of the two, *zenzen* is used more frequently in colloquial and written language, whereas *zehi* is restricted to more formal situations and is used frequently with honorifics in polite speech levels. The *ze* prompt before the blank caused learners to think of the more common and frequently used adverb that started with *ze*. The Korean learner's use of a different Chinese character for *TAI* in *SHOO*[*TAI*] is another example of phonetic and semantic confusion. The character that the learner used means "belt" or "strip," but the correct character means "wait." Both characters thus have the same pronunciation, but a different meaning and appearance.

Lexical creations differ from approximations in that they reflect attempts to create new forms of existing words or completely new words to fill in the blank. The resulting creation often reflects a mixture of L1 and the target language. In this study, the creation could also reflect the influence of L2 and other languages that learners have learned or acquired before learning Japanese. Lexical creations involving Chinese characters were common. Native speakers of Chinese, for example, who used the Chinese character *EN* ("garden") and *IN* ("place/institution") after *MAN* ("full/complete") in *MAN*[*KAIni*] ("to bloom fully") attempted to approximate the meaning of "in full bloom" by focusing on the garden being full of flowers as opposed to the flowers being "fully open," the literal meaning of *MANKAI* (*ni* is a particle that is not part of the noun *MANKAI*). In Chinese, the word for

MANKAI is *SHENGKAI*, the second character (*KAI*) of which is the same as in *MANKAI*. The first character *SHENG* means "flourishing" or "prosperous." The resulting mixture of characters created new words that have some semantic coherence with the rest of the text. The use of *SAkini* after *MAN* is interesting because Japanese word formation rarely mixes a Sino-Japanese pronunciation of a character, *man* in this case, with a native-Japanese pronunciation of the character, *saku* for "to bloom." This mixture can be considered a mixture of L1 Chinese and L2 English transfer because the noun form of the verb *saku* ("to bloom") *saki* follows the Chinese character for full to create a word that has a one-to-one correspondence with "to [full] bloom" in English. Creative use of Chinese characters caused some Chinese learners to create lengthy responses to certain blanks. With *oHANAmino*, for example, one learner put *KANKOO suru* ("to tour, to travel") in the blank to create a new verb *oHANAKANKOOsuru* ("to tour the flowers"). Using *KANKOO suru* in this context is an attempt to create a semantically acceptable expression that is coherent with the rest of the text. Another Chinese learner used *oHANA* ("flowers") as a noun and added the Chinese noun *KANSHOO* ("to appreciate [art, culture, etc.]"). This reflects direct transfer from L1, but creates a form that, while being grammatically correct, is far too formal and literary in this context. In both cases, however, learners drew on their L1 knowledge of Chinese characters to come up with creative solutions to gaps or lapses in their knowledge of Japanese.

Lexical creations also include words that do not exist in the target language or any of the other languages that the learner knows. With *Aku*, learners created words that sounded like other words in Japanese, but were meaningless when used with the Chinese character for "to open" given in the prompt. One Chinese learner created *Ameru* ("to edit, to bind"), which does not relate to the context. A native

speaker of English produced *Aru*, which means "there is/are" and is one of the most common verbs in the Japanese language. With *SHOOTAI* ("to invite"), one Chinese learner created a new word *SHOOKO*, which uses the character *KO* ("to call, to name") in the blank after *SHOO* ("to call"). The resulting combination is a non-existent word that repeats the meaning of "to call" twice. This may reflect an attempt to fill gaps in knowledge of Japanese by drawing on L1 knowledge to repeat or intensify the meaning of the character in the prompt. After the *ze* in *zehi* ("by all means"), a Chinese learner produced *zenbun*, which means "preface" in Japanese, but has nothing to do with the context of the text. An Anglophone and a Korean learner produced *zebu*, a non-existent word that may reflect phonetic confusion with other words, such as *zehi* ("by all means") and *zenbu* ("all, everything"). Results here indicate that learners draw on knowledge of L1 lexical items and intuitions about what sounds right in the target language to create idiosyncratic lexical items. Further research using introspective methods is needed to reveal the processes that learners use in making lexical creations.

4.3.1.4. Grammatical Particle Usage

As defined in Section 4.3.1.2, grammatical particles (i.e., *wa, ga, wo, ni,* etc.) denote the grammatical function of a word or group of words in the sentence. Some particles, such as *wa*, can be used with other particles to show mood. How learners fill in blanks designed to elicit particles thus provides information on their grammatical competence and on possible sources of language transfer into Japanese. Table 36 provides an overview of the linguistic environment of selected particle deletions. As in Table 34, the deleted portion and correct response are given in the

boxed area; uppercase letters indicate the use of a Chinese character in the response; an English gloss is given in parentheses.

Table 36. Environment of Selected Particle Deletions

HITO[ga] ("people" subj.)	YORU[ni] ("at night")
iru[node] ("because")	NAKA[ni] ("inside")
HANA[ga] ("flowers" subj.)	kabe[niwa] ("on the wall")
HITO[ga] ("people" subj)	wata[shini] ("to me")
HIRU[ni] ("at lunch time")	HITO[wa] ("people" top.)

Note: *node* is considered a semi-noun, but functions as a particle to link cause and effect clauses; *niwa* is a combination of the particles *ni* and *wa*. Of the particles, only *wa* and *mo* can be added to another particle.

Because particles are used so frequently and make up of one (sometimes two) *hiragana* character, there are fewer opportunities for particle approximations or creations in responses to blanks designed to elicit only a particle. Blanks that include a lexical or morphological component stimulated a wider variety of responses, including the lexical approximations and creations discussed above. In particle-only blanks, most incorrect responses consisted of using another particle, or combination of particles, instead of the correct one. The following Table 37 provides an overview of selected examples of particle use.

Table 37. Examples of Different Particle Use

Particle	wa	ga	ni(wa)	no	wo	mo	de	node	Other	None
HITO[ga]	2	19				1			1	1
YORU[ni]	2	1	20						1	
iru[node]									7	17
NAKA[ni]			22				2			
HANA[ga]		9	1		9				3	2
kabe[niwa]			3	4	2				2	13
HITO[ga]	1	4							5	14
wata[shini]	2		7	11	1				1	2
HIRU[ni]	2		5	2			1		7	7
HITO[wa]	6	1	2						7	8

The above table reveals several interesting trends. First, despite the frequency of particles, such as *wa*, *ga*, *wo*, *ni*, *no*, *mo* and *de*, responses to blanks designed to elicit these particles vary considerably. With *HANA[ga]*, for example, nine learners filled in the blank correctly with the subject marker *ga*, but nine chose *wo*, the object marker, for the same blank. A comparison by language group reveals that most native speakers of Chinese answered the item incorrectly (1.875), whereas native speakers of Korean answered correctly (1.0); native speakers of English at 1.583 were close to the mean of 1.625. With *wata[shini]*, only seven learners filled in this blank correctly with *shini* (*shi* is the last syllable of the word watashi "I"), whereas 11 used the possessive marker *no*, two the topic marker *wa*, and one the object marker *wo*. With regard to comparison by language group, responses to *wata[shini]* showed the same pattern as in *HANA[ga]*, but with less variance. The Chinese learners had the lowest score at 1.875 and the Korean learners the highest score at 1.5; at 1.667 native speakers of English were closest to the mean of 1.708.

Patterns of responses correlated positively at .4497 ($p<.05$), which shows that responses across the two items were fairly consistent. In a number of cases, the most common response consisted of no response at all. With *iru*[*node*], none of the learners produced the correct response; 17 left the blank open, and seven came up with other responses. Of these seven, three used the word *kara*, a slightly more colloquial word for *node*. Of all the particles deletions in the C-test, however, *node* is the least frequently used particle, which suggests that learners would have had far less exposure to the particle than other commonly used particles. Of the examples listed above, only *YORU*[*ni*] and *NAKA*[*ni*] elicited consistent and correct responses across learners. Consistent blanks or incorrect responses and consistent correct responses both produced means for correctness that were similar across all groups. For example, the mean for *iru*[*node*] was 1.917, indicating that almost all learners got the item wrong. Chinese learners had the best overall score of 1.875, Anglophone learners were next with 1.917, followed by Korean learners with 2.0. Clearly, the small number of Korean learners in the sample makes it difficult to draw conclusions from an analysis of specific items, but figures indicate that with the most frequently used particles such as *ga* an *ni*, Chinese learners performed noticeably worse than the other two groups.

Chinese learners had the lowest average score for correctness in particle use of the three major language groups (1.703 versus 1.614 for Anglophone learners and 1.375 for the Korean learners). Differences in L1 and language learning experience help explain this finding. Of the languages in this study, only Korean makes extensive use of grammatical particles to denote the function of a word. Chinese uses a number of characters to indicate tense, questions, and emphasis, among other things, but not to indicate the grammatical function of lexical items or the

relationship of lexical items to each other. English, French, and Italian, common L2s for many native speakers of English in this study, have few morphemes that function independently from morphological changes as Japanese particles do. The topic marker *wa*, for example, never changes its form and can be used with other particles to indicate specificity and contrast. German, an L2 of two native speakers of English in this study, has clear morphological case markers that denote the function of a word in the sentence. The accusative and dative cases in particular function in similar ways to *wo* and *ni* in Japanese (*ni* has also has a locative function). In this study, only the *watashini* blank focused on the dative meaning of *ni*, and no blanks focused specifically on *wo*. With *watashini*, however, learners with German and French as an L2 had the highest score (1.5), followed by learners with Italian as an L2 (1.667). The three learners learning Japanese as an L2 also have 1.667, and the 10 learners, mostly Chinese and Korean natives speakers, with English as an L2, had 1.7, which was close to the mean of 1.708.

The relatively narrow range in these figures and the lack of deletions focusing exclusively on *wo* and *ni* makes it difficult to determine whether knowledge of German or another European language before learning Japanese helps develop metalinguistic awareness that is helpful in learning Japanese grammatical particles. Overall C-test results, which were reported in Section 2.2 above, show that learners with German as an L2 had a lower mean (30.0) than the mean for the group (36.541) or for other European L2 language groups (French = 39.0; Italian 37.0; Latin 36.0). This suggests that prior knowledge of German did not aid subsequent acquisition of Japanese. The wide range of languages in this study made it difficult to investigate this issue closely and it remains an important problem in L≥3 acquisition research: how to control for different L1s, L2s, and other L≥3s in groups of multilingual

learners. Also important here is the question of whether multilingual learners, particularly those who are monolingual but have learned or acquired several languages have clearer and more elaborate metagrammatical notions that help them in learning subsequent languages.

4.3.2. Perceived Language Distance

This section will discuss the second hypothesis that this study seeks to investigate, namely that "learner perceptions of L≥3 relatedness or closeness to the L1 and L2 will increase the likelihood of language transfer." Several types of analysis can be used to determine whether learner perception of language closeness or relatedness influences decisions about language transfer. One method would have been to ask a direct question on the matter, but such a question would have been highly subjective because many learners do not necessarily think about the relationship of Japanese to other languages that they know. Instead, I decided to ask learners for their views on the difficulty of learning Japanese, which is something that most learners have thought about during their course of study.

4.3.2.1. Perceptions of Difficulty

Perceptions of difficulty do not necessarily indicate perceived language distance, but they can be compared with the actual linguistic relationship to see if there is a correlation between perceived difficulty and the linguistic relationship among the languages in question. A pattern of correlation that shows learners perceiving areas of difference between Japanese and one of the previously-acquired languages as

difficult and areas of similarity as easy would indicate that learners are sensitive to language distance and the relationship between Japanese and languages that they already know. Irregular or no correlation would indicate that learners are not aware, at least consciously, of the relationship between Japanese and languages that they already know. Another possibility is for both patterns to exist, but to be distributed differently among native language groups. In this study, the Japanese-specific section of the questionnaire was the only instrument that measured perceived language difficulty directly. The introspection sections on the DCT, the DET, and the SWT were designed to elicit open-ended information on anything that came to mind. Results showed, however, that many learners used the introspection section as a chance to evaluate the difficulty of the task, explain difficulties that they had in forming their responses, or express their feelings about the instruments. This information turned out to be very useful in providing insight into learners' subjective states, which could then be compared with results from the questionnaire.

Ratings of Japanese-language difficulty by L1 group appear in Table 38 below. After a discussion of these ratings, they will be correlated with C-test results to determine how useful they are as a predictor of proficiency. The questionnaire used a five-point scale in which a rating of 5.0 indicated "very easy," and a rating of 1.0 indicated "very difficult." As in other areas of this study, the discussion will focus on the three main L1 language groups in the sample: Chinese, English, and Korean.

Table 38. Mean Ratings of Japanese-Language Difficulty by L1 Group

	All Groups	Chinese	English	Korean
Overall	2.750	2.887	2.616	3.050
Verb Endings	2.875	2.875	2.833	3.000
Culture	3.250	3.000	3.333	4.000
Particles	2.517	2.375	2.500	3.000
Keigo	1.667	1.750	1.583	1.500
Pronunciation	3.542	3.125	3.667	4.500
Read *Kanji*	2.583	4.000	2.000	2.000
Vocabulary	2.833	2.500	2.917	3.000
Word Order	3.208	3.000	3.167	3.500
Write *Kanji*	2.958	4.750	2.000	3.000
Writing System	2.792	3.375	2.417	3.000

Note: "Overall" refers to a combined average of scores for all areas of difficulty.

These results show a number of interesting patterns. Overall, the combined figure for all 10 categories shows relatively little difference among the three main groups. As expected, however, native speakers of Korean rated Japanese easiest (3.050), followed by the group of Chinese native speakers (2.887), and native speakers of English, who gave it the highest overall difficulty rating (2.616). Though learners were not asked specific questions about language distance, the above figures show that learners whose L1 is closer to Japanese typologically view Japanese as easier than learners whose L1 is more distant from Japanese.

Ratings for difficulty by language area, however, confirm the influence of L1 on perceptions of difficulty. In the three categories relating to syntax and morphology (verb endings, particles, and word order), native speakers of Korean consistently gave Japanese lower ratings for difficulty than the other groups. The difference was particularly in the rating for grammatical particles. Korean learners

rated them at an average of 3.0 versus 2.5 for Anglophone learners and 2.375 for Chinese learners. These results are similar to those for correct responses to particle deletions in the C-test as presented in Table 38 above.

In the two categories related to Chinese characters (reading *kanji* and writing *kanji*), however, native speakers of Chinese gave a much lower difficulty rating than the other groups of learners. In the reading category, Chinese learners gave an average of 4.0, whereas Anglophone and Korean learners both gave an average of 2.0, which indicates that the last two groups of learners perceived reading Chinese characters as difficult. The gap was even larger in the category of writing Chinese characters, in which Chinese learners gave an average rating of 4.75, Anglophone learners 2.0, and Korean learners 3.0. These figures suggest that Chinese and Korean learners find it easier to draw on their knowledge of Chinese characters in writing than in reading. The perception that Chinese characters are easier to write, however, may have to do with the simple fact that writing characters requires no knowledge of their pronunciation, whereas reading, particularly aloud in class, requires knowledge of the appropriate Japanese pronunciation.

How characters are used in the Japanese writing system may have influenced how learners responded to the questionnaire. In Chinese and Korean, most characters have only one pronunciation, whereas as they have at least two in Japanese. Tones in Chinese distinguish between different characters with the same pronunciation and change according to a character's location in the sentence, but the basic phonetic features remain the same. Korean has no tones and, with a few exceptions, all Chinese characters and Sino-Korean lexical items have only one pronunciation. Chinese and Korean learners thus find the multiple pronunciations of one character in Japanese difficult to read, whereas writing the characters does not

require much knowledge of Japanese phonetics. Ratings for the overall writing system (writing system) showed that Chinese learners were not as confident about the ease of writing the mixed Japanese script as they were with writing Chinese characters. Chinese learners gave the Japanese writing system a rating of 3.375, whereas Anglophone learners gave it a 2.417 and Korean learners a 3.000, the same rating that they gave for writing Chinese characters. In all areas of reading and writing, Anglophone learners rated Japanese as "difficult." This finding is expected, given the differences between the English and Japanese writing systems.

In the two categories relating to honorifics and cultural background (*keigo* and culture), the results were equivocal. The vagueness of the term "cultural background," which was used on the questionnaire, may have affected responses, but a lengthy explanation of culture would not have been appropriate on the questionnaire. With an average rating of 4.0, the Korean learners were those that rated Japanese easiest in terms of cultural background. Native speakers of English and Chinese gave similar ratings of 3.333 and 3.0 respectively. Ratings in the honorific category yielded the opposite pattern. The Chinese learners were those that found honorifics easiest on average (1.750), whereas it was the Korean learners who found this aspect most difficult (1.5). At 1.583, native speakers of English gave it a slightly easier rating than native speakers of Korean did. This issue will be addressed in greater detail in Section 4.5 on sociolinguistic transfer, but the results here seem to suggest that Korean learners may perceive Japanese sociolinguistic norms as "easy," but may worry more than do other groups about how best to *realise* sociolinguistic norms appropriately. Chinese learners are in the opposite position of finding Japanese sociolinguistic norms as neither particularly easy nor difficult, but of worrying less than other groups about how to realise them appropriately. The

contradictory ratings for honorifics and cultural background in the data show that metacultural knowledge and feelings of cultural affinity with the target language culture or cultures are not necessarily an indication of confidence in acquiring sociolinguistic competence in the target language.

In the two remaining categories, pronunciation and vocabulary, results show that actual language closeness influences perceived difficulty. In relation to pronunciation, Korean learners gave a rating of 4.5, whereas Anglophone learners gave a 3.667 and Chinese learners a 3.125. Of the three languages in question, Korean phonetics and phonology are closest to Japanese. Though Korean has more sounds and vowel harmony, it has no tones or rhythmic intonation. Except for emphatic speech, each syllable in Korean and Japanese receives equal weight. Furthermore, the native Korean script *han'gul* is often used to indicate Japanese pronunciation because it can convey most of the sounds in Japanese accurately. This contributes to the perception that Japanese pronunciation is "easy." In the vocabulary category, native speakers of Korean and native speakers of English had similar average ratings of 3.00 and 2.917 respectively. Chinese learners had a higher average rating for difficulty of 2.5. The similarity between Korean and Anglophone learners is surprising given the similarities between Korean and Japanese. Except for the Chinese-character based lexicon, however, Korean shares almost no common lexicon with Japanese, so learning native Japanese lexical items, aside from pronunciation, may be equally difficult among the groups in this study. Native speakers of English may have been influenced to a small degree by the large number of English words in Japanese. The number of English words in their "learner lexicon" may have been higher than if they had learned Japanese in Japan because they would have used lexical items, such as proper names, food, etc., that are

specific to Australia and Anglophone culture. The high rating for difficulty from Chinese learners is surprising given the large common Chinese-character lexicon, but difference in how Chinese characters are used and the high frequency of native Japanese lexical items in conversation and simple reading texts are likely to have caused these results.

To see if the results of difficulty perception match findings from proficiency instruments, correlation was conducted using the overall C-test score, the overall self-evaluation of proficiency, the overall perception of difficulty, and each category of the overall rating. The results are presented in Table 39 below.

Table 39. Correlation among C-test, Self-Evaluation of Proficiency, and Difficulty Perception

	C-test	Self-Evaluation	Difficulty Perception
Overall	.2112	.2827	1.0000
Verb Endings	.1205	.4257*	.3103
Culture	.1719	.1446	.4366*
Particles	.0660	.1617	.5730**
Keigo	.0617	.0165	.7095**
Pronunciation	-.1300	.0721	.0678
Read Kanji	.0920	.1691	.3539
Vocabulary	-.2155	-.1135	.4515*
Word Order	.1142	.1693	.5698**
Write Kanji	.1025	.1920	.5217**
Writing System	.4662*	.2772	.5270**

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

Results showed that the overall C-test score and overall self-evaluation rating correlated positively, but not significantly with the overall perception of

difficulty. Perception of difficulty correlated slightly more positively with self-evaluation (.2827) than with the C-test (.2112). Positive correlation here indicates that learner perception of difficulty is related to achieved proficiency and learner self-evaluations of proficiency, but that the relationship is not a strong predictor of similar results in other groups of learners.

By category, only ratings for verb endings had a significant correlation with overall self-evaluation of proficiency at .4257, and only ratings for the writing system showed a significant correlation with the C-test at .4662 (both figures $p<.05$). At the other end of the spectrum, only ratings for pronunciation and vocabulary showed a negative correlation with the C-test at -.1300 and -.2155 respectively. Ratings for pronunciation correlated slightly positively with self-evaluation (.0721), but ratings for vocabulary correlated negatively with self-evaluation at -.1135. These figures are interesting because they show that learner perceptions of difficulty in these areas do not predict C-test performance or self-evaluations of proficiency. The above figures for vocabulary ratings are particularly interesting because mean ratings for vocabulary (2.500 for Chinese, 2.917 for Anglophones, and 3.000 for Koreans) show that perception of difficulty differs from actual language distance. Korean is the closest language in terms of lexicon, syntax, and morphology to Japanese of the languages in this study. This suggests that learners do not always develop notions of difficulty based on the actual linguistic relationships between the languages in question.

The other six categories--culture, particles, *keigo* (honorifics), reading kanji, word order, and writing kanji--show only slight positive correlation with the C-test and self-evaluation. This supports the conclusions regarding correlation of overall difficulty rating with the C-test and self-evaluation, namely that there is only a slight

relationship between learner perceptions of difficulty, the C-test, and self-evaluation of proficiency. For this study, these findings are important because they indicate that learner perceptions of difficulty are not closely related to actual language distance. Learners have clearly relied on transfer from L1 and, to a slight and, as yet, undefined degree from L2, but they have done so selectively and to varying degrees.

4.3.2.2. Introspective Comments on Japanese

Introspective comments on the DCT, the DET, and the SWT gave additional insight into how learners perceived language difficulty, the instruments, their experience learning Japanese, and their subjective views of the "Japan" and the Japanese language, but relatively little information on perceptions of language distance or of language difference or similarity. The instructions for the introspection section of the DCT read as follows (also see Appendix C):

> In the "introspection" section following each situation, please write why you wrote what you did immediately after finishing your response. Again, you may write as little or as much as you wish. Please feel free to write your comments in any language because your comments can be translated from that language to English later.

Instructions for the introspection section of the DET and the SWT were the same except for minor instrument-specific differences (i.e., situations in the DCT and dialogues in the DET). The length of introspective comments varied according to instrument because each instrument took a different amount of time to complete and because learners found the DCT and the SWT more difficult than the DET. Of the

three instruments, the SWT was most similar to classroom exercises, and fewer learners commented on the instrument.

Broadly, responses to introspection sections can be organised into four categories: comments about language, comments about personal experience, comments about the instruments, and no response. By L1 language group, Anglophone and Korean learners responded more frequently and wrote longer comments than native speakers of Chinese. All learners who responded did so in English, though they were clearly encouraged to write in their L1 in the instructions. Introspective comments will be analysed in greater detail for information on sociolinguistic proficiency and transfer in Sections 4.4 and 4.5 below. Here, they will be discussed only as they relate to perceived language distance and language transfer.

Comments about language focused mainly on difficulty, correctness, and appropriateness. Table 40 shows some salient examples of this type of comment. The source of the comment is given in parentheses; all spelling and punctuation reflect the original.

Table 40. Examples of Introspective Comments on Language

L1	Comment
English	Something like 'you shouldn't have' should've been said but I don't know how to. (DCT)
Chinese	I can't write the proper way in writing Japanese for this question. (DCT)
Chinese	Some words I want to use, but I forgot what is in Japanese. (DCT)
English	This is quite difficult--formal language must be used. (DCT)
English	I'm not sure whether my answers are correct. I know I've learnt all these things, but I find changing things to and from polite verb forms difficult. (DET)
Chinese	I don't understand the topic. The words are difficult. (DET)
Korean	I've guessed some of them and have heard some easy words. (DET)
Chinese	I came up with the answer by guessing it, I heard something like "shashin," so I guess it means photo. (DET)
English	Wanted to write more kanji, but couldn't remember. (SWT)
English	Probably too short to do the job. (SWT)

In the above examples and other comments related to language, many learners expressed concern about the appropriateness of their responses, but gave relatively little information on how they came up with their responses. Several learners commented that they had guessed or made up responses because they were not confident of their responses. Learners frequently expressed concern about the difficulty of the situation or the language. Many learners said that they were not confident of their responses because the language they thought appropriate was too difficult or because they could not remember the appropriate phrases or lexical items. In all cases, perceptions of difficulty of Japanese were based on what learners had learned in the classroom setting or on what they knew about Japanese, not on how closely they perceived Japanese to be to their L1. No direct references to language transfer could be found in any of the introspective comments.

Comments about personal experience and about the instruments were fewer than comments on language. Many comments on personal experience dealt with the language programme at the University of Sydney and with personal views of Japanese cultural and sociolinguistic norms. Comments on the instruments were relatively rare, but dealt with learner feelings about the instruments. The following table shows some examples of comments on personal experience and on the instruments.

Table 41. Examples of Introspective Comments on Personal Experience and on the Instruments

L1	Comment
English	I noticed when I was in Japan how important the plain form is between good friends. However sometimes it's a bit difficult to know when it's appropriate. (DCT)
Chinese	This question is not interesting and I don't feel confident in writing Japanese properly for this question. (DCT)
English	I know this should be a basic question, but we don't have the casual speaking practise that we need. (DCT)
English	This is a really useful exercise. We're made to think of everyday situations that we are likely to use. (DCT)
Sinh*	Easy to listen. Some parts can't remember, but I think we have done it before. (DET)
English	I believe we learnt this from the book!?! (DET)
Chinese	The voice is not very clear--can't understand the whole meaning of conversation. (DET)
English	These are grammar question and relate to Japanese society. It helps to understand the difference between colloquial and formal Japanese (DET)
Chinese	This exercise was difficult. (SWT)

*Sinhala

Several patterns emerge from the above and other comments in the data.

First, a number of learners express their views of Japanese cultural and sociolinguistic norms, but do so with varying degrees of confidence. The first comment in Table 41 is typical of learners who feel confident of their metalinguistic notions, but are less confident about applying them to specific linguistic situations. Second, a number of learners relate the instruments and the language elicited in them to the textbook or curriculum of the Japanese programme at the University of Sydney. Direct references to the instruments, however, are relatively rare with only a few learners making such comments. Though useful, the introspective data obtained here is not simultaneous with speech production, which casts doubt on their validity as representation of thought processes. Rather, the data should be interpreted as reflection on completed thought processes. It may be that in ascertaining information on metalinguistic attitudes such data are more useful, but further research is needed to answer this question.

4.3.3. Concluding Discussion of Language Transfer

Taken together, the discussion on language transfer and learner perceptions of difficulty yields the following conclusions:

1. Learners who have learned three or more language before learning Japanese received a higher mean on the C-test than learners who learned only one or two languages before learning Japanese. Though this result confirms the folk-linguistic notion that the greater number of languages learned the easier learning subsequent languages becomes, it raises questions about the facilitative role of language transfer from languages more closely related to Japanese.

2. Results from the item analysis of the C-test show that learners achieve higher scores in areas of Japanese that are related to their L1 than in those areas that are not. This is a strong indicator of the facilitative influence of transfer in areas of linguistic similarity between L1 and Japanese. Little evidence of transfer from L2 or another L≥3 was found either at the discrete-point level or at the metalinguistic level.

3. Linguistic similarity between L1 and Japanese did not influence perceptions of difficulty consistently. Chinese and Korean learners perceived areas of L1 with overt similarity to Japanese as easy, but they did not do so in areas with a covert or less apparent similarity with Japanese. The perception of difficulty or simplicity does not prove, however, that learners perceived similarity between Chinese or Korean and Japanese. Indeed, findings from introspective comments revealed no direct references to language distance or similarity. Learners may have perceived language closeness tacitly and unconsciously that could not be readily detected by the research methodology used in this study. The above findings, however, suggest that the second hypothesis of this study, which states that learners' perceptions of language distance conditions language transfer, might require modification because perception of language distance is variable among learners and among areas of language.

4.4. Sociolinguistic Proficiency

In this section, I will present data from the three instruments designed specifically to evaluate sociolinguistic proficiency. The data will be analysed in comparison with native-speaker data from the same instruments and with the literature on Japanese sociolinguistic norms. Findings from this section will form the basis for analysis and discussion of sociolinguistic transfer in Section 4.5.

In this study, two hypotheses regarding sociolinguistic transfer were presented in Chapter 1:

1. As a set of complex phenomena influenced by many social and cultural factors, sociolinguistic transfer will more variable and less predictable than lexico-grammatical transfer.

2. In intermediate and advanced learners, sociolinguistic transfer will create sociolinguistic dissonance rather than miscommunication. Because of the inherent variability of sociolinguistic transfer, sociolinguistic dissonance may be greater than the learners' level of lexico-grammatical competence would lead one to expect.

Findings from Section 4.3 on language transfer and perceptions of difficulty raise questions about the second hypothesis because the relatively low mean on the C-test shows the most learners in this study have intermediate, and in some cases low-intermediate, proficiency in Japanese. Only the three learners who had C-test scores near 60% can be considered as having (nominally) advanced proficiency. The discussion in Section 4.3 did not, however, deal specifically with sociolinguistic

transfer, so the possibility of perceived language distance affecting sociolinguistic transfer cannot be discounted. The above hypothesis should be tested with respect to sociolinguistic transfer before it is rejected or modified.

To test the above hypotheses, it is necessary to evaluate learners' sociolinguistic proficiency so that it can be compared with overall linguistic and sociolinguistic proficiency in individuals and among L1, L2, and L≥3 groups. As with the discussion of C-test results, the discussion here will include reference to native-speaker results obtained from the same research instruments. Using the same research instruments for learners and native speakers allows for a comparison of learner performance with native-speaker performance to investigate the degree of learner approximation to native-speaker performance. This is not meant as a value judgement on learner performance or affirmation of the notion that learners should approximate native-speaker usage. Rather, it is important to the validity of the study because evaluation of overall language proficiency in Japanese was based on an instrument--the C-test--that rated learner proficiency on a scale of 0-100 in which 90-100 represented native-speaker competence. Native-speaker results from the same research instruments are also important to highlight problems with the instruments that may affect their validity in this study. If, for example, native speakers show consistent results on most instruments, but significant deviation from each other in several areas, then their validity needs further critical scrutiny.

4.4.1. The HDI (Honorific Density Index)

The DCT, the DET, and the SWT were used to elicit data on sociolinguistic proficiency. Of these, the DCT and the SWT include a substantial amount of

writing in response to different speech-act situations. The DET includes a number of short-answer questions on social variables and paraphrases of selected lexical items in different speech levels. The instruments elicited data more suitable to qualitative analysis than to quantitative analysis. To compare the results with those from other instruments and from the C-test, however, quantitative analysis provides an overview of relationships across the instruments and among learners from different language groups that organizes the data and provides useful information for subsequent qualitative analysis. With the DET, it is possible to score the responses for accuracy and develop a numerical measure, but, aside from the word counts and Chinese character counts used in Section 4.2, this is more difficult with the DCT and the SWT. As discussed in Section 4.3.1.4, any measure of accuracy on the DCT and the SWT would require subjective evaluation by several native speakers of Japanese, but it would have been difficult to separate an evaluation of sociolinguistic proficiency from an evaluation of overall linguistic proficiency. To fill this gap, a quantitative measure of sociolinguistic proficiency called the "honorific density index," henceforth known as the HDI, was developed.

The HDI takes its inspiration from the lexical density index developed by M.A.K. Halliday (1985) and work in Japan on the quantification of honorifics (e.g. Ogino 1986, Yoshioka 1990). Briefly stated, Halliday's lexical density index is the percentage of lexical words out of the total number of words in a given clause. The index is based on a binary division of the lexicon into lexical words and grammatical words. Lexical words are meaning and content words that are not part of the grammatical system, whereas grammatical words function within a closed grammatical system (Halliday 1985). The binary approach to the lexicon is useful in sociolinguistic research on Japanese because the Japanese lexicon can be divided

into (roughly) informal and formal forms. Though neither grammatical words nor grammatical particles have a formal form, most verbs and many nouns have formal forms that include one or more of the following: terms of address, honorific and humble verbs, honorific verbs of giving and receiving, the *masu/desu* ending, and *o/go* prefixes as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.1.2.4. This binary division is useful because it retains the simplicity of Halliday's index without creating arbitrary categories that obfuscate the differences among speech levels. Speech levels in Japanese can also be classified broadly as "informal" and "formal," which includes the "standard" and formal speech levels. As in any language, however, speech levels in Japanese follow a continuum from "vulgar" to formal, and such gradations between the standard and formal speech levels and between different informal speech levels will be noted as they relate to the results of this study.

Adapting Halliday's lexical density index to Japanese honorifics involved the same problem as adapting the C-test to Japanese: the definition of a word. As discussed in Chapter 3, the notion of a word in Japanese differs from the traditional notion of a word in Western languages as an orthographic unit divided from other such units by a space. The lack of spaces between lexical items and the complex system of agglutinating suffixes and, in the case of honorifics, prefixes, makes using the Western orthographic definition of a word illogical for Japanese. I have chosen to follow the standard phonological definition of a word, the *bunsetsu*, which I used in adapting the C-test to Japanese. A *bunsetsu* is a phonological grouping of a lexical item (including prefixes when applicable) and suffixed items, such as agglutinating morphemes and grammatical particles. In spoken Japanese, pauses of varying length are common after each *bunsetsu*, and spaces are frequently added at the end of each *bunsetsu* in textbooks for learners of Japanese as a second language.

The volume of text in Japanese, however, is measured by the number of *kana* and Chinese characters in any given text, not the number of *bunsetsu*.

In this study, the *bunsetsu* definition of a word was used in the C-test to divide texts into "deleteable" units that maintained enough context and coherence in the text. To delete a character at set intervals as is done in the C-test would have resulted in considerable loss of contextual clues, depending on the number of deleted characters, which would have altered the level of difficulty to favour Chinese and Korean learners. Measurements of volume and Chinese character use in the DCT and the SWT were based on the total number of all characters and of Chinese characters in the text. The character-based measure of volume was useful because it is easily comparable across learners. For the HDI, I decided to use a character-based measure of volume for total volume because many responses to individual DCT items contained relatively few *bunsetsu*. Counting *bunsetsu* would have therefore produced a smaller number that would have made it difficult to create a statistical measure that distinguished adequately among learners. In the case of native speakers, the number of honorifics could easily exceed the number of *bunsetsu* in discourse and texts with a large number of honorifics.

Measuring honorifics and formal forms (e.g., humble forms, *masu/desu* forms) in characters is problematic because such forms differ considerably in length, but not necessarily in sociolinguistic or pragmatic effect. The term "honorific" is used broadly here to cover forms that are classified as such (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.2.4) and formal forms that raise the level of speech from the informal level to the standard and formal levels. The honorific *o-/go-* prefixes, for example have considerable effect in certain situations, but are only one character long. To base the HDI on the length of honorifics would have risked distorting the measure. The

opposite of this approach would have been to assign a value to different honorific and polite forms based on their sociolinguistic and pragmatic effect. A total figure based on the value of each honorific that appeared in the sentence would be derived and divided into the figure for total volume. The obvious problem with this approach is that the sociolinguistic and pragmatic effect of such forms is situation-specific and therefore changes greatly according to the context. Assigning a value to such forms is also logistically difficult because they are extensive and because, as the data from native speakers in this study reveals, native speakers have differing opinions on the use and pragmatic effect of such forms.

Another problem with honorifics was how to handle forms that combine several honorifics. As a noun prefix, *o-* is usually a referent to the hearer (*o-namae* "[your] name"), but it is also used with humble verbs in the "*o- masu* stem + *suru*" form and with honorific verbs in the "*o- masu* stem + *ni naru*" form. As a suffix to humble and honorific verbs, then, *o-* becomes part of a new form. It can also be used as a "beautification" prefix, such as *o-mizu* ("water") and *o-sushi* ("sushi"), which is used to varying degrees in formal speech levels. A strict count of honorifics, however, risks overlooking changes in form and function that affect how honorifics should be measured. The case of *masu/desu* is similar because honorific verbs, such as *irassharu*, are used without *masu/desu* in a variety of ways. In contrast to the incorporation of *o-* into a new form, *masu/desu* are optional formal endings that raise the level of speech from the informal level to the standard speech level even if no referent or addressee honorifics are used. As such, they should be counted as distinct units in the HDI. When combined with an honorific, such as *irassharu*, the resulting form (*irasshaimasu*) would be counted twice. Another problem with counting units in the HDI arises from formulaic expressions. A

formulaic expression, such as *onegai shimasu* ("to request, to ask a favour of") is frequently used in the *masu/desu* form, but because it can also be used with in an informal ending, the base lexical item *onegai suru* and the *masu/desu* form would each count once. By contrast, the honorific and formal form of copula (*da/desu*) *degozaimasu* would count only once because it is never used with an informal ending.

Several researchers have attempted to quantify honorifics. Ogino (e.g. 1986) is a leading researcher in quantitative linguistics and one of the first to develop quantitative measures of honorifics. His system of quantification is based on the idea that the "politeness of expressions" is based on frequency of use toward the hearer. In this method, different situations are ranked for politeness and respondents are asked to match sentences ending different forms of a verb to 14 different researcher-determined "hearers." Each hearer represents a different age and degree of closeness and intimacy. The matches are then calculated for frequency to determine how the hearer determines the speaker's perception of the "politeness of the expression" (Ogino 1986). This measure produces a tapestry of politeness rankings for a given form in different contexts. Frequently used forms between strangers are rated as polite and forms frequently used between siblings are rated as informal. This approach is useful in finding out how people perceive a certain form in use with a hypothetical hearer, but it is not suited to comparing individuals within smaller groups or in analysing relatively opened responses. In keeping with tradition in Japanese sociolinguistic research, the number of subjects in Ogino's studies is typically in the hundreds. This model is problematic for research focused on learners of Japanese because researchers in this area, particularly those outside of Japan, do not normally have access to hundreds of learners. To

compensate for the lack of a large sample, a measure that focuses more on individual use of different forms in speaking and writing is more appropriate for researching learners of Japanese. Individual variation in native-speaker honorific use has received short shrift in the literature, but recent studies have revealed considerable variation in honorific use in different frames of interaction and over time within the same frame. Native-speaker data and introspective comments in this study show considerable individual variation. These findings and recent research will be discussed in Section 4.5 below.

More recently, Yoshioka (1990) has developed a measure of politeness that addresses some of the limitations of Ogino's work and that has inspired the development of the HDI for this study. Yoshioka developed a complex system that rates politeness density as a percentage of politeness forms per volume of text. His measure of volume was based on the total number of kana and Chinese characters in text. To rate politeness, he developed a 23-cell grid containing all the possible grammatical categories in a Japanese sentence (common categories were represented with two cells). In Yoshioka's approach, a sentence is analysed according to these grammatical categories, but only those units of the sentence that contained a politeness marking form are noted with a "+" mark in the grid. Units that contain two politeness markings are counted twice. The total number of units with politeness markings is known as the politeness index, with the politeness density being the percentage of politeness units per volume of text. Yoshioka's system differs from the HDI, however, because it follows a much broader definition of politeness that includes use of local dialect and discourse markers, such as conjunctions. Local dialect was included by Yoshioka because it indicates familiarity; discourse markers were included because they are commonly used in

certain speech acts to "soften" or frame the speech. Including dialect and discourse markers in this study would have complicated matters unnecessarily because both are also used extensively in informal speech. Furthermore, few learners of Japanese outside of Japan are familiar with dialects, and views on the appropriateness of dialect use vary considerably in Japan. Despite these limitations, Yoshioka's development of an index for politeness as a percentage of volume broke new ground in quantifying honorifics.

For the HDI to be successful, it needs to be simple to enough to code, detailed enough to be valid, and consistent enough to cover nearly all genres of spoken and written Japanese. To accomplish these goals, I decided to divide honorifics and formal language into eight clearly defined categories and to code each appearance of a form that fits into any of the eight categories equally with a rating of 1.0. This simplifies Yoshioka's grammar-based grid and focuses coding solely on honorifics and related forms. Table 42 below provides an overview of the components of the HDI.

Table 42. Components of the HDI (Honorific Density Index)

Category	Usage	Example
Terms of Address	referent (nom)	*sensei, shachoo, go-shujin*
o/go	referent (nom)	*o-namae*
	beautification	*o-mizu, go-annai*
Honorific	referent (pred)	*irassharu, sareru, o-* masu stem + *ni naru*
Humble	referent (pred)	*itasu, o-* masu stem + *suru, degozaimasu*
Give	referent (pred)	*sashiageru, kudasaru*
Receive	referent (pred)	*itadaku*
Formulaic	various*	*sumimasen, sitsureishimasu*
masu/desu	addressee	*arimasu, desu*

Note: "nom" refers to "nominative"; "pred" to "predicate."

*Items in this category vary, but most are used as addressee or beautification honorifics.

In this calculation, a short text of 50 characters that contains three appearances of *masu/desu* and no appearances of the other seven categories of honorifics would have an honorific density index of 6% ($\frac{3}{50}$) or a ratio of 16.6 to one. In most cases, the gap between the number of characters and appearances of honorifics will be rather large, yielding relatively low percentages. The difference between the two figures, however, will be less in shorter texts and greater in longer texts. Though seemingly inconsistent, this is ideal for illustrating the differences between spoken and written language and between informal and formal and polite speech levels because spoken language, with is repetition and restatement, at the formal and polite speech level typically uses more honorifics that written language at the same speech level.

The simplicity of the HDI implies certain limitations in its design and use. The clearest limitation comes from the construct of assigning equal value to forms in each of the eight categories because these forms are hierarchical in that some forms indicating a greater degree of formality and honorification than others. It may mask some important stylistic differences in texts with the same HDI rating. In comparing native and non-native speakers, for example, it is possible for both groups to have similar HDI scores on a text in which non-native speakers use honorifics as frequently as native speakers, but in the wrong way. A detailed and comprehensive quantitative measure of honorific use in Japanese should be based on a valid ranking of terms according to sociolinguistic use, but no such research has been undertaken. The two studies review above (Ogino 1986, Yoshioka 1990) focused on quantifying honorific use in different situations, not on establishing a ranking of degrees of

formality and honorification of various forms. Rather than being conclusive, the HDI is designed to take a quantitative snapshot of a given text so that it can be compared with other measures. It is mainly useful, therefore, to distinguish texts in the informal register from those in more formal and polite speech levels. Though this is useful in a study of learners of Japanese such as those in this thesis, it suggests caution in using the HDI as the sole method of analysis in studies of native speakers or highly proficient non-native speakers of Japanese. The HDI should be augmented by a qualitative discussion, as presented in Section 4.5.2 of this chapter, of background influences that may have affected or skewed the index.

Before turning to a presentation of the results from HDI analysis, a discussion of the eight categories that make up the index is in order. Of the eight categories, only the first four relate specifically to honorifics and humble forms. The next two categories on giving and receiving verbs include polite and honorific forms of these verbs. The next category on formulaic expressions focuses on commonly used formulaic expressions that cross different speech levels. The last category, *masu/desu* is almost always used with honorific verbs, but is also used as a separate marker of the "standard" speech level (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.2.4). The first four categories follow from the analysis of honorifics presented in Chapter 2, but the last four categories are often subsumed into these categories, and formulaic expressions are usually classified as part of the lexicon. Verbs of giving and receiving, formulaic expressions, and the *masu/desu* ending, however, play an important role in defining the speech level that is commonly used in public life in Japan and that is almost always used with honorific and humble forms. Though arbitrary, this set of categories covers the most common forms that mark speech as different from the informal speech level used in everyday life. The HDI thus

focuses on the degree of difference, or markedness, from the informal speech level, rather than on an assumed level of "politeness" or "respect" in a text or, indeed, in a lexical item. The assumption in this study is that the informal speech level is the underlying norm in Japanese speech and that the addition of the forms found in the eight categories changes the speech level to meet communicative needs or to conform to social expectations in a frame of interaction. This approach allows for a more dispassionate analysis that expunges notions of "politeness" and "respect" from linguistic representation and places them back in individual and social consciousness.

4.4.2. HDI Analysis of DCT and SWT Results for Learners and Native Speakers

The HDI was used to analyse learner and native-speaker responses to each dialogue of the DCT and on the SWT. Before calculating the HDI, it is necessary to calculate the number of honorifics that appeared in each situation. Though this figure is an integral part of the HDI, examining it separately from the HDI permits a correlation of both measures with findings from native speakers. For reference, the speech act dealt with in each situation is given in parentheses. The social variables that formed the frame of interaction in each situation will be referred to in the discussion throughout this section and will be investigated in detail in the Section 4.5. on sociolinguistic transfer. Table 43 below shows the mean number of honorifics in each DCT situation and in the SWT for learners and native speakers.

Table 43. Mean Honorific Count for DCT and SWT by L1 Group

Situation	Overall	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
Number	24	8	12	2	10
1 (request)	2.583	3.250	2.250	2.000	.400
2 (refusal)	4.750	4.500	4.500	7.000	4.900
3 (invitation)	2.542	3.625	1.917	1.500	0.000
4 (promise)	2.333	2.000	2.250	4.000	2.200
5 (apology)	2.875	2.500	3.250	3.000	1.900
6 (thanks)	3.667	3.625	3.667	4.000	1.500
7 (disagreement)	1.833	1.875	1.667	3.000	.200
8 (complaint)	3.833	3.750	3.917	4.500	4.000
DCT Range*	2.971	2.625	2.833	5.500	4.900
SWT (apology)	10.542	10.750	9.500	17.500	16.100

*Range between highest and lowest mean of the eight situations

Regarding learners, the above figures show that native speakers of Chinese and native speakers of English used a similar number of honorifics in five of the eight situations, whereas native speakers of Korean differed considerably from both groups four times and from the group of Anglophone learners three times. Figures for Chinese and Anglophone learners were similar five times. Because the number of Korean learners is small, results here need to be treated with caution. They suggest, however, that L1 created a larger difference between Korean learners and the two other groups than between learners in the other two groups. It also showed that the range between the lowest and highest mean number of honorifics for the Korean learners (5.5) was greater than that of the other two groups (2.625 for Chinese learners and 2.833 for the Anglophone learners). The wider range of honorific use by Korean learners is strong indication that they are more aware of speech level variation according to situation than learners in the other two groups.

The differences between Korean learners and the other two groups, however, do not in themselves indicate greater approximation to native speaker-results from the same instruments or to native-speaker sociolinguistic norms.

Results from the SWT are similar to those from the DCT for learners and native speakers. Of the three groups of learners, Chinese and Anglophone learners used a similar number of honorifics at 10.75 and 9.50, respectively. Korean learners, however, use 17.50 honorifics on average. Again, the small sample size for Korean may have affected these figures. Native speakers of Japanese used an average of 16.10 honorifics in the SWT, only slightly fewer than Korean learners. This result shows greater approximation between Korean learners and native speakers on the SWT than on the DCT.

To investigate these issues further, the HDI (Honorific Density Index) was calculated for each group of learners and for native speakers. For the HDI to be valid, however, it must yield consistent results from the group of native speakers to establish their responses as a "working norm" for this study. Highly divergent results for native speakers, for example, could mean that the data elicitation instruments are not valid or, at the very least, that the number of subjects in the study was too small to yield significant trends. Table 44 gives an overview of the descriptive statistics for the DCT and the SWT for native speakers.

Table 44. Native-Speaker HDI Descriptive Statistics for the DCT and the SWT

Situation	Mean	Std. Dev.	Range	Max	Min
1 (request)	0.9%	1.2	3.1%	3.1%	0.0%
2 (refusal)	11.1%	2.4	7.5%	16.1%	8.6%
3 (invitation)	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4 (promise)	11.3%	3.2	9.8%	16.7%	6.9%
5 (apology)	7.5%	4.8	16.4%	20.0%	3.6%
6 (thanks)	7.2%	9.8	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
7 (disagreement)	0.5%	1.2	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%
8 (complaint)	11.8%	5.5	19.7%	22.2%	2.6%
SWT (apology)	14.3%	2.8	9.8%	20.6%	10.8%

(n=10)

Results from a descriptive analysis of native-speaker HDI calculations are equivocal. Of the eight situations, native speakers showed a consistent pattern of response to the three situations (1, 3, and 7) in which the hearer was a friend. In the two situations in which the hearer was a social superior (a teacher in Situation 2 and a work supervisor in Situation 4) the patterns were moderately inconsistent, but in the two situations in which the hearer was an non-intimate out-group member (high school students in Situation 6, and a server at a restaurant in Situation 8), there was a high degree of inconsistency. Results from Situation 6 were skewed because one native speaker opted out and wrote nothing. In the introspection section, she wrote, "I'm not sure whether I'm talking to the representatives of the group or the whole group." The instructions for all instruments offered subjects the opportunity to opt out, but it is unclear whether this native speaker was influenced by the wording of the instructions on the DCT. Results from Situation 5 were also skewed because most native speakers used the formulaic expression *gomen* ("I'm sorry, pardon me"), but to

varying degrees. None of the responses showed use of *masu/desu* or any other form of honorific. Results from the SWT showed considerable inconsistency, but were similar to those from Situation 2, which also involved the student-teacher relationship, and to Situation 4. This suggests that native speakers differ considerably in the number of honorifics that they use in a given situation, but that they interpret social variables fairly consistently. The relationship between honorifics, speech levels, and social variables will be discussed in greater detail in Section 5.1.2 below. Taken together, the above results indicate the DCT and the SWT elicit consistent and therefore highly predictable responses in situations dealing with informal language, but inconsistent and unpredictable responses in situations dealing with social superiors and, particularly, in situations dealing with strangers or non-intimate out-group persons.

Another explanation for the above findings is that there could be problems in using the HDI to quantify honorific use. The relative simplicity of the eight categories, for example, could lead to an overly simplistic picture of honorific use that creates artificial inconsistencies. It must be remembered, however, that the HDI is not designed to elicit information on detailed differences in honorific use, but is instead designed to distinguish the degree of difference from informal speech, which is assumed to be the "baseline" speech level in Japanese. Because the native speakers showed uniform consistency in three of the four situations that were designed to elicit informal language and, if differences in the use of the formulaic expression *gomen* ("I'm sorry, pardon me") are excluded in Situation 5, native-speaker responses in all four situations dealing with informal language show a high degree of consistency. The HDI also reveals different degrees of honorific use, with the highest use appearing in situations that involve social superiors (2, 4, and

SWT) and out-group strangers (Situation 8). This is consistent with expectations based on findings from other studies on Japanese sociolingustic norms (e.g., **Ide 1982**, Coulmas 1992). The HDI is valid because it does what it is designed to do: show the degree of departure from the informal speech level in different texts of spoken and written language.

The final explanation for the above findings is that native speakers use a consistent speech level in informal situations, but are less consistent in formal situations in which honorifics are normally used. This means that, while all native speakers differentiate between the informal speech level and formal speech levels, they use honorifics in varying amounts and in individual ways. If valid, this argument undermines much of the previous research on Japanese honorifics that assumes broad similarity among native speakers in honorific use. As noted above, situations with weak power, status, and social distance relationships between speaker and hearer produced greater inconsistency in responses. Native speakers have stronger intuitions relating to situations in which the power, status, and distance relationship between speaker and hearer are clear. It may also be, of course, that the brevity of the DCT creates an artificial inconsistency because it does not reveal variations in honorific use in native speakers in extended dialogue. Recent research by Okamoto (1997, 1998) has shown that native-speaker speech levels vary considerably in extended dialogue in service encounters. The above discussion confirms doubts about the validity of basing research on Japanese sociolinguistics and pragmatics on only on DCTs. Problems with the DCT will be discussed further in the end of this section and in the qualitative analysis in Section 5.

The above discussion has shown, however, that the HDI is a more sensitive measure of differences in speech levels than a raw count of the number of honorifics

in a text and that it is valid in differentiating formal speech levels from baseline informal speech levels. Table 45 shows HDI results for the three main groups of learners and for native speakers. In the discussion that follows, results for Korean learners should be treated with considerable caution because there were only two learners in this group and, as noted in Section 4.2.1 of this chapter, their proficiency differed from each other considerably. A larger number of Korean learners would have increased the validity of the results, but there were only two Korean learners in the third year Japanese class at the University of Sydney when the data were collected.

Table 45. Mean HDI Results for DCT and SWT by L1 Group

Situation	Overall	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
Number	24	8	12	2	10
1 (request)	7.03%	8.03%	5.96%	4.44%	0.91%
2 (refusal)	12.48%	11.86%	12.72%	12.72%	11.11%
3 (invitation)	6.91%	9.29%	5.84%	2.86%	0.00%
4 (promise)	9.82%	7.69%	10.68%	9.81%	11.34%
5 (apology)	13.56%	13.66%	17.28%	9.53%	7.53%
6 (thanks)	11.88%	12.11%	15.80%	7.72%	7.16%
7 (disagreement)	4.64%	6.19%	6.57%	5.56%	0.50%
8 (complaints)	12.64%	12.88%	14.73%	9.03%	11.83%
DCT Range	10.60%	9.42%	11.44%	8.28%	11.83%
SWT (apology)	11.91%	11.27%	10.51%	11.62%	14.25%

The findings mirror the pattern in the raw count of the number of honorific appearances, but show considerably more similarity among different groups. Among the three groups of learners, for example, all three groups reported similar results for Situations 2 and 7. A comparison of Chinese and Anglophone learners

shows that figures were similar five times and figures for Anglophone and Korean learners were similar four times. Despite the large common Chinese-character lexicon, a comparison of Chinese and Korean learners shows that figures were similar only in Situations 2 and 7. In the raw count of honorific appearances, the range between the highest and lowest figures was higher for the Korean learners than for the other two groups of learners, but based on the HDI calculation, the results are inverted: Korean learners have the lowest range at 8.28%, followed by Chinese learners at 9.42% and Anglophone learners at 11.44%. These figures show that, as a percentage of volume, the pattern for Korean learners is not as divergent from the other two groups as in the raw honorific count in figures for each situation and for the overall range in the data.

Comparing the results for learners with those for native speakers shows that Korean learners approximate to native speaker results more closely than in the raw honorific count. Figures are very close in two cases, Situations 2 and 6, and moderately close in Situations 3, 4, 5, and 8. The only area of significant difference was Situations 1 and 7, but in both cases, results for native speakers were closer to those of Korean learners than of any other group. Indeed, native speakers were closer to Korean learners in five of the eight situations. In the remaining three, they were close to Chinese learners twice and Anglophone learners once.

HDI figures for the SWT are interesting because all three groups of learners used almost the same number of honorifics as percentage of volume. The range between the highest group, the Korean learners, and the lowest groups, the Anglophone learners, was only 1.11. HDI figures for the SWT also differ considerably from results from the raw honorific count as shown in Table 45 above. There, Korean learners used more honorifics (17.50) than the other two groups

(Chinese 10.75 and Anglophone 9.50), but the differences are levelled when calculated by the HDI. HDI figures for native speakers show that native speakers used more honorifics than any other group, with the gap between them and the next highest group, the Korean learners, being 2.68, more than twice the gap of 1.11 between the highest and lowest learner HDI figure. Indeed, compared with all eight DCT situations, native speakers used the highest percentage of honorifics on the SWT, and the SWT was only the second instance in which the native speakers had the highest HDI figure among all groups, the other being DCT Situation 4. This indicates that the SWT stimulated the production of honorific forms more than all but one other DCT situation. Further analysis is needed to determine whether results were significantly affected by the topic of the situation or the instructions indicating that this was a writing exercise as opposed to those on the DCT, which instructed respondents to write what they would "say."

Correlation of HDI results for the three groups of learners and native speakers is a way to check the tentative conclusions of the above discussion. Table 46 contains correlation results for the four groups for the all eight DCT situations. The SWT results could not be correlated for Korean learners because there were only two figures for Korean learners on the SWT.

Table 46. Correlation of Learner and Native-Speaker HDI Results for the DCT

	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
Chinese	1.0000	.8678**	.5272	.5724
English	.8678**	1.0000	.7165*	.7480*
Korean	.5272	.7480*	1.0000	.9031**
Japanese	.4724	.7524*	.9031**	1.0000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

The above results confirm the patterns of approximation to native-speaker performance that appeared in the discussion of raw honorific count and of the HDI. Results for Chinese and Anglophone learners show a high degree of positive correlation at .8678, whereas the correlation between Anglophone learners and Korean learners was lower at .7165. Results from Chinese learners correlated positively, but not significantly with Korean learners and native speakers (.5272 versus .5724). Of all groups, only results from Anglophone learners correlated positively with all other groups. Korean learners and native speakers of Japanese showed the highest degree of positive correlation at .9031. Interestingly enough, results for native speakers of English correlated slightly more positively with native speakers of Japanese than they did with Korean learners (.7480 versus .7165).

Together, these results confirm that Korean learners came closest to approximating to native speakers, but only slightly more so than did Anglophone learners. Because Korean has an extensive system of honorifics, it seems natural for Korean learners of Japanese to be more sensitive to the role that honorifics play in defining different speech levels than Chinese or Anglophone learners. The positive correlation between Anglophone learners and native speakers, however, may be seen as undermining the notion of the L1 having a role influencing learner use of honorifics, because English has few such forms beyond terms of address. Either Anglophone learners in this study have developed enough metalinguistic awareness of speech levels in Japanese to use honorifics effectively, or it could be that English and Japanese follow similar sociolinguistic and pragmatic conventions in the situations given on the DCT. Perhaps the lack of preconceived notions about Japanese helped Anglophone learners come closer to approximating to

native-speaker performance than Chinese learners who draw heavily on L1 knowledge of Chinese characters. The relationship among social variables, language background, Japanese proficiency, individual variation, and the data elicitation instruments will be examined in greater detail in the qualitative analysis Section 4.5.1.2 below.

4.4.3. Results from the DET for Learners and Native Speakers

The DET (Discourse Evaluation Task) was designed to elicit data on learner metalinguistic awareness of honorifics and speech levels and on learner ability to relate honorific forms that appeared in the listening passages to other forms of the same lexeme or similar semantic items. Compared with the DCT and the SWT, the DET is designed to elicit specific responses to questions about language, which can then be scored against a composite of native-speaker responses to the same questions. Results for native speakers showed remarkable consistency, so it was easy to develop a composite of responses that could be used to evaluate learner response. This composite of acceptable responses will also be used to evaluate learner responses in the section on sociolinguistic transfer. Turning DET, DCT, SWT, and C-test results into fractional rank percentages allows for all four instruments to be correlated. Results from these instruments were ranked so that native speaker results were on the high end of the scale, which allowed native-speaker responses to be interpreted as that native-speaker proficiency against which learner responses could be evaluated. The DET also included a written introspection section that gave learners and native speakers the opportunity to comment on the dialogues, their answers, or the instruments. The version of the DET used in the pilot study had eight dialogues,

but I reduced it to six so that the time required to complete the task would be similar the time required to complete the DCT and the C-test (the SWT took less time). Descriptive statistics for the DET by learner L1 group are presented below in Table 47.

Table 47. Descriptive Statistics for the DET by Learner L1 Group and by Dialogue Number

L1 Group	Overall	Chinese	English	Korean		
Number	24	8	12	2		
Mean	10.83	10.63	10.75	13.00		
Std. Dev.	2.140	2.264	2.137	2.828		
Range	8	8	7	4		
Max	15	15	14	15		
Min	7	7	7	11		
Dialogue	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mean	1.792	2.792	1.333	1.708	1.542	1.667
Std. Dev.	.658	.415	.637	.690	.884	.816
Range	3	1	3	3	3	3
Max	3	3	3	3	3	3
Min	0	2	0	0	0	0

The above results are similar to those from the C-test insofar as the mean for Korean learners is not only the highest of the three groups, but also statistically higher than the next highest group. As with the C-test, results for Chinese and Anglophone learners are close to each other with a large range between the maximum and minimum figures. Indeed, the range of acceptable responses for Korean learners was almost half that of Chinese and Anglophone learners. Results by situation indicate that learners performed best on Dialogue 2, a dialogue between

a teacher and student with a large number of honorific expressions, and worst on Dialogue 3, a dialogue between a teenage boy and his friend's mother. Results for the other dialogues were similar in mean and range, but Dialogues 1 and 4 had slightly smaller standard deviations than Dialogues 5 and 6. Schema and metalinguistic awareness developed from formal training in the classroom no doubt made the topic and language of this dialogue more familiar to learners and hence easier to understand. On the contrary, Dialogue 3 was difficult because all but one of the learners had the extensive living experience in Japan that is helpful to understanding dialogues relating to Japanese family life.

DET, C-test, and DCT and SWT volume results were correlated to determine the relationship among analyses used to measure language proficiency. Correlation results are given in Table 48.

Table 48. Correlation of DET Scores with the C-test and Other Language Proficiency Measures for Learners

Sit.	DET	C-test	DCT Vol.	SWT Vol.
DET	1.0000	.6999**	.5021*	.7010**
1	.3757	.3132	.4518*	.4748*
2	.3020	.3611	.1725	.0522
3	.5209**	.7210**	.4323*	.5875**
4	.6132**	.3213	.5353**	.5831**
5	.7166**	.4867*	.2439	.3618
6	.4645*	.0377	-.1895	.0852
C-test	.6999**	1.0000	.6580**	.7980**
DCT Vol.	.5021*	.6580**	1.0000	.8210**
SWT Vol.	7010**	.7980**	.8210**	1.0000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

The above results show that the DET correlates positively with all measures of proficiency used in this study. Of these measures, the C-test is the most important, and it correlated well with the DET at .6999. Performance on the C-test can thus be considered an accurate predictor of performance on the DET. DET scores and DCT volume figures correlated positively, but less strongly than DET scores did with SWT volume figures. This suggests that either the format or the topic of the SWT stimulated learners to produce a volume of writing that was closer to scores on the DET than the DCT did. Volume figures for the DCT and the SWT are useful measures of proficiency only because they correlate well with the C-test, but when correlated against the C-test and the DET, the SWT showed a higher correlation than did the DCT.

Also of interest are the correlation results for each dialogue of the DET with the overall score. Dialogues 3, 4, and 5 correlated most significantly with the overall score, with Dialogue 6 correlating only slightly less significantly. Dialogues 1 and 2 correlated positively, but not significantly with the overall score. Results from Dialogue 6, however, correlate poorly with all other measures of proficiency. The low correlation with the C-test (.0377) indicates that results from the dialogue are not a valid indication of proficiency. Descriptive statistics for the dialogue, which were presented in Table 48 above, are similar to Dialogue 5, which correlates positively and significantly with the C-test. The best explanation for this seemingly contradictory finding is that Dialogue 6 caused learners to perform in a way that was inconsistent with their performance on the other proficiency measures. Among the dialogues, this dialogue contained the most informal colloquial language and may have caused learners who had not been to Japan or who had not had frequent contact with Japanese people to perform worse than those who had. The type of questions

asked might have also influenced how learners responded.

With a positive correlation between the C-test and DCT and SWT volume, the DET can be considered a valid indicator of overall language proficiency, but this says little about its validity as a measure of sociolinguistic proficiency. Correlating fractional rank percentages for the DET scores with DCT and SWT HDI figures and C-test results shows how well the DET correlates with other measures of sociolinguistic proficiency relative to native-speaker proficiency. This measure is based on the rank divided by the number of cases and multiplied by 100 and was calculated using SPSS software. This method assumes native-speaker responses to all instruments as a norm so that fractional percentage rankings were conducted, depending on the item, by assigning a value of 1.0 to the largest or smallest value so that native-speaker results were ranked the highest; learners who deviated most from native-speaker results were thus ranked lowest. Native speaker results thus formed the basis from which learners were ranked. Table 49 presents correlations for combined results on each instrument. The number of subjects in this and subsequent tables for learners and native speakers is 34 (24 learners and 10 native speakers).

Table 49. Fractional Rank Percentage Correlation for DET and Other Instruments for Learners and Native Speakers

	DET	DCT HDI	SWT HDI	C-TEST
DET	1.0000	.7061**	.3685*	.8593**
DCT HDI	.7061**	1.0000	.3429*	.7683**
SWT HDI	.3685*	.3429*	1.0000	.2910
C-TEST	.8593**	.7683**	.2910	1.0000

**= $p<.01$; *=$p<.05$

The above figures show that, in terms of fractional rank percentages, the DET correlated strongly with the DCT HDI and the C-test, but less so with the HDI rating for the SWT. The high correlation with the C-test was somewhat expected because native speakers were assigned a perfect score and received a near perfect score on the C-test. The high correlation with the DCT HDI, however, was somewhat less expected because DCT HDI results for learners and native speakers varied considerably. Because the DET correlated well with the two instruments that were evaluated with the HDI, the DET can be considered a valid measure of sociolinguistic proficiency when used with the other two instruments. A word of caution is in order: if native-speaker responses to the DET had differed considerably from each other, it would have been difficult to assign a perfect score to native-speaker responses, which would have lowered the correlation between the DET and the C-test.

4.4.4. Concluding Discussion of Sociolinguistic Proficiency

Before concluding the discussion on sociolinguistic proficiency, it is important to conclude the discussion on the validity of the instruments by examining native-speaker introspective comments on them because few studies include subjective native-speaker comments on research instruments or on the language used in them. As with learners, native-speaker introspective comments were optional, but most native speakers made comments. Table 50 below provides some examples of native-speaker introspective comments on the instruments and language used in them. The DCT situation number and the DET dialogue number referred to in the

comment are noted in parentheses after each comment. Comments written in Japanese have been translated into English.

Table 50. Selected Native-Speaker Introspective Comments on the DCT, the SWT, and the DET

DCT
1. I'm not sure whether I'm talking to the representatives of the group or the whole group. (6)
2. Responses differ according to familiarity with the hearer and the type of non-verbal communication he or she uses. In Japanese, it's for somebody to continue talking without reaction to the hearer's verbal (*aizuchi*) and non-verbal response. (general comment)
SWT
1. This was really difficult to write. I tried to apologise enough, but I think I would have not left a memo and would have waited to talk to the tutor in person.
2. I would be less formal in writing to a male tutor, but it depends on his age and personality. It's hard to imagine who the tutor is here.
DET
1. Slightly unnatural level of politeness. (1)
2. The dialogue is too slow--unnatural. (1)
3. "KYOUha korede SITUREIsimasu" is not used like this. It seems impolite. "sayonara" is more natural. (2)
4. Seems like a TV drama. Too "standard." (3)
6. In a normal conversation, they would decide the place and time at the end. (5)
7. This topic is usually only discussed among married couple. (6)

The above examples indicate that native-speakers found it difficult to imagine themselves in some of the situations presented in the DCT and the SWT and that they found the language in some of the DET dialogues unnatural. One native speaker also noted that the DCT does not measure verbal interjections and non-verbal

communication. These findings highlight a serious limitation of instruments such as the DCT and the SWT: researcher control over the frame of interaction presented as a "situation." The issue of researcher control also affected perceptions of the DET because many native speakers perceived some of the dialogues, particularly Dialogues 1 and 3 as unnatural. This seems inevitable, however, because many learners had trouble understanding the dialogues even though they contained simplified language spoken slightly slower than natural speed. More colloquial and natural dialogues would have made it even more difficult for learners to understand.

Aside from gathering naturalistic data, which is difficult in a foreign language environment, all data elicitation instruments have to compromise the need to balance "naturalistic" language production with researcher control. The problem, then, is the degree of artificiality in researcher controls and in the data elicited. In this study, the SWT was the closest to a "real-life" activity that would produce language in use because native-speakers and learners do write notes and letters to social superiors in everyday life. The DCT and the DET, however, have greater researcher control and hence risk reduced validity as a measurement of natural language production. Despite problems with these instruments, they were useful in this study to distinguish among different L1 groups and yield a rough measure of how well learners approximated native-speaker performance. If used in isolation in studies of native-speaker sociolinguistic use (e.g., Okada Yamashita 1996), the problems with the DCT discussed so far could seriously undermine the validity of such studies.

The discussion in Section 4.4 has focused on sociolinguistic proficiency and on the validity of the instruments in this study that were used to measure it. Sociolinguistic proficiency in this study is defined as the degree of approximation to

native-speaker sociolinguistic norms. Accordingly, learners who come closer to approximating native-speaker norms are considered to have a higher level of sociolinguistic proficiency than those who do not. Results and discussion in this section lead to the following conclusions on sociolinguistic proficiency. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, however, the small number of Korean learners in the data sample makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions from the data presented here.

1. The HDI (Honorific Density Index) is a valid quantitative measure of the degree of deviation from the informal speech level in learners and native speakers. It produces significant differences among groups that allow for meaningful comparison. It must be remembered, however, that the HDI is designed as a rough measure of the honorific density of a given text and should be used with caution in discussion of detailed aspects of individual honorific use, particularly in analysing data from native speakers and highly proficient non-native speakers.

2. Of learner L1 groups, Korean learners showed the highest degree of approximation to native-speaker sociolinguistic norms on the DCT and the SWT as measured by the HDI and had the highest mean score on the DET of all groups. This suggests that differences in L1 background influence sociolinguistic proficiency to some degree. Findings from Korean learners, however, are speculative because there were only two Korean learners in the sample.

3. The results reveal considerable individual variation in learner sociolinguistic proficiency and in native-speaker usage of formal speech levels on the DCT and the

SWT. Native-speaker usage was consistent in informal speech levels, as were responses to most questions on the DET.

4. Native speaker introspective comments on the format and validity of the instruments provided important information that can be used in evaluating the validity of the instruments as research tools and as representations of "real-life" language.

4.5. Sociolinguistic Transfer

Confirming that L1 proficiency affects sociolinguistic proficiency and that sociolinguistic proficiency varies considerably in learners, however, does not reveal sources of sociolinguistic transfer or information on the relationship between transfer and other cognitive and affective variables. In this section, I will discuss confirmed and speculative sources of sociolinguistic transfer and how they relate to other variables. I will relate findings from this discussion to those from the discussion on linguistic transfer above. Finally, I will address the hypotheses regarding sociolinguistic transfer that have guided this study so far. Throughout, I will evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the instruments and procedures used in this study.

As in the discussion of language transfer in Section 4.3 of this chapter, the discussion here will be based on a detailed analysis of specific items from the DCT, the SWT, and the DET. Because responses to all these instruments were open-ended, item-analysis will be mostly qualitative and include references to learner and native-speaker introspective comments.

4.5.1. Social Variables and Speech Act Coding

Before analysing sources of sociolinguistic transfer, it is necessary to define the sociolinguistic constructs behind the situations and dialogues in the DCT, the SWT, and the DET. This information will help reveal patterns of similarity and difference across the instruments that affect learner and native-speaker responses. The underlying construct behind each situation and dialogue in the instruments is that of

the speech act. Within each speech act, dominance, status, age, and social distance relationship were established to stimulate the production of a certain speech level. Table 51 below gives an overview of the relevant information on the 17 situations and dialogues. For the DCT and the SWT, the notation refers to the hearer (interlocutor), and for the DET, the two notations (i.e., -/+) refer to the first and second speaker in the dialogue respectively.

Table 51. Overview of Speech Act and Speaker-Hearer Relationship in the DCT, the SWT, and the DET

Speech Act	Source	SVI*	Distance	Dominance	Age	Status	Place
Apology	DCT 5	-4	--	=	=	=	cafe
	SWT	+4	-	+	+	+	university
	DET 3	+4	-	-/+	-/+	-/+	telephone
Complaint	DCT 8	+2	++	=	?	-	restaurant
	DET 6	-4	--	=	=	=	home
Disagree	DCT 7	-2	-	?	?	=	group meeting
Invite	DCT 3	-4	-	-	=	=	university
	DET 1	+2	+	=	?	=	?
Promise	DCT 4	+4	-	+	+	+	work/office
Refusal	DCT 2	+4	-	+	+	+	classroom
	DET 5	-2	-	?	=	=	work/office
Request	DCT 1	-2	-	=	=	=	telephone
	DET 4	-4	--	=	=	=	home/cafe
Thanks	DCT 6	0	+	=	-	=	outside
	DET 2	+4	-	-/+	-/+	-/+	university

Note: "+" refers to positive values, "-" to negative values, "=" to equal values; "?" refers to relationships that are unclear. "++" and "--" refer to stronger values on either end of scale.

* SVI (Social Variable Index)

Gender was not included in Table 51 because learners and native speakers were asked to choose the gender of their imagined interlocutor for the DCT and the SWT.

I chose this method because it gave learners the option of deciding the gender of the interlocutor. In contradistinction to the present situation in the West, social roles of men and women are clearly defined in many parts of the world, and researcher-determined or vaguely defined gender roles could make it difficult for learners to interpret the situation clearly. To date, I know of no DCT that allowed learners to indicate the gender of the interlocutor. In the case of the DET, all of the dialogues were between a man and a woman. In three dialogues (nos. 1, 4, and 6), the man and woman were equal or nearly equal in status; the man was dominant in Dialogue 2, and the woman in Dialogue 3. Dialogue 5 was designed to be equal, but several native speakers thought that the woman was dominant over the man, which made it difficult to determine a clear pattern of gender dominance in this dialogue. Gender relations in Japan do not always follow the stereotypical view of the woman as submissive or "indirect," which makes it difficult to ascribe a clear value to the role of gender in the limited context of these dialogues. Because of this difficulty, gender differences were not categorised separately in the above table.

Of the 15 situations and dialogues, only one speech act, that of apology, appeared in all three instruments. It might have been ideal to have added several more writing samples on the SWT to allow for a more complete cross-instrument comparison, but this was logistically difficult because it would have required the learners to sacrifice even more time for the project than they already had. The DCT and the DET, however, had six speech acts in common, which allows for comparison between these two instruments.

To permit quantification of the social variables listed in Table 51 (distance, dominance, age, and status), I developed the Social Variable Index (SVI) to determine a numerical value for different variables in a given situation. The idea of

coding the variables using a "+" or "-" comes from the coding system used in the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Patterns) research project (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989: 15-16). They coded their DCT situations for social distance and dominance; for social distance, they used a "+" or "-" to indicate the degree of social distance in each situation, and for dominance, they used an "=" to indicate equality and a "<" or a ">" to indicate the direction of dominance. Together these notations produced six role patterns, which were represented in symbols such as "{+SD}, {x=y}." This system was a useful point of departure, but was too narrow to reveal subtle distinctions between the situations. To social distance and dominance, I added "age" and "social status" because it is possible for people to have different social status, but not be in a relationship that involves dominance. As discussed in Chapter 2, research on Japanese sociolinguistic norms has shown that age is an important factor in determining speech levels and use of honorifics (e.g., Ide 1982). I also allowed for another "+" or "-" to be added to describe situations in which a particular value was especially strong, such as a high degree of social distance.

The Social Variable Index (SVI) was calculated on the basis of assigning an arbitrary value of 2.0 for each positive, a -2.0 for each negative, and a value of 0.0 for equal and unknown social variable in Table 51. The value of 2.0 was chosen to widen the range of the scale. An example of an SVI calculation for DCT Situation 5, for example, would be as follows: -4 (-- equals strong lack of distance) + 0 (equal dominance) + 0 (equal age) + 0 (equal social status) = -4. An SVI of -4 shows that the social variables in the frame of interaction call for language that is appropriate for close relationships among peers. Figures for the DET were more difficult to calculate because the two interlocutors in the dialogue were noted in the table. In

dialogues with positive and negative social variables, the positive figure was used in the calculation so that the measure would be consistent with the DCT. Though the resulting SVI figure yields only a rough approximation of the social variables in each situation and dialogue, it provides a useful guideline for evaluating learner and native-speaker responses through the HDI and qualitative analysis. Like the HDI, the SVI is applicable to spoken and written language as well as to extended discourse. It is limited, however, because the narrow scale does not yield as fine a distinction among responses as the HDI. Assigning varying values to social variables would require that the researcher determine the value of each variable in relation to other variables. This would immediately call into question the researcher's judgement because native speakers do not always agree on which variables are more influential than others. Future research on native-speaker perceptions of the importance of the SVI and other variables is needed to determine whether a weighted index provides a more accurate description of the relative importance of each variable than the non-weighted format used here. The SVI will be referred to throughout the discussion on sociolinguistic transfer.

The SVI needs to be tested before it can be used as a point of reference in the discussion that follows. Ideally, native-speaker HDI results should correlate well with the SVI to show that the arbitrary constructs accurately reflect how native speakers perform in each situation. An exact correlation is impossible because individual factors affect how native speakers react to any frame of interaction. A weak correlation, however, would indicate that the constructs in the SVI are invalid, or at least that the description of the situation was too vague for native speakers to formulate a sociolinguistically appropriate response. The problem of lack of non-verbal information as it affects the validity of the DCT has already been noted in

Section 4.4.1.4. A number of DCTs, such as those used in the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realisation Patterns) research project (Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper 1989) have short, if not vague, descriptions that many native speakers of Japanese would find insufficient.

To correlate HDI figures with the SVI, I used the mean HDI figure for each group of learners for each of the eight DCT situations and correlated these with SVI. The results of this correlation are presented in Table 52 below. Because the HDI was not used with the DET, only figures for the DCT will be presented here.

Table 52. Correlation of Mean DCT HDI Figures by L1 Group with the SVI.

L1	Japanese	Chinese	English	Korean	SVI
Japanese	1.0000	.5333	.7389*	.9283**	.7908*
Chinese	.5333	1.0000	.8679**	.5915	.0653
English	.7389*	.8679**	1.0000	.7419*	.2617
Korean	.9283**	.5915	.7419*	1.0000	.7417*
SVI	.7908*	.0653	.2617	.7417*	1.0000

*= $p<.05$, **= $p<.01$

The above figures indicate that the native-speaker HDI results correlate positively at $p<.05$. This indicates that the constructs in the SVI reflect the native-speaker use of honorifics on the DCT, thus validating the SVI as a measure of broad social variables in each of the DCT situations. HDI figures for Korean learners also correlated positively with the SVI at .7417 ($p<.05$). The closeness of this figure to that of native speakers (.7908, $p<.05$) indicates that Korean learners perceived the social variables in much the same way as native speakers. The almost perfect correlation between the two groups at .9283 ($p<.01$) confirms this finding. HDI figures for

Chinese and Anglophone learners, meanwhile, correlated positively but not significantly with the SVI, which indicates that these two groups perceived social variables in each situation differently on average from native speakers and Korean learners. Indeed, figures for Chinese learners were barely positive at .0653. Though these results show that the SVI is a valid indicator of social variables in each DCT situation, they mask important differences and distinctions among groups that will be discussed in the following section.

4.5.2. Speech Act Analysis and Sources of Transfer

The discussion in this section will be organised around learner and native-speaker responses to each of the eight speech acts that are listed in Table 52 above. Each speech act will be examined to see whether a pattern of transfer exists, and this will be followed by a discussion on possible sources of transfer and on other cognitive and affective variables that may have influenced the results. To compare learner and native-speaker results within the same speech act, HDI results for the DCT, the SWT, and the DET, I decided to rank results from these instruments for learners and native speakers together (n = 34; 24 learners and 10 native speakers) on a fractional percentage basis. As described in Section 4.4.3 above, this measure is based on the rank divided by the number of cases and multiplied by 100. This method assumes native-speaker responses to all instruments as a norm so that fractional percentage rankings were conducted, depending on the item, by assigning a value of 1.0 to the largest or smallest value so that native-speaker results were ranked the highest; learners who deviated most from native-speaker results were thus ranked lowest. Native speaker results thus formed the basis from which learners were ranked.

Table 53 provides an example of this method, which will be used through the discussion that follows. "Lowest," "middle," and "highest" refer to the HDI figures or C-test scores. Figures in the "middle" category are examples that are closest to the mean for the entire group.

Table 53. Sample of Ranks and Fractional Percentage Rank Calculations for Selected HDI figures and the C-test

	DCT #1			SWT			C-test		
	HDI	Rank	Fract. %	HDI	Rank	Fract. %	Score	Rank	Fract. %
Lowest	0.00%	31.5	92.65%	7.27%	1	2.94%	20.0%	1	2.94%
Middle	5.41%	14	41.18%	11.70%	20	58.82%	58.0%	22	64.71%
Highest	15.00%	1	2.94%	20.62%	34	100.0%	98.0%	34	100.0%

In the above table, a native speaker had the lowest HDI in DCT Situation 1, the highest HDI on the SWT, and the highest score on the C-test. To create a fractional percentage ranking that would put a native speaker at the top of the three scales, I had to rank DCT Situation 1 by assigning a rank of 1.0 to the largest value (15.00%) because a native speaker had the lowest score (0.0%). With the SWT and C-test, I had to do the reverse by assigning a rank of 1.0 to the smallest value (7.27% and 20.0% respectively) because a native speaker had the highest scores (20.62% and 98%) on both measures. The lack of a 100% figure in DCT Situation 1 is because so many of the native speakers had the same HDI of 0.0% for this item that they had to share the top ranking position (the mean for native speakers was 0.9%). Though I have not seen this method used before in the literature, I believe that it is useful in creating a common measurement that permits correlation among HDI fractional

percentage rankings, DET fractional percentage rankings, and C-test scores, in which native speakers naturally ranked at the top of the scale. Correlation among these measures is useful to augment quantitative analysis of the results. Though the transformation of different measures into a common fractional percentage ranking risks certain distortions, which are evident in the figures for DCT Situation 1 in Table 53, it is the only way to create a common numerical measure among different numerical measures discussed in this section. The qualitative analysis in each section will also provide an opportunity to highlight results from this analysis that are not supported by the raw data. Tables under each speech act show selected examples from the data. The complete set of data is shown in its entirety in the appendices.

4.5.2.1. Apologies

The first speech act, which appeared in all three instruments, was apologies. This category included DCT Situation 5 (SVI -4), DET Dialogue 3 (SVI +4), and the SWT (SVI +4), and was the only category to include items from the three instruments designed to elicit data on sociolinguistic transfer. In Table 54, the percentage figure for each instrument indicates the fractional percentage rank for the L1 group. The mean at the bottom of the table indicates the mean fractional percentage rank for all three instruments by L1 group.

Table 54. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Apology Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	13.66	17.28	9.53	7.53
DCT %	45.22%	41.54%	61.03%	72.94%
SWT HDI	11.27	10.51	11.62	14.25
SWT %	44.48%	35.05%	50.74%	76.91%
DET Score	1.25	1.5	1.5	3.0*
DET %	34.56%	42.16%	42.65%	85.29%
Mean %	41.42%	39.58%	51.47%	78.38%

It is clear from the above results that Korean learners come closest of the three main groups of learners to approximating to native-speaker performance on all three apology measures. This indicates that L1 has a clear influence on learner approximation of native-speaker norms in the speech act of apology. Correlation among the three instruments and the C-test shows that all three measures correlated positively and significantly (DCT .5314, SWT .4540 and DET .9028, all at $p<.01$), which indicates that language proficiency also influenced the degree to which learners approximate native-speaker norms. From the above data, it appears that Korean learners drew on their L1 linguistic and cultural knowledge to approximate to native-speaker performance in the density of honorifics used in the DCT and the SWT and in comprehending the DET dialogue. Findings regarding Korean learners, however, are limited by the small size of the sample.

Although the mean C-test score for Korean learners was 47.50%, which indicates higher overall language proficiency than in respect of the other groups of learners (37.50% for Chinese and 35.67% for Anglophone learners), the difference between Korean learners and other learner groups in the category of apologies is

greater than the difference in C-test scores, which makes overall language proficiency an unlikely explanation. Rather, the Korean learners seem to have come closer to native-speaker interpretations of social variables and to have had sufficient language proficiency to produce a wider range of informal and honorific forms. Chinese and Anglophone learners, on the other hand, had more divergent interpretations of social variables and lacked the language proficiency to produce a sufficient range of informal and honorific forms. Examples shown in Table 54 illustrate this point. Parentheses contain the learner or native-speaker ID number, HDI results, and C-test results for learners. A translation of each response, which is designed to reflect the speech level of the original, is given below in Roman letters. The original situation is given at the beginning of the table. All subsequent tables relating to speech acts follow the format of Table 55.

Table 55. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 5 (SVI -4)

Situation: You have an appointment with a close Japanese friend. You were supposed to meet him or her at 3:00 p.m. at a café in Gleebe. You are usually on time, but this time you left home a little late and then missed the bus, causing you to wait 20 minutes for another bus. You arrive at 3:40 p.m. and apologise for being late.

You would say:

Japanese 1. *gomen ne! konnani OKUrechatte. NANJI goro Kita?* (#1 HDI 5.0%)

("Sorry! For being this late. When did you get here?")

2. *gomen ne. basu ga okurechatte. Matta? koohii wa WATASHI no ogoriyo.* (#7 HDI 3.6%)

("Sorry. The bus was late. Did you wait? Let me treat you to coffee.")

Korean 1. *sumimasenga, takusan osoi desu ne.* (#7, HDI 12.5%, C-test 37%)

("Sorry, but I'm really late.")

2. *gomen ne. nagaku matta ne. basu wo miss shimattara 20BUN matanakereba naranai deshitayo. ato niwa kono occasion ga shinai to DORYOKU shimasu yo. gomen ne.* (#17, HDI 6.6%, C-test 58%)

("Sorry. You've been waiting a while, I know. When I missed the bus, I had to wait

another 20 minutes. I'll try not to let this occasion happen again. I'm sorry.")

Chinese 1. *sumimasen. sumimasen. IE wo DAshita TOKI, DENWA ga atta. basu ga chotto OSOku kara IMA TSUKImasu.* (#16, HDI 12.5%, C-test 43%)
("Sorry. Sorry. I got a phone call when I was leaving the house. The bus was late, so I'm arriving now.")
2. *OMAtaserareru node SHITSUREI shimasu.* (#8, HDI 25.0%, C-test 61%)
("I am very for having caused you to wait.")

English 1. *gomennasai. watashiwa baka desu yo. osoidesu ne.* (#14, HDI 15.0%, C-test 20%)
("I'm sorry. I'm such a fool. It's late.")
2. *yosiko-san, omataseishimashita. hontooni gomennasai ne! WATASHIga tsugoi baka node noru tsumori deshita. bus ni noranakatta node konnani osokunatta.* (#24, HDI 8.2%, C-test 59%)
("I'm sorry for keeping you waiting, Yoshiko-san. I'm really sorry. I'm such a fool. I tried to get the bus [on time], but I couldn't so I'm this late.")

Sinhala *sumimasenga.* (#5, HDI 33.3%, C-test 27%)
("I'm sorry.")

None of the native speakers in these examples or in the data set used any honorifics except for the expression *gomen* ("I'm sorry") or its slightly more formal variant *gomennasai*. All of their responses began with this word and used the informal speech level through the rest of the response, which would be expected in an informal situation with an SVI of -4. Most of the learners began with an apology, but continued their responses in the formal speech level. The average HDI for the Korean learners, however, is lowered considerably in this situation because the second learner (C-test 58%) wrote a longer response than the first learner (C-test 37%), but was the only learner who did not use *masu/desu* endings and other honorific forms. Chinese learners, by contrast, used *masu/desu* endings and a variety of honorific forms regardless of proficiency. Indeed, as the above examples show, they often created long non-existent honorific forms. Together, the short sentences ending in *masu/desu* that less proficient learner produced and the honorific creations that more-proficient learners produced raised the average HDI for these two

groups considerably. Anglophone learners presented a mixed picture. Like Chinese learners, they consistently used the *masu/desu* form and more advanced learners tended to use extensive and creative honorific forms. Unlike the Chinese learners, however, the most proficient learner had a lower HDI than many of the less-proficient learners. It must be remembered, however, that this learner was the only one in the group that had spent at least a year in Japan.

In contrast to the DCT, the SWT and the DET had positive SVIs. The following Table 56 shows selected examples from SWT responses.

Table 56. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to SWT (SVI +4)

Situation: You have an appointment with your Japanese teacher to discuss the results of a recent homework assignment. Something came up suddenly in your life, forcing you to cancel the appointment. Please leave him or her a note apologising for not being able to keep the appointment. Begin with the greeting and end with the closing.
Note:

Japanese *itsumo o-SEWA ni natte orimasu. SENJITSU o-YAKUSOKUshita KYOO no o-HANAshiAi desuga, KYUUYOO ga dekimashita node BETSU no Hi ni HENKOOshite ITADAkitaku ZONjimasu. ainiku SENSEI ga o-RUSU desu node memo ni SHITSUREI ITAshimasu. mata o-DENWA ITAshimasu.* (#6, HDI 20.6%)
("I am always indebted to you. Regarding today's previous appointment, something urgent came up, so I would like to ask you to change the appointment to another day. You were not in, so unfortunately I had no choice but to leave this memo. I will ring you later.")

Korean 1. *o-GENKI desuka. WATASHI wa GENKI desu. TOKU ni(wa) nanimo arimasenga, zannen desu keredo, KYOO SENSEI ni Au kotoga dekimasen. sumimasenga, WATASHI wa ASHITA kara itsunimo ii desu node, SENSEI no BENRIna JIKAN de auno KIKAI wo oNEGAIsimasu. WATASIno DENWAbangoha 674-3301.* (#7, HDI 12.8%, C-test 37%)
("How are you? I am fine. I don't mean to bother you, but unfortunately, I will not be able to meet you today. Sorry, but any time after tomorrow is fine, so I would like a chance to meet you at a convenient time for you. My telephone number is 674-3301.")
2. *KYOO, GOGO NIJI ni, SENSEI to YAKUSOKU ga arimasu kedo, KYUU ni byooin e*

Ikanakereba naranai koto ga DEKImashita. hiru go-han de TAbeta sashimi ga MONDAI datta to OMOimasu. moosiwake arimasen desuga, BETSU no HI ni oMEni kakaritai desu. WATASHI no DENWA BANGOO wa 838-3533 desu. o-JIKAN ga attara, WATASHI no IE ni DENWAsasete itadakemasenka. GOGO YOJI ATO wa itsudemo ii desu. totemo arigatoo gozaimashita. (#17, HDI 10.4%, C-test 58%)

("I have an appointment with you today at 2:00 p.m., but I had to go to the hospital suddenly. I think that my lunch might have made me ill. I am terribly sorry, but I would like to meet you on another day. My telephone number is 838-3533. If you have time, please feel free to ring me at home. I am usually in after 4:00 p.m. Thank you very much.")

Chinese 1. *o-GENKI deirasshaimasuka. RAISYUU no SUIYOUBI no YAKUSOKU wa MAIranaida to OMOtte, gomennasai. RAISYUU ni amerika ni iru obaasan no IE ni MAIrimasu. KANOJO wa BYOOKI desu kara, MItte Ikanakereba narimasen. dakara, YAKUSOKU wo TORIKEshimasu. mada gomennasai.* (#2, HDI 10.8%, C-test 40%)

("How are you? I am sorry but I don't think that I will be able to attend out meeting next Wednesday. My grandmother who lives in the United States will visit next week. She is ill, so I have to take care of her. So, I will cancel our appointment. Again, I am sorry.")

2. *o-GENKI irasshaimasuka. WATASHI wa NIHONGO no SANNENSEI desu. KYOO, SHUKUDAI ni tsuite YOYAKU wo arimasitaga WATASHI wa Kimasen deshita. sumimasen deshita. JISSAI, KONTYO wa KOOTSUU JIKO ga arimashita. dakara, RAISHUU no GETSUYOOBI no GOGO SANJI de YOYAKU wo shimashooka.* (#10, HDI 10.3%, C-test 34%)

("How are you? I am a third-year Japanese student. I had an reservation [appointment] with you today about my homework, but I cannot come to it. I am sorry. Actually, I was in an auto accident. So, shall we make the reservation for next Monday at 3:00?")

English 1. *sitsureishimasu. WATASHI wa SUIyooBI de SENSEI ni Aemasen. kinoo WATASHI no CHICHI wa byooin ni tsurete Ikimashita. byooin de DOyooBI made imasu. dakara SUIyouBI ni WATASHI wa DAIGAKU ni Kimasenda to OMOimasu. ashita, WATAShI wa SENSEI ni denwa wo kakemasu. tabun RAISHUU, WATASHItachi wa Aimashoo. sitsureishimasu. sumimasen.* (#1, HDI 11.5%, C-test 36%)

("I am sorry. I cannot meet you on Wednesday. I had to take my father to the hospital yesterday. I will be in the hospital until Saturday. So, I don't think that I will go to school this Wednesday. I will ring you tomorrow. Probably let's meet next week. I am sorry. I am sorry.")

2. *sumimasenga KAZOKU no tameni KYUUni YOUJI ga arimasu. sore kara yoyaku ni KUru koto ga dekimasen. SENREI(sitsurei) shimasu. doomoo arigatoo gozaimasu.* (#11, HDI 14.5%, C-test 31%)

("I am sorry, but something urgent came up in my family. Thus, I will not be able to come to our appointment. I am sorry. Thank you very much.")

The examples above show that all three groups of learners had similar HDIs, which were less than native-speaker HDIs on average. High SVI of +4 for this situation caused native speakers to use a variety of honorifics. Of all the instruments in this study, this situation elicited the greatest variety of honorific forms from native speakers. Learners, on the other hand, used a much narrower range of honorifics and tended to repeat formulaic expressions, such as *sitsureishimasu* ("I'm sorry/rude") and *sumimasen* ("I'm sorry") to convey apology. As with DCT responses, more-proficient learners wrote more and created non-existent honorific forms, whereas less-proficient learners repeated frequently used formulaic expressions. Examples from the two Chinese learners in Table 56 show that they tried to use the very formal and rarely used *deirassharu* form for *desu* in a situation in which it would normally not be used. Anglophone learners frequently repeated formulaic expressions of apology at the beginning and end of the message, which reflects the repeated us of "I'm sorry" in apologies in English. Korean learners were divided between the less proficient learner who used a narrower range of honorifics but had a higher HDI and the more proficient learner who used a much wider range of honorifics, but had a lower HDI because the volume of writing was much larger. As in her response to the DCT, the second Korean learner was one of the few learners to use *o-* as a referent honorific prefix with *jikan* (time) and *itadaku*, the honorific verb of receiving. The other two highly proficient learners, one Chinese and the other Anglophone, had HDIs of 9.39 and 7.27, which is close to the second Korean learner's HDI, but neither used the range of honorifics that the Korean learner used. Overall, learners interpreted the social variables of the situation as requiring honorific and formal language, but they did not have the language proficiency to

produce a wide range of forms. This is different from the DCT situation, in which learners interpreted the social variables differently from native speakers.

The DET was also a positive-SVI situation between a friend and his mother. Native speakers were in broad agreement that the situation was between a teenager and his friend's mother and that she apologised because her son failed to keep a commitment to his friend. Table 57 shows the questions about this dialogue.

Table 57. Questions about DET Dialogue 3 (SVI+4)

Original Script:

M: *yamamoto hiroshi desuga, kenchti-kun imasuka.*
("This is Yamamoto Hiroshi. Is Kenichi in?")

W: *a, hiroshi-kun. kenichi wa ima dekaketiru wa.* ***nanika*** *yooji.*
("Oh, Hiroshi. Kenichi is out now. What's **up?")**

M: *kyoo boku no ie de au yakusoku wo shitieta noni, kenichi dake ga konai kara denwa shitan desu.*
("I invited some friends over to my house today, but Kenichi's the only one who didn't come, so I thought I'd call.")

W: *ara, kenichi wa wasureta no ne. gomennasai ne.*
("Oh dear, it must have slipped his mind. I'm really sorry.")

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. About how old do you think the man is?
3. In English, why does the woman apologise to the man?

Note: Because the dialogue was spoken, Chinese characters are not noted by capital letters as they are in DCT and SWT responses.

Many learners found this dialogue difficult and it received the lowest average score of all six dialogues because, except for the possibility of the one Anglophone learner who had spent a year in Japan, most of the learners in this data set would not have had extensive exposure to the informal language used in family life. Many learners,

for example, described the relationship between the teenager and his friend's mother as one between friends or work colleagues. This interpretation affected Question 2 because many learners wrote that the man was a college student or in his 20s or 30s. All of the native speakers thought that the man was a teenager. Question 3, which is arguably the most difficult question in terms of social context, proved easier for learners because most wrote that the woman was apologising because Kenichi had failed to keep the appointment. Learners thus did better on the one question that dealt with broad social context than on questions that dealt with detailed interpretation of the social variables in the frame of interaction.

Introspective comments from all three instruments are useful in giving information on possible sources of transfer. As noted in the discussion above, L1 and Japanese language proficiency both affected the results in this speech act. Anglophone learners deviated most from native-speaker norms on the DCT and the SWT, but the pattern of deviation was different. On the DCT, Anglophone learners had the highest HDI, but on the SWT, they had the lowest, whereas the native speakers showed the opposite pattern. Introspections show that Australian cultural concepts of appropriate linguistic behaviour influenced Anglophone learners' perception of the social variables in the DCT situation. For example, one English learner wrote in her introspection, "Even in English I think I'd feel so bad that I'd just keep apologising! With a close friend, I think it's alright that I wouldn't give a lengthy explanation." Korean learners, on the other hand, perceived the situation as requiring a less elaborate apology as would be the case in a similar situation in Korean or, as native-speaker responses showed, in Japanese. One wrote, "close friend so I only need to speak casually." Results from the SWT showed that the HDI for Anglophone learners was lower than it was for Chinese and Korean learners

because they did not have the same level of proficiency in honorifics as other groups of learners. Together, results and introspective comments show that intermediate learners of Japanese view social variables of apologies from an L1 perspective, but also that proficiency in Japanese greatly influences their ability to produce appropriate responses, particularly at the honorific speech level.

4.5.2.2. Complaints

The next speech act in the data set was that of complaints. This category contained DCT situation 8 and DET Dialogue 6. The DCT had a SVI rating of +2, while the DET had an SVI rating of -4 and was the most intimate and informal dialogue in the DET. The contrast between different SVI ratings in the same speech act allows for a comparative discussion similar to the one above on apologies. The following Table 58 presents an overview of results in this category.

Table 58. Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Complaint Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	12.88	14.73	11.83	9.03
DCT %	47.98%	44.48%	79.41%	54.11%
DET Score	1.63	1.58	1.50	3.00
DET %	36.21%	37.13%	31.62%	82.35%
Mean %	42.09%	40.81%	55.52%	68.23%

The above results are somewhat problematic because the Korean learners received a ranking-based percentage that was higher than the native speakers on the DCT. This result is understandable because HDI for native speakers was between

that of the Korean learners and Chinese and Anglophone learners. By HDI score, however, the figures show that native-speakers were in fact on the lower end of the scale. The wide variance of nearly 20% in native-speaker HDI affected the ranking calculation. Correlation of DCT with the C-test showed that proficiency did not affect DCT results because there correlation was barely positive at .0875. The DET showed that Korean learners had the lowest mean score and were thus furthest from approximating to native-speaker norms. The wide gap between native speakers, who were all give the top score of 3.0, and the learners, however, contributed to a positive correlation between the DET and the C-test at .6996 ($p<.01$). Of the six DET dialogues, however, the degree of correlation here was the second lowest. The overall mean for both complaint situations, however, shows that Korean learners came closest to approximating to native-speaker performance on both instruments.

A closer look at DCT and DET responses will help explain the contrary results in the speech act of complaints. Table 59 presents selected examples of responses to the DCT.

Table 59. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 8 (SVI +2)

Situation: You are in Japan. You go out to a moderately priced restaurant for lunch with a friend. You have been waiting quite a while for your order, and both of you have something to do right after lunch. You are worried that you may not have enough time to eat. You get the waitperson's attention successfully. He or she comes over to your table, and you ask him or her to bring your order as soon as possible.
What would you say?

Japanese 1. *sumimasen, oRYOORI ga mada KONAIn desuga.* (#1, HDI 22.2%)
("Pardon me, our food hasn't arrived yet...")
2. *kanari Matten dakedo mada desuka? anmari JIKAN nainde dekireba ISOide HOsiin dakedo...*

("We've been waiting a while, but do we have to wait more? We don't have much time, so we'd like our food as soon as possible.") (#4, HDI 2.6%)

3. *ano sumimasenga, JIKAN ga amari nai node dekiru dake HAYAku shite itadakemasuka?* (#10, HDI 11.8%)

("Umm, I'm sorry, but we don't have much time, so you could please bring the food as soon as possible.")

Korean 1. *sumimasenga, moo NAGAi Matteno wa FUKATAI kamo shiremasen node moo HAYAi dekimasenka?* (#7, HDI 7.9%, C-test 37%)

("I'm sorry, but there's probably no choice but to wait, but could you please hurry?")

2. *doomo sumiasen kedo, WATAShItachi wa SANJI made, kisshatende itte kissha wo nomanakereba narimasen. hayaku service morau koto ga dekimasuka?* (#17, HDI 10.2%, C-test 58%)

("I'm very sorry, but we have to get a train by 3:00. Could we receive faster service?")

Chinese 1. *sumimasen. WATASHITACHI wa NIJI kara ISOGAsii de, sugu GOHAN wo kurete KUDAsai.* (#6, HDI 18.5%, C-test 34%)

("I'm sorry. We will be busy from 2:00, so please give us our food quickly.")

2. *sumimasenga, WATASHI wa KAIGI ga NIJIni aru node WATASHI no CHUUMON shita TAbeMONO wo HAYAku KUDAsai.* (#8, HDI 9.1%, C-test 61%)

("I'm sorry, but I have a meeting at 2:00, so please bring the food that I ordered quickly.")

3. *sumimasen, WATASHITACHI wa moo ICHIJIKAN de MAtte imasu, IMA kara GOHUN no NAKA ni nanimo morattara, we'll leave and won't pay.* (#18, HDI 11.1%, C-test 31%)

("I'm sorry, but we have been waiting for an hour. If you [don't] bring our food in five minutes, we'll leave and won't pay.")

English 1. *sumimasenga, moo sugu Ikanakeba narimasen kara, Tabemono wa HAYAku motte Kitemo ii desuka.* (#1, HDI 9.8%, C-test 36%)

("I'm sorry, but we have to go soon, so is it all right if you brought the food faster?")

2. *sitsureishimasu. WATASHItachino tabemono wo hayaku motte KUDAsai.* (#3, HDI 12%, C-test 23%)

("I'm sorry. Please bring our food quickly.")

The wide variation in native-speaker responses may have contributed to the puzzling pattern of results shown in Table 59. Because native-speaker interpretations of the social variables in this situation vary considerably, some use the honorific and formal speech level, whereas others use a mixture of formal and informal speech levels. The problem in interpreting the social variables here is that,

except for social distance, other variables--age, dominance, and social status--are not clear to native speakers from the description given on the DCT or in real life. In the example, the first native speaker used the formal speech level to drop hints, whereas the second native speaker stated the complaint and a request for action clearly and ended the utterance by using the informal form *da* (copula, formal form is *desu*) and *kedo* (but), which is frequently used in informal situations. The second native speaker was one of the few native-speakers or learners who did not begin the utterance with the formulaic expression *sumimasen* ("I'm sorry, excuse me"). The third native speaker produced a formal and direct request for action to solve the issue at hand. Most native speakers produced variations on this type of response.

Learner responses varied considerably by L1 group, but compared with the speech act of apology, less in relation to language proficiency. Though nearly all learners began the utterance with a formulaic expression of apology, such as *sumimasen* ("I'm sorry, excuse me") or *shitsureishimasu* ("I'm sorry, I'm rude"), they differed considerably in their use of honorifics and, perhaps more obviously, in the organisation of speech acts in the utterance. Korean learners, for example, both concluded their utterances by asking whether it was possible to get faster service. Many Chinese learners concluded that the formal imperative form "verb + *kudasai*" ("please give" + verb). Anglophone learners, however, showed a mixed pattern as the above examples indicate. Interestingly enough, none of the native speakers used the imperative form. Four out of the 10 native speakers in this sample used negative questions and all four of those responses contained the honorific verb of receiving *itadaku*. The use of a verb and the honorific verb of receiving is one of the most common ways of making a request in Japanese. Of the learners, only one Korean and one Anglophone learner used a negative question; none of the learners

used *itadaku* or another verb of receiving. Chinese learners thus interpreted the situation as calling for direct explanation and a formal command for action, whereas Korean learners and some Anglophone learners were direct in explanation, but more tentative in their requests for action. The above findings indicate that, although native speakers interpreted the social variables in this situation differently and produced responses in varying speech levels, they used verbs of giving and receiving extensively to convey the request for action to solve the issue of the complaint.

By contrast, learner and native speaker responses to the DET dialogue of complaint were surprisingly consistent. Table 60 gives an overview of the questions asked.

Table 60. Questions about DET Dialogue 6 (SVI -4)

Original Script:

W: *kyoo kaisha de nanika attano.*
("Did something happen at work today?")

M: *betsuni nanimo nakatta kedo chotto isogasikattan dayo.*
("Nothing special. Things were a little busy, that's all.")

W: *nande.*
("Why?")

M: *otani-san to kimura-san ga ichinichijuu dekakete ite kachoo to futari dake dattan dayo.*
("Otani and Kimura were out all day, and I was left alone with the section chief.")

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is a more formal form of 何で (*nande*) in Japanese?
3. In English, how do you think the man feels about his day?

All native speakers and a majority of learners said that the dialogue was between husband and wife. All native speakers and nearly all learners wrote that the man

was tired or exhausted from work. The major difference between learners and native speakers was in their response to Question 2. All of the native speakers came up with an acceptable formal alternative for *nande* ("why"), but few of the learners did so. Most learners either thought that *nande* meant *nani* ("what"), or that *dooshite* ("what") was the formal equivalent. *Dooshite* is informal unless it is followed by a *desu* or a formal form of a verb. As in the speech act of complaints, learners were more accurate in responding to questions on the social context of the dialogue than to questions on detailed differences between formal and informal speech levels.

The lack of correlation between the DCT and the C-test shows that Japanese language proficiency as measured by the C-test had little effect on the results, which would, in turn, indicate that other factors, such as L1 background and individual factors, directly affected the results. From introspective comments, it is clear that a number of Anglophone learners applied Australian discourse patterns to interpreting the situation, whereas Chinese and Korean learners drew on native and Australian discourse patterns to varying degrees. One Anglophone learner, for example, wrote, "I don't think a Japanese person would say this so nicely but that's how I would speak to them." This clearly shows a desire in this case to follow Australian discourse patterns even when the learner perceives Japanese discourse patterns to be different. Another Anglophone learner wrote a similar introspection, "I don't know what level of language to use with a waiter. In English I would speak politely, but I know that some people treat waiters quite rudely." And another Anglophone learner wrote, "sorry but I'm in a hurry, but Japanese people I think aren't very polite to shopkeepers or waiters." The first part of this introspection paraphrases what she wrote in Japanese, but the second part is evidence of clearly defined intuitions regarding

Japanese sociolinguistic norms. None of the Korean learners gave introspective comments on this situation, and only a few Chinese learners gave comments, most of which related to not knowing enough Japanese vocabulary to express themselves clearly. From introspective comments and the data discussed above, it appears that differences in L1 linguistic and cultural background affected how learners perceived the social variables in the situation given, but their proficiency in Japanese had a stronger influence on the language that they produced in this study.

4.5.2.3. Disagreement

The speech act of disagreement was dealt with only in DCT Situation 7, which had a SVI of -2. The original DET included a dialogue on disagreement, but as mentioned in Section 4.4.1.3., this was omitted because of the need to shorten the time that it took to administer the DET. Table 61 gives an overview of results on disagreement.

Table 61. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Disagreement Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	6.19	6.57	5.56	.50
DCT %	38.05%	40.44%	41.17%	80.88%

The results for disagreement are similar to those for the speech act of apology in that Korean learners came closest to approximating to native-speaker norms. The major difference, however, is that the gap between Korean learners and native speakers is

considerably larger than the gap between these two groups in the apology situation. The gap between these two groups of learners is larger in this situation than in any of the other seven. The gap among the three groups of learners, however, is very narrow, which shows that the learners used nearly the same amount of honorifics regardless of L1 background. Results correlated with the C-test at .7410 ($p<.01$), which indicates that, in this case, Japanese proficiency influenced the degree to which learners approximated native-speaker norms.

A closer look at learner and native-speaker responses, as shown in Table 62 below, reveals important differences among the groups of learners.

Table 62. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 7 (SVI -2)

Situation: You have agreed to take a trip to Melbourne with some Japanese friends. All of you have arranged to meet at a friend's house to discuss plans for the trip. You go to this meeting and discuss the group's plans. Some members of the group want to take the bus, but others want to take the train. You think that it is better to take the train, and you say so to one of the people who wants to take the bus.
What would you say?

Japanese 1. *TASHIkani basumo ii kedo basu wa SEMAishi, FUTARI zutsu de shika SUWArenai kara WATASHI wa DENSHAde Ikitai na.* (#6, HDI 0%)
("The bus is fine, but only two people can sit together, so I want to take the train.")
2. *DENSHAni shiyoo yo. kotti no HOO ga HAYAishi TANOsii yo. UGOkimawareru kara.*
(#8, HDI 0%)
("Let's take the train. It's faster and more fun. Because it's easier to move around.")

Korean 1. *basu mo iin desuga, densha wa moo HAYAkute YASUi desu kara...*
("The bus is fine, but the train is faster and cheaper so ...") (#7, HDI 8.0%, C-test 37%)
2. *TAROO-san baasu de Ikuno mo ii kedo oosutoraria niwa baasu ga yoku kinakute, konogoro wa YASUmi no tame totemo konjatte imasu kara, densha de ikuno ga motto ii no ga nai ka. mottomo baasu no hoo ga takakute, SANSHUUKAN gurai mae YOYAKU shinakereba naranai desu kara, moo ICHIDO kangaete kudasai noka.* (#17, HDI 3.1%, C-test 58%)

("Taroo, the bus is fine, but buses don't come that frequently in Australia and because fares have been cheap recently, buses are crowded, so don't you think it's better to take the train? Actually the bus is more expensive [cheaper?] and you have to make a reservation three weeks in advance, so please think again, OK?")

Chinese 1. *DENSHAga hoo ga ii to OMOimasu. totemo YASUi desu ne. sono UE ANZENna transportation desu.* (#18, HDI 10.3%, C-test 31%)
("I think the train is better. It's really cheap, right? In addition, it's safe transportation.")
2. *DENSHA wo NOruno wa iito OMOimasu. DENSHA wa HAYAkute, basu wa semai desu.*
(#2, HDI 7.1%, C-test 40%)
("I think it's good to take the train. The train is fast; the bus is crowded.")

English 1. *sumimasen. ressha wa mo hayai desu to OMOimasu. ressha mo yasui desu.*
(#21, HDI 12.5%, C-test 38%)
("Excuse me. I think the train is faster. It's also cheaper.")
2. *denshano hoo ga ii to OMOwanai no? basu dattara kanari JIKANga kaka**ru janai**?*
(#24, HDI 0%, C-test 59%)
("Don't you think the train is better? The bus takes more time, don't think?")

Two trends emerge from the above examples. First, native speakers used the informal speech level exclusively, whereas learners mostly used the formal speech level with a mixing of informal expressions. The second Korean learner, however, mostly used the informal speech level and had a 3.1% HDI, which is only slightly higher than the native-speaker mean of .50%. Overall, however, learners interpreted the act of disagreement as requiring a certain degree of politeness, which caused them to use the formal speech level more frequently than native speakers. One Anglophone learner, for example, wrote in the introspection section: "polite suggestion to get him to change his mind." This indicates that the learner believes that the formal speech level can be used as a pragmatic strategy to achieve goals. A number of Chinese and Anglophone learners used formulaic expressions such as *sumimasen* ("I'm sorry") to take the floor, whereas native speakers used interjections or, as the second Korean learner, the interlocutor's name. Second, native speakers

and Korean learners began their utterance by giving a hint that they were about to disagree with the previous speaker or, as in the second native-speaker example, seeking sympathy from hearers by presenting the disagreement as a proposal. In the introspection section, one native speaker wrote, "I don't want to offend the person who wants to go by bus, but at the same time want to express what I think." The comment reflects the desire of most native speakers to be sympathetic to the hearer, but also to be clear in giving an alternative opinion. Korean learners and native speakers also concluded their questions in a similar way by presenting the reason for their opinion, as the second native speaker and the first Korean learner did, or by asking a question, as the first native speaker and second Korean learner did. Many native speakers used a negative question at the end, which also seeks hearer sympathy for the ideas in the utterance. Chinese and Anglophone learners, however, focused on explaining their opinion clearly and giving reasons for their opinions. Both groups used the verb *omou* ("to think") frequently, whereas native speakers and Korean learners mostly avoided this form.

The above discussion suggests that L1 did not influence HDI results very much because all groups of learners had used a similar speech level. It contributed to differences in how learners organised speech acts and linguistic elements in their utterance. Korean learners closely approximated to native-speaker organisation of utterances, with the second and more proficient Korean learner (C-test 58%) approximating to native speaker norms in speech level use and in utterance organisation. The few learner introspective comments regarding this situation show that learners were relatively confident of their answers to this DCT situation. Neither of the Korean learners wrote anything in the introspection section, but one English learner wrote, "Used '*demo*' as it really stands out--that is a powerful

conjunction. Also '*yo*' seems to add the voice of experience--a bit authoritative." Indeed, the paucity of written introspections to this situation also suggests that learners did not have doubts about what they had written. Most of the introspective comments in DCT related to doubts about answers or concerns about sociolinguistic appropriateness. Yet, as mentioned above, the second Korean learner was the only learner who used the informal speech level in this situation. Together, these findings suggest that learners who speak a language, such as Korean, with clearly distinguished speech levels, come closer to approximating to native speaker norms in speech level use and in the organisation of utterances.

4.5.2.4. Invitations

Data on the speech act of invitations were elicited by DCT Situation 3 (SVI -4) and DET Dialogue 1 (SVI +2). As with the speech acts of apologies and complaints, there was a contrast between a positive and a negative SVI in this speech act. An overview of results for this speech act is presented in Table 63 below.

Table 63. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Invitations Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	9.29	5.84	2.86	0.0
DCT %	23.71%	43.01%	66.17%	85.29%
DET Score	1.62	1.92	2.50	3.0
DET %	31.06%	40.93%	63.24%	83.82%
Mean %	27.39%	41.97%	64.71%	84.55%

Unlike the speech acts of complaint and disagreement, results here show a wide difference among all of the groups. With the DCT, in particular, figures for each language group differed by a factor of two. Though slightly less evenly distributed, figures for the DET followed the same pattern as the DCT results. Indeed, fractional percentage rankings for the instruments correlated significantly at .7569 ($p<.01$), even though DCT Situation 3 had an SVI of -4 and DET Dialogue 1 an SVI of +2. This differs greatly from the low correlation between the two instruments in the complaints category (.1958) and the lower level of correction in the apologies category (.4500 $p<.01$), both of which contained a similar positive and negative SVI contrast. The figures in Table 63 also show that Korean learners were closest in approximating to native-speaker performance by a wider margin than in most of the other speech acts discussed thus far.

Qualitative analyses of the learner and native-speaker responses confirm the consistency of the results, but reveal a number of differences between native speakers and learner L1 groups. The following Table 64 provides some relevant examples of responses.

Table 64. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 3 (SVI -4)

Situation: You run into a Japanese friend of yours by chance in the in the Manning Union. After exchanging greetings, you tell your friend of your plans to go out to dinner with a small group of friends and invite him or her to join you.
What would you say?

Japanese *KYOO BANmesi minna to Tabeni Ikun dakedo yokattara KOn?* (#4, HDI 0%)
("Today a bunch of us are having dinner together--don't you want to come?")
ne KYOO choodo minna de gohan Tabeni Ikun dakedo Yokattara KOnai? (#7, HDI 0%)
("Hey, a bunch of us are having dinner tonight--don't you want to come?")

Korean 1. *KONban JIKAN ga attara WATASHI no tomodachi to isshoni ii resutoran he Itte TAbemashooka.*
(#7, HDI 2.5%, C-test 37%)
("If you have time tonight, how about going to a good restaurant with together with some of my friends.")
2. *kono KINYOOBI tomodachi NI/SANNIN to MACHI ni aru sakura to iu resutoran ni SHOKUJI suru ikoo to YAKUSOKU simashita. jikan ga attara ISSHOni Ikimashooka.*
(#17, HDI 3.2%, C-test 58%)
("This Friday, I have an appointment to go to a restaurant in the city centre called Sakura with a few friends. If you have time, shall we go together?")

Chinese 1. *KONBAN, TOMODACHI wo ISSHOOni NIHON resutoran he Ikimasu. anata wa Kite KUDAsai.* (#10, HDI 6.7%, C-test 34%)
("Tonight, I'm going to a Japanese restaurant with some friends. Please come.")
2. *KONYA wa o-JIKAN ga arimasuka. TOMODACHI to resutoran he Ikimasu. ISSHOni Ikimashooka.* (#18, HDI 11.4%, C-test 31%)
("Do you have time tonight? I'm going to a restaurant with some friends. Shall we we go together?")

English 1. *ashita no yoru ne, SANNIN gurai isshoni Tabeni Iku tsumori da yo. WATASHITACHI to isshoni Ikooka.* (#1, HDI 0%, C-test 36%)
("I plan to go to dinner with three or so friends tomorrow night. Let's got together?")
2. *TOMODACHI to GAISHOKU he Iku node X-san mo Ikimasenka (mo Ikanaika).*
(#11, HDI 7.7%, C-test 31%)
("I'm going out to dinner with some friends, would you like to go, too?")
3. *TOMODACHIto isshoni resutoran ni Kuru itadakemasenka.* (#23, HDI 8.3%, C-test 27%)
("Would you please come to a restaurant together with some friends?")

The above examples indicate that learners avoided using the informal speech level, whereas native speakers used it exclusively. This pattern is similar to findings from the DCT of apology and the DCT of disagreement. Compared with those situations, however, learners of all language groups here used the formal speech level, but differed in HDI because both Korean learners and more proficient Chinese and Anglophone learners wrote more, which lowers the density of honorifics in their utterances. The correlation between C-test scores and DCT volume for this

situation was high at .5489 ($p<.01$), which is higher than in respect of other situations discussed so far and indicates a clear relationship between proficiency and volume. Learner introspective comments reveal considerable ambiguity over which speech level to use. The first Anglophone learner (C-test 36%) in Table 64 wrote in the introspection section, "I noticed when I was in Japan how important the plain form is between good friends. However sometimes it's a bit difficult to know when it's appropriate." The second Anglophone learner echoed the first's concerns: "feel sure the plain form would be used in this situation, but uncertain." To be "safe," both learners opted for the formal speech level, despite intuitions telling them to do the contrary. By contrast, the second Korean learner wrote, "I've known here quite some time (but not very long) so I do not need to be very polite." Though many learners interpreted the situation as calling for the type of informal language that native speakers in fact used, they lacked the confidence and language proficiency to produce forms effectively.

DET Dialogue 1 dealt with a friendly conversation in the "public" *masu/desu* speech level in which many social variables were ambiguous. This dialogue was designed to see how learners and native speakers interpreted speech in which the social variables are not readily detectable. The three questions that were asked are given in Table 65.

Table 65. Questions about DET Dialogue 1 (SVI +2)

Original Script:

W: *eiga no kippu ga nimai arun desuga, isshoni ikimasenka?*

("I have two tickets to a film; do you want to go with me?")

M: *ii desu ne.*

("That sounds nice.")

W: *konban wa doo desuka?*

("How about tonight?")

M: *ja, gojihani daimaru depaato no maede aimashoo.*

("OK, let's meet in front of Daimaru at 5:30.")

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is another way of saying いっしょに行きませんか (isshonini Ikimasenka) in Japanese?
3. What is a more informal form of 会いましょう (Aimashoo) in Japanese?

Most learners answered Question 1 by saying that they were friends, whereas most native speakers said that they were friends or acquaintances but not very close. One of the Korean learners (C-test 58%) added in the introspection section, "they seem like friends, but not like childhood friends because they used quite polite language." This and the same learners comment on the invitation DCT shows that this learner is keenly aware of how social variables affect speech levels and use of honorifics in Japanese. For Question 2, most learners came up with an acceptable answer, but many wrote a different grammatical form instead of a different form of the same grammatical category. The ambiguity of the question no doubt affected the results here. For Question 3, many learners tried to write the informal form of the word, but made a number of orthographic errors. An Anglophone learner's introspective comment sums up the difficulties that many learners had with this dialogue: "I'm not

sure whether my answers are correct. I know I've learnt all these things, but I find changing things to and from polite verb forms difficult." Most learners thus found it easier to understand the context and many of the social variables than to understand the differences in linguistic form that influenced the speech level of an utterance. Results from the speech act of invitations thus indicate that Korean learners came closer than learners from the other two groups in approximating to native-speaker norms, which is evidence of transfer from L1 Korean into Japanese. Regarding Chinese and Anglophone learners, however, there is little evidence that they drew on L1 sociolinguistic norms to decide which speech level of Japanese to use in their responses.

4.5.2.5. Making Promises

The DCT (SVI +4) was the only instrument to deal with the speech act of making promises. As with the disagreement dialogue on the DET, the promise dialogue on the DET was omitted because of a shortage of time. Table 66 presents an overview of results from the DCT.

Table 66. Making Promises

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	7.69	10.68	9.81	11.34
DCT %	26.47%	54.16%	52.94%	62.35%

Except for results from the DET in the complaints category, this is thus far the only case in which Anglophone learners came closer than Korean learners in

approximating to native-speaker performance. It is the only case thus far in which Chinese learners have differed considerably from both the English and Korean L1 groups. The pattern of results differed from the C-test, which resulted in a low positive correlation of .2128, the second lowest figure for the DCT. The low correlation with the C-test suggests that language proficiency was less important than L1 background in influencing the results. The difference between Chinese learners, on one hand, and other learners and native speakers, on the other, suggests that Chinese learners perceived the social and linguistic variables in the situation differently from all other groups.

Speech-act analysis in this section has shown that learners tend to approximate to native-speaker performance more closely when the SVI is positive because both learners and native speakers use the formal speech level and honorifics, but that almost no native speakers use them when the SVI is negative. The following Table 67 gives examples that illustrate this point.

Table 67. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 4 (SVI +4)

Situation: You work for a Japanese company in Australia. Your boss has asked you to prepare a briefing on the company's activities in Western Australia in a week's time. He or she stresses that it is important to finish the briefing on time because he or she needs to present it at a convention in nine days. You agree to do the work and promise to finish it by the deadline.

What would you say?

Japanese 1. *SHOOCHI itashimashita. KANARAzu MAniau yooni YOOI itashimasu.*
(#3, HDI 16.7%)
("I understand. I will do my utmost to meet the deadline.")

2. *ee, WAkarimashita. shimeKIri madeni SHIGOTO wo Owaraseru yooni shimasu.*
(#9, HDI 6.89%)
("I understand. I will do my my best to finish the work by the deadline.")

Korean 1. *hai, ii desu yo. kono Hi made mo owaru to OMOimasu.* (#7, HDI 9.1%, C-test 37%)
("Yes, that's fine. I think that I will finish by that day.")
2. *go-SHIMPAI nasatte kudasai. zehi RAISHUU no GETSUYOO made owarimasu. SHIRYOO wa moo takusan otte imasu kara sugu Owaru koto ga dekiru to OMOimasu.* (#17, HDI 10.5%, C-test 58%)
("Please [don't] worry. I will definitely finish it by next Monday. I have a lot of material, so I think I can get it done in quickly.")

Chinese 1. *WATASHI wa kono SHIGOTOwo saseruto OMOimasu. RAISYUUno MAEni Owarimasu. DAIZYOOBU desu.* (#2, HDI 10%, C-test 40%)
("I thought that you would make me do this. I will finish before next week. I can do it.")
2. *hai, mochiron. SHIMPAI shinai desu.* (#10, HDI 7.7%, C-test 34%)
("Yes, of course. No worries.")

Czech 1. *hai, ii degozaimasu. deddorainni owarimasu.* (#19, HDI 13.6%, C-test 25%)
("Yes, that's fine. I will finish by the deadline.")

English 1. *hai mochiron. DEKImasu. deadline no tameni yakusoku shimasu.* (#1, HDI 9.1%, 36%)
("Yes, of course. I can do it. I will promise because of the deadline.")
2. *hai, ii desu. asatte wa ii desuka.* (#4, HDI 12.5%, 39%)
("Yes, that's fine. Is the day after tomorrow OK?")
3. *hai kashikomarimashita. kore kara isshoo kenmei suru node zehi maniaimasu.* (#24, HDI 8.8%, 59%)
("Yes, I understand. I will work hard and will get it done in time.")

Among native speakers, eight of the 10 used the word *wararimashita* ("I understand") either as the beginning of the utterance or immediately following *hai* (yes). One native speaker used the humble form *shochi itashimashita* ("I understand"), and only one used another expression. Because *wakarimashita* conveys a sense of agreement in relation to what has been said, most native speakers did not add much of a detailed explanation in the rest of the utterance. The brevity of their responses thus raised the overall HDI. Among learners, however, none of the Korean learners and relatively few learners began with this expression and the second Korean learner wrote far more than almost any other learner. Anglophone

learners, however, were brief, thus raising their mean HDI scores, whereas Chinese learners wrote more and used fewer honorifics. Most learners and native speakers ended their utterances with a promise to finish the work by a certain time or to do their best. Together, these findings reveal a different limitation to the HDI from the ones discussed in Section 4.4.1 of this chapter; namely, that low overall volume can raise the HDI without necessarily indicating the level of formality or honorification of the utterance concerned. The situation discussed above, however, native-speaker responses were short, so the low-volume induced HDI figures are useable as a measure of native-speaker norms.

The examples contain a number instances of possible sociolinguistic transfer from L1 and perhaps L2. The use of an expression, such as *ii desu* ("It's fine") or *hai, mochiron* ("Yes, of course") reflects the influence of English. Native speakers would rarely use *ii desu* in this situation because it does not carry the idea of acceptance of the hearer's proposal or opinion. *Hai mochiron* would be used only it if the speaker feels that agreeing to the request is obvious; such a strong statement of the obvious carries the risk of embarrassing the speaker. A number of learners appear to have interpreted the situation as calling for formal language, but drew on their knowledge of English and of the workplace in Australia in forming their responses. Several learner introspections confirm this conclusion. The second Chinese learner in the examples used the introspection section to finish what she had wanted to say in her response. The introspection read as follows: "Of course, I'll finish it, so please don't worry (I don't know how to write in order to be polite)." The second Anglophone learner in the examples wrote in the introspection section: "Wasn't sure what to write. But wanted to convey the idea it wasn't a problem--as didn't want to be too formal. After all, it is an Australian working for a Japanese

company." The use of the verb *omou* ("to think") was also interesting because none of the native speakers used this verb, whereas both Korean learners and a number of Chinese and Anglophone learners used this word. The common use of *omou* ("to think") across a diverse group of learners indicates that possible transfer from L1 and L2 English.

4.5.2.6. Refusals

The speech act of refusal is one of the more commonly researched speech acts in the second language literature. Data on refusals were elicited by DCT Situation 2 (SVI +4) and by DET Dialogue 5 (SVI -2). The positive and negative dichotomy in SVI between the two instruments was the same as the other speech acts investigated in this study so far. Table 68 provides an overview of the results.

Table 68. Descriptive Statistics for Learner and Native-Speaker Refusals Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	11.86	12.72	12.72	11.11
DCT %	50.36%	48.89%	41.17%	61.91%
DET Score	1.63	1.33	2.00	3.00
DET %	40.81%	32.59%	52.21%	82.35%
Mean %	45.58%	40.74%	46.69%	72.12%

Results from the DCT are interesting because this is the first case in which Chinese learners approximated to native-speaker performance more closely than Korean and Anglophone learners, with Korean learners deviating most from native-speaker performance in terms of fractional percentage ranking. With the DET, however,

Korean learners were closest in approximating to native-speaker performance, whereas Anglophone learners deviated the most. Results for the DCT based on the HDI, on the other hand, show a much narrower range than results presented as fractional percentage rankings. The HDI range is lower than in any of the speech acts discussed so far, which indicates that L1 background or proficiency had relatively little influence on the figures or that it did not cause a wide variation in the results. A correlation of percentage rankings for the C-test and the HDI yields a positive but statistically insignificant correlation of .2447. The pattern of results and the wider discrepancy among groups in the DET, by contrast, yields a high correlation of .7476 ($p<.01$).

Qualitative analysis of learner and native-speaker responses, however, reveals a greater difference between learner groups and native speakers than the above quantitative analysis indicates. Table 69 shows selected examples that illustrate this point.

Table 69. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 2 (SVI +4)

Situation: A tutorial in one of your favourite Japanese subjects has just finished. On your way out of the classroom, your tutor asks you to visit his or her office to talk about your plans after graduation. You would like to speak with him or her, but refuse because you have another lecture in ten minutes.
What would you say?

Japanese 1. *TSUGI no JUGYOO ga arimasu node, kono TSUGI ni demo o-JAMA sasete itadakimasu.* (#5, HDI 10.3%)
("I have another class after this, but I'd like to talk about it at some other time.")
2. *ee. HONTOO desuka. ano TAIHEN YOROshiin desuga, IMA kara JUGYOO ga atte chotto MURI nandesu. demo ZEHI BETSU no KIKAIni oNEGAi shitain desu kedo....* (#9, HDI 8.6%)

("Really? I'm very happy to, but I have another class now, so it's a little difficult. I'd very much like to do it some other time, though.")

Korean 1. *sumimasenga, IMA kurasu ga atta node moshi gogo ni go-JIKAN ga oarininattara WATASHI wa ii desu.* (#7, HDI 10.5%, C-test 37%)
("I'm sorry, but I have a class now; if you have time tomorrow, then that's fine with me.")
2. *mooshi wake arimasen kedo sugu hoka no jugoo ga arimasu. o-jikan ga yorosikattara kono atode oukagaishitain desu kedo, SENSEI no JIKAN wa doo desuka.* (#17, HDI 14.9%, C-test 58%)
("I'm extremely sorry, but I have another class soon. If you have time, I'd be glad to meet you later. Is that fine with you?")

Chinese 1. *sumimasenga, JUPPUN no ATO de, JUGYOO JIKAN ga arun desuga SENSEI wa hoka no JIKAN ga yoroshii deshooka.* (#8, HDI 15%, C-test 61%)
("I'm sorry, but I have a class in ten minutes; is another time good for you?")
2. *sumimasen, SENSEI. WATASHI no SOTSUGYOO site kara no KEIKAKU wo anatani SOODAN shitai noni IMA, kurasu ga aru node ato de go-JIKAN ga aru TOKI, Aimashoo.* (#16, HDI 12.5%, C-test 43%)
("I'm sorry, [Sir/Madam]. Though I want to tell you about my plans after graduation, I have another class now, but let's meet later when you have time.")

Czech 1. *doomo arigatoo gozaimasu! sumimasenga tsugino kurasu wa JUPPUN niwa hajimete imasu. ashita wa ii desuka.* (#19, HDI 13.3%, C-test 25%)
("Thank you very much! I'm sorry, but the next class is beginning in ten minutes. Is tomorrow all right?")

English 1. *hai. WATASHI wa sensei ni hanashini suki desuga, IMA hoka no kurasu ga arimasu. ashita wa Aini narimasuka.* (#3, HDI 9.5%, C-test 23%)
("Yes. I like talking to you [Sir/Madam], but I have another class now. Will you meet me tomorrow?")
2. *sitsurei shimasu. JUPPUN ni, WATASHI wa kurasu de irasshaimasu. dewa, ashita o-hanasini naru kamo shiremasen.* (#21, HDI 9.3%, 38%)
("I'm sorry. In ten minutes, I have a class. So, you will probably speak to me tomorrow.")

Perhaps the biggest difference between learners and native-speakers is that almost all learners began their utterances with a formulaic expression of apology or thanks, the most common of which was *sumimasen* ("I'm sorry"). The two Korean learners and most of the Chinese learners began their utterances with an apology. Native-speakers, by contrast, used formulaic expressions, such as *o-jama sasete*

itadakimasu (lit. "please let me impose on you"), at the end of utterances, usually to request a meeting at an unspecified time that could be convenient for the lecturer, whereas many learners concluded by suggesting a specific time or saying when it would be a good time for them. As with other positive SVI situations, learners created a number of expressions that combine different forms of honorifics into something that looks like an honorific. The two Anglophone learners in Table 68 above, for example, used *ni naru* from the honorific *o-* verb *ni naru* form to create *aini naru* and *o-hanasini naru*, but it is unclear from their responses whether they are referring to themselves or the lecturer because the *o-* has been omitted and the syntax indicates that the verbs refer to the first person, whereas the context indicates that they refer to the second person. Another area of confusion over honorifics relates to the use of *o-* or *go-* before nouns. In most cases in Japanese, *o-* goes before native Japanese lexical items and *go-* before Sino-Japanese items, but there are a number of exceptions, of which *jikan* ("time") is one. Among the Korean learners, the first learner used *go-*, and the second learner used *o-*. Among the three Chinese learners who used *jikan*, only one used *go-* and the other two used no prefix, which would be typical of more informal speech levels. The differences among learners from the same L1 background indicate that L1 did not determine the pattern of *o-* and *go-* usage.

The DET situation had an SVI of -2 because it was assumed that the two speakers were in-group members who were similar in age, dominance, and social status. This mixture of social variables would produce a negative SVI. Both speakers used the *masu/desu* form, which is frequently used in work situations when colleagues want to maintain a certain emotional distance. Mixing informal and formal speech levels is perhaps the most common way of maintaining emotional

distance while upholding in-group solidarity, but this usually appears in extended discourse. In designing the DET, I decided that mixing speech levels in short discourse would be unnatural and that learners would find it too difficult to understand. A number of native speakers felt that the dialogue was unnatural and a number of learners found it difficult to understand the context of the dialogue. Table 70 shows the three questions that were asked in this dialogue.

Table 70. Questions on DET Dialogue 5 (SVI -2)

Original Script:

M: *wada-san.*
("Ms. Wada.")

W: *hai.*
("Yes.")

M: *anoo, sumimasenga, kyoo kono repooto wo chotto naoshite itadakemasenka.*
("Um, I'm sorry, but could you check this report today.")

W: *ima desuka. anoo, mooshi wake nain desuga, kyoo wa chotto tsugoo ga waruin desu kedo. doomo sumimasen.*
("Now? I'm terribly sorry, but I'm not free today. I'm sorry.")

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is another word for 申し訳ないんですが (mooshi wake nain desuga) in Japanese?
3. In English, do you think that the woman wants to help the man?

To Question 1, most learners responded that the speakers were friends, colleagues or classmates, but did not have a close relationship. Eleven, or almost half of the 24, learners thought that the conversation was between a lecturer and student or between an employee and a worker, which indicates that they perceived a major difference in social status between the two speakers. This indicates that the formality of the language caused learners to perceive a difference in social status, whereas only two

of the 10 native-speaker informants thought that the relationship was hierarchical. Many learners had difficulty in answering Question 2 and left the item blank. Those who answered, however, chose *sumimasen* ("I am sorry; excuse me") or *gomennasai* ("I am sorry; excuse me") as alternatives to the formal and honorific expression *mooshi wake gozaimasen* ("I am extremely sorry"). Several learners who did not respond wrote in the introspection section that they had trouble understanding the tape. Others wrote that they had trouble understanding the vocabulary in the dialogue. Responses to Question 3 were particularly interesting because all the native speakers said that the woman did not really want to help the man. Learners, on the other hand, were split: twelve said that she did not want to help him. Of these 12, only five were Anglophone. The two Korean learners, a number of Chinese learners, and the Sinhala learner said that the woman did not really want to help the man. This indicates that Anglophone learners took the contents of the dialogue at face value, whereas many non-Anglophone learners assumed, as did the native speakers, that refusal conveyed unsaid negative feelings.

Evidence of sociolinguistic transfer in refusals is equivocal because all groups of learners and native speakers had similar HDI results for the DCT, which makes it difficult to argue that one group approximated to native speakers significantly more than another. The low correlation of .2386 between the DCT and the C-test indicates that language proficiency also did not influence DCT results. Of interest, however, is that Korean and Anglophone learners had the same mean HDI score. In their introspections, a number of Anglophone learners again used the word "polite" in referring to the social variable involved. One Anglophone learner wrote, "Perhaps I should be a bit more polite." Another Anglophone learner wrote, "I think I have the honourable and the humble forms confused," which reflects the

insecurity that many Anglophone learners expressed about using honorifics to "social superiors." The data suggest that, as in other situations, insecurity over "politeness" caused Anglophone learners to use as many honorifics as possible regardless of native speaker norms and how they perceived them. This indicates that learner perceptions of sociolinguistic norms influenced learner language as much as transfer or language proficiency in situations that involve a social superior in Japanese. Combined with findings from other speech acts, it appears that L1 sociocultural norms and metalinguistic discourse on sociolinguistic norms contribute much to the development of learner perceptions.

4.5.2.7. Requests

The speech act of requests is another commonly researched speech act in comparative sociolinguistics and pragmatics. In this study, data on requests were obtained from the DCT and the DET, both of which had a negative SVI. In each of the speech acts discussed so far, the DCT and the DET had a differing SVI in which one was positive and the other was negative. To compare how learners respond to both instruments with similar social variables in each situation and dialogue, I intentionally arranged the SVI to be negative in both instruments. Descriptive statistics for requests are given in the Table 71 below.

Table 71. Descriptive Statistics for Learners and Native-Speaker Requests Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	8.03	5.96	4.44	.911
DCT %	29.04%	45.22%	48.53%	85.29%
DET Score	1.75	1.67	2.50	3.00
DET %	38.78%	36.88%	64.71%	83.82%
Mean %	33.91%	41.05%	56.62%	84.55%

Overall, the results show that Korean learners came closest to approximating to native-speaker performance on both instruments. The gap between all learner groups and native speakers was substantial, but Korean learners and, to a slightly lesser degree, Anglophone learners were closer to approximating to native-speaker performance than Chinese learners. This shows that, at least in terms of honorific usage, native speakers perceived the situation as calling for no honorifics, whereas Chinese learners interpreted the situation as calling for a number of honorifics. Indeed, the mean HDI for Chinese learners in the situation (8.03) was higher than their mean on Situation 1 (SVI -2). Despite the large gap between Chinese learners and native speakers, results from this situation correlated positively with the C-test at .7732. DET Dialogue 4, meanwhile, correlated positively and significantly with the C-test at .7949 ($p<.01$). Results from the DET closely mirrored the C-test, in which Korean learners had a mean (47.50) considerably higher than other groups, with Chinese learners having a mean (37.50) only slightly higher than Anglophone learners (35.67).

Qualitative analysis of the data confirms findings from the statistical analysis above. Table 72 gives an overview of representative responses.

Table 72. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 1 (SVI -2)

Situation: You have to write a cover letter to send your resume in response to an advertisement for a good job. You need to finish the cover letter tonight, but don't have a computer. The public computer room at your university is closed at this time. You ring a Japanese friend who has a computer and a printer, and after exchanging greetings, you ask him or her to let you use his or her computer.

What would you say?

Japanese 1. *nee, ikinari da kedo, konpyuutaa kashite kureru? SHIMBUN MItetara, ii SHIGOTO ga atte, ASHITA madeni DAshitai no yo. oNEGAi.* (#7, HDI 1.5%)

("Umm, I know it's short notice, but can you lend me your computer? I saw a good job offer in the paper and want to apply by tomorrow. Can you help me [*lit.* I beg you]?")

2. *chotto ii SHIGOTO ga atte KYOOJUU ni apurikeeshon Tsukuran to ikan noya kedo, oMAE no konpyuutaa KAshicharan? KONBAN DAIJOBU?* (#4, HDI 0%)

("I found a good job offer and have to get the application together today; can I borrow your computer? Is tonight OK?")

Korean 1. *IMA, konputta wo TSUKAimasuka. WATASHI wa IMA konputta wo TSUKAinarakereba narimasen yo. konputta wo TSUKAuno wa ii deshooka.* (#7, HDI 5.5%, C-test 37%)

("Do [can] I use a computer now? I have to use a computer now. Is it OK if I use a [your] computer?")

2. *KYOOKO, osoku made gomen kedo, ima anata no IEni itte computer wo tsukutte mo ii.* (#17, HDI 3.3%, C-test 58%)

("Kyoko, sorry for calling late, but is it all right if I use your computer now?")

Chinese 1. *IMA ISOgasii desuka. ja WATASHI wa konpiita wo tsukaremasuka.* (#2, HDI 9.1%, C-test 40%)

("Are you busy now? Well, can I use your computer?")

2. *kono BAN wa SHOKUGYOO wo SHINSEI suru SHINJI wo Kakanakereba narimasen. dakara YUKIKOsan no konpiita wo TSUKAtte mo itadakemasenka.* (#8, HDI 7.6%, C-test 61%)

("Tonight I have to write a letter to apply for a job. So, is it all right if I use your [Yukiko-san] computer?")

3. *kanpyuuta wo TSUKAete itadakemasuka.* (#18, HDI 11.8%, C-test 31%)

("Would be please let me use your computer?")

English 1. *chotto oNEGAi shimasu. konpuuta wo tsukattemo ii desuka.* (#11, HDI 12%, C-test 31%)

("I have a favour to ask. Is it all right if I use your computer?")

2. *shitsurei shimasu. anata no konpieetaa wo tsukatte mo ii desuka.* (#15, HDI 10.3%, C-test 41%)

("I'm sorry. Is it all right if I use your computer?")

3. *onegai shitai koto ga arun desuga... ashita made DAIjina hitsuyoo mono no junbi wo shinakucha ikenai node konpiita wo kashite kureru?* (#24, HDI 4.9%, C-test 59%)
("I have a favour to ask, um, I have to prepare something important for tomorrow, so can you lend me your computer?")

Sinhala 1. *anata no komupyutaa wo takatte itadakemasenka.* (#5, HDI 9.1%, C-test 27%)
("Would you please let me use your computer?")

The above data indicate that Chinese, Anglophone, and, to a lesser degree, Korean learners view the imposition of the request as requiring honorific forms, whereas native-speakers provide a clear and logical reason in explanation of the request. All native speakers wrote their responses in the informal level and many grammatical particles were omitted, as is common in colloquial speech. In contrast, almost all the learners used *masu/desu*, except highly proficient learners such as the second Korean learner (C-test 58%) and the last English learner (C-test 59%) from the examples. This suggests that after reaching a certain level of proficiency, learners became aware of speech level distinctions and thus came closer to approximating to native-speaker norms. What is interesting, however, is that the most proficient learner, the second Chinese learner in the above examples (C-test 61%), used the formal *masu/desu* speech level and honorifics, such as the verb of receiving *itadaku* ("to receive from a superior"). A number of learners used the verb *itadaku*. In a similar negative SVI situation, native speakers would rarely use *itadaku*, which denotes the formal speech level. Though the results of one learner should be treated with caution, this suggests that L1 had a stronger influence on this learner's performance on the DCT than did language proficiency. Another interesting trend is that a number of learners, but particularly Anglophone learners, used forms of requesting permission (*...shitemo ii desuka*) instead of a verb of giving and receiving

after the main verb as native speakers did. At various points in their introspections on the DCT and the DET, Anglophone learners mentioned that they had learned verbs of giving and receiving in the second year of Japanese instruction, but were not very comfortable with the forms. This suggests that a number of learners used the relatively simple form for requesting permission (... *shitemo ii desuka*) as a way to avoid the use of verbs of giving and receiving.

Responses to the DET showed that learners clearly understood the social variables involved in the dialogue. Table 73 shows the questions asked about the contents of this dialogue:

Table 73. Questions about DET Dialogue 4 (SVI -4)

Original Script:

W: *dooshitano. nani ga okashii no.*
("What's funny?")

M: *kono manga totemo omoshiroinda.*
("This comic book is really funny.")

W: *ja, yomiowattara, watashi ni chotto misete kudasai.*
("Well, please it to me when you're finished.")

M: *ii yo. ato de misete ageruyo.*
("Sure. I'll show them to you later.")

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. In English, how polite do you think the word どうしたの (dooshitano) is?
3. What is a more polite form of 見せて上げるよ (MIsete Ageruyo) in Japanese?

The most salient trend to emerge from the data was the difficulty that learners had with Question 3. By contrast, almost all learners responded to Question 1 by saying that the relationship was that of close friends or lovers, and to Question 2 by saying

that *dooshitano* ("What's the matter?") is colloquial Japanese. Both responses closely mirrored that of native speakers who mostly said that the relationship was between lovers. In response to Question 3, however, most learners responded with verb forms that used *miseru* ("to show") with a variety of verbs of giving and receiving, but not with *sashiageru* ("to give [to a superior]"), the honorific equivalent of *ageru* ("to give"). Several frequent responses included using *misete kudasai* ("please show me"), *misete kureru* ("please show me"), and *misete itadakimasu* ("I humbly accept your showing me"). All of these forms, however, indicate a second or third person subject, rather than the first-person subject that is given in the dialogue.

The high correlation between DCT and the C-test at .7732 ($p<.01$) indicates that Japanese language proficiency influenced the results, whereas the large gap between mean HDI figures for Chinese learners (8.03) and Korean learners (4.44) indicates that L1 also influenced the results. Qualitative analysis and learner introspections indicate that Chinese learners did not perceive the situation as requiring informal language. This may not be direct evidence of transfer from L1, but because Chinese has no grammatically marked speech levels, Chinese learners may have not have been as aware of the need to use the informal speech level. Indeed, as one learner wrote in a DCT introspection, they may have been using honorifics as a pragmatic strategy, rather than as part of an overall speech level: "First I tell her it's urgent for using computer. So as to convince her to let me use her computer. Although we are friends, but I use polite form as to make her to let me to use the computer." In a DET introspection, the same learner wrote, "They use informal speech. I find it's not easy for me at this stage to understand all the informal ending." What is interesting here, however, is that this learner had the

highest C-test score (61%) of the entire group. This indicates that, at least in this learner's case, language proficiency as measured by the C-test does not necessarily reflect learner sociolinguistic proficiency. Anglophone learners were also in a similar situation because English has no grammatically marked speech levels, but, as the discussion so far has shown, Anglophone learners expressed greater worry over which speech level was appropriate than did Chinese learners.

4.5.2.8. Expressing Thanks

The final speech act in the data set was that of expressing thanks. Like requests and refusals, this speech act has received considerable attention in the sociolinguistics and pragmatics literature because it is a universal speech act. Table 74 gives an overview of relevant statistical findings.

Table 74. Descriptive Statistics for Learners and Native-Speaker Thanks Responses

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
DCT HDI	12.11	15.79	7.72	7.16
DCT %	48.71%	33.58%	72.06%	74.56%
DET Score	2.75	2.75	3.0	3.0
DET %	46.32%	46.32%	58.82%	58.82%
Mean %	47.52%	39.95%	65.44%	66.69%

The most noticeable trend in the results is the close approximation of the Korean learners to native speakers in the DCT and the DET. On both instruments, the Korean learners performed almost the same as the native speakers, whereas Anglophone and Chinese leaders deviated considerably from native-speaker

performance. DCT Situation 6 correlated with the C-test at .5674 ($p<.01$), an intermediate degree of correlation for a DCT situation in this study. DET Dialogue 2 correlated with the C-test at .3652 ($p<.05$), which was the lowest figure among all six dialogues, but this finding must be treated with caution because the range of scores among groups (2.75-3.0) was narrow. Results here indicate that, among learners, L1 background had a clear influence on use of honorifics.

Qualitative analysis also indicates that Korean learners interpreted the social variables in the situation similarly to native speakers and had enough language proficiency to produce language that approximated to native-speaker norms. The following Table 75 shows relevant examples.

Table 75. Selected Examples of Learner and Native-Speaker Responses to DCT Situation 6 (SVI 0)

Situation: You have volunteered to show a group of Japanese high school exchange students around Sydney for the day. You have now come to the end of the tour and everyone thanks you for your time and consideration. Several students approach you and present you with a gift from the entire group in appreciation for the tour.
What would you say?

Japanese 1. *ee, HONTOOni morattyatte ii no? WATASHI nanka MANZOKU ni ANNAI shite agerarenakkata noni! demo, minna HONTOOni arigatoo. NOKOrino oosutorariano JIKAN wo TANOsinde KUDAsaine!* (#3, HDI 2.8%)
("Wow, is it really OK for me to accept this? You know, I didn't you around to my satisfaction! Still, I really thank all of you. I hope you enjoy the rest of your stay in Australia!")
2. *uwaa, doomo arigatoo. wazawaza purezento made kurete. NANI? Aketemo ii?* (#10, HDI 3.1%)
("Wow, thanks a lot. You didn't have to go as far as giving me a present. Well? Can I open it?")

Korean 1. *doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. WATASHI wa anatatachi to isshoni sugoshita toki wo totemo ureshikatta. wasureno wa dekimasen.* (#7, HDI 8.2%, C-test 37%)
("Thank you very much. I really enjoyed the time I spent with you. I cannot forget it.")

2. *doomo arigatoo. mezurashii mono desu. IZEN kara konna mono ga hoshikatta. kore wo Miru to anataTACHI wo oboeru koto ga dekiru ne.* (#17, HDI 7.3%, C-test 58%)
("Thanks. It's a special [rare] thing. I have been wanting something like this for a long time. When I look at it, I will remember all of you.")

Chinese 1. *arigatoo, kore wa NAN desuka. soo desuka. mata arigatoo. moo ICHIDO oosutorariani KItte KUDAsai.* (#2, HDI 11.9%, C-test 40%)
("Thanks--what's this? Really? Thanks again. Please come to Australia again.")
2. *aa, irimasen desu yo. KYOO, anatatachito totemo ureshii desu. arigatoo gozaimasu. JIKAN ga aru. mo IKKAI DEkishoo.* (#16, HDI 12%, C-test 43%)
("Oh, I don't need that. I was very happy with all of you today. Thank you very much. I have time. Let's do it again.")

English 1. *bikkuri shimashita. minnasan doomo arigatoo gozaimashita. KYOO wa totemo tanoshikatta desu.* (#1, HDI 12.2%, 36%)
("I'm surprised. Thank you very much. Today was very pleasant.")
2. *arigatoo gozaimashita. anata wa WATASHI ni okurimono wo Ageru wa ikemasen.* (#15, HDI 12.5%, C-test 41%)
("Thank you very much. You must not give me a present.")
3. *ara, ureshii wa! hontooni minna to Atte ureshii koto desu. arigatoo gozaimsu.* (#24, HDI 5.3%, C-test 59%)
("Wow, how nice! I'm pleased to have met all of you. Thank you.")

The two native speakers above both used informal language with intermittent formulaic expressions of thanks. The second Korean learner (C-test 58%) also used the informal speech level mixed with formulaic expressions. The first Korean learner (C-test 37%) used the formal speech level, but dropped to the informal speech level at the end of the second sentence. Aside from individual variation, this suggests that proficiency affects the range of learner production because the first Korean learner interpreted the situation as calling for the formal speech level while the second Korean learner used the informal speech level. By contrast, almost all Chinese and Anglophone learners used the formal speech level. Only the last Anglophone learner (C-test 59%) used the informal speech level, but she did so only at the beginning of the utterance. In terms of discourse structure, most native

speakers included an apologetic reference about not having been a good guide or not wanting to trouble the students with buying a present. A number of Anglophone and Chinese learners used this form as in the examples above, but neither of the Korean learners did. Though both Korean learners expressed deep appreciation for the gift, they did not use apologetic references. Findings here highlight the limitations of the HDI, as discussed in Section 4.4.1 above, in showing details of discourse-level phenomena. Thus, according to the HDI, Korean learners closely approximated to native speakers, but a qualitative look at the data reveals major differences between the two groups, which suggests that the HDI is best used in combination with qualitative analysis.

Though results from the DET broadly mirrored those of the DCT, Chinese and Anglophone learners came close to approximating to Korean learners and native speakers. The average score for Chinese and Anglophone learners was 2.75, only slightly lower than the 3.0 score for Korean learners and native speakers. The questions asked about the dialogue are given in Table 76 below.

Table 76. Questions on DET Dialogue 2 (SVI +4)

Original Script:

W: *sensei, kyou wa tanoshii ohanashi wo arigatoo gozaimashita.*
("Professor, thanks for the interesting chat today.")

M: *dooitashimashite. kono tugi wa anata no yooroppaa ryokou no shashin wo miyoo.*
("You're welcome. Next time, let's look at pictures from your trip to Europe.")

W: *hai. dewa, mata ojamasasete itadakimasu.*
("Fine. I'd be happy to visit you again.")

M: *unn, ja matte iruyo.*
("OK. I'll be waiting.")

W: *kyoo kore de shitsurei shimasu.*
("I'll stop imposing on you now.")

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. In English, why does the woman thank the man?
3. What is a more informal form of 失礼いたします (SHITSUREI shimasu) in Japanese?

Qualitative analysis also shows that all groups responded similarly on this dialogue. Indeed, the uniformity of responses is most striking in this dialogue. All learners, for example, said in response to Question 1 that the relationship was a teacher-student relationship. In response to Question 2, nearly all learners said that the woman was thanking the man for an interesting talk, but some said that the teacher was showing the student pictures. He had in fact only promised to do so in a subsequent meeting. The formulaic expression *shitsurei itashimasu* ("I am [humbly] sorry") in Question 3 is the humble form of the *shitsurei shimasu* ("I am sorry"). About half the learners responded with *shitsurei shimasu*, which indicates that they were clearly aware of the differences in formality between the two forms because *shitsurei itashimasu* indicates a greater degree of formality. A number of learners chose *sumimasen* ("I am sorry") as a more informal form because it also conveys apology and is one of the most frequently used formulaic expressions in the language. Together these findings show that the learners in this study were sensitive to a number of different linguistic differences in giving apologies, but, as results from the DCT show, had different interpretations of social variables that constrained linguistic production.

The close approximation of only the Korean learners to native-speaker norms indicates that L1 affected learner performance on the DCT. Introspective comments on the DCT show that, as in many of the speech acts discussed above, Anglophone learners and, to a slightly lesser extent, Chinese learners interpreted the

speech act of thanks as requiring the formal speech level and the use of honorifics. Indeed, as with apologies and complaints, some Anglophone learners here consciously applied L1 sociolinguistic norms in developing their responses. One Anglophone learner, for example, wrote, "Something like 'you shouldn't have' should've been said but I don't know how to." Here the learner assumes the English form "shouldn't have" is applicable to the situation. Another Anglophone learner commented on not knowing the appropriate way to express thanks, "I'm not sure of the usual polite greetings to thank someone." Of interest, however, is the Chinese learner who draws on Australian cultural norms to develop her response: "The Japanese culture is different from Australian, so it might be strange to answer this way." Results throughout this study have shown differences between Chinese and Anglophone learners, but this comment indicates that Chinese learners were influenced in some way by L2 English sociolinguistic norms. In several situations, Chinese and Korean learners used English words written in the Roman alphabet (as opposed to *katakana*, which is used for foreign words that have become Japanese) to fill in gaps in their Japanese proficiency. This indicates that learners drew on L2 English as well as their L1 to formulate responses to the instruments in this study. The data in this study are insufficient to show a clear pattern of L1 and L2 interaction in producing L3, but they suggest that the use of L2 as a pedagogical language in the classroom and as a language of daily life outside the classroom creates a useable source of linguistic knowledge that learners draw on periodically to solve tasks in the L3.

4.5.3. Concluding Discussion on Sociolinguistic Transfer

Results and discussion on sociolinguistic transfer in this section lead to the following tentative conclusions:

1. The SVI (Social Variable Index) was developed to provide a measure of the formality or informality of DCT situation and the SWT. Correlation with native-speaker responses to DCT items showed that it provides a simple and valid measure of native-speaker perception of social variables in a given situation. Correlation with learner DCT responses showed that Korean learners came closest to approximating to native speakers, which suggests that at least the two Korean learners in this study perceive social variables similarly to native speakers. It must be remembered, however, that conclusions based on data from Korean learners are limited because the sample consisted of only two learners.

2. Analysis of the eight speech acts discussed in this study showed that a number of Chinese and Anglophone learners interpreted social variables using Australian cultural norms. For Chinese learners, this suggests that L2 linguistic and cultural norms influenced their perception of social variables in Japanese. Though many Anglophone learners perceived social variables in Australian cultural terms, they were also concerned with "being polite," which suggests that metalinguistic notions of Japanese speech level use influenced their performance as much, if not more than, transfer from L1. Learners from all language backgrounds used English in the middle of Japanese sentences, which suggests that learners drew on the language of the classroom and the learning environment to fill gaps in their lexical knowledge of Japanese.

3. Introspective comments provided valuable information on learner motives, metalinguistic awareness, and metacultural attitudes. Because the introspection sections in all the instruments are retrospective, it is difficult to interpret them as evidence of the thought processes that took place as learners were developing their responses. Though this makes it difficult to use introspective comments as evidence of thought processes, it shows that such retrospective comments provide information that can be used with other types of qualitative analysis.

As given in Chapter 1 and again at the beginning of Section 4 of this chapter, two hypotheses on sociolinguistic transfer have been used in this study. They are as follows:

1. As a set of complex phenomena influenced by many social and cultural factors, sociolinguistic transfer will more variable and less predictable than lexico-grammatical transfer.

2. In intermediate and advanced learners, sociolinguistic transfer will create sociolinguistic dissonance rather than miscommunication. Because of the inherent variability of sociolinguistic transfer, sociolinguistic dissonance may be greater than the learners' level of lexico-grammatical competence would lead one to expect.

Results from the discussion on sociolinguistic transfer in this section lend tentative confirmation to the first hypothesis. Conclusions based on the two Korean learners must be treated with caution, but Korean learners come closer to approximating to native-speaker performance than other groups of learners in seven of the eight

speech-act categories. Results of the mean fractional percentage rank for all instruments in a single speech-act category are presented in Table 77 below.

Table 77. Mean Fractional Percentage Ranks for Speech Acts

L1	Chinese	English	Korean	Japanese
Apologies	41.42	39.58	51.47	78.38
Complaints	42.09	40.81	55.52	68.23
Disagreement	38.05	40.44	41.17	80.88
Invitations	27.39	41.97	64.71	84.55
Promises	26.47	54.16	52.94	62.35
Refusals	45.58	40.74	46.69	72.12
Requests	33.91	41.05	56.62	84.55
Thanks	47.52	39.95	65.44	66.69
Overall	37.80	42.34	54.32	74.72

That Korean learners came closest in approximating to native-speaker performance, however, does not indicate that they perceived language closeness or, indeed, transferability. Introspective comments from Korean learners show that Korean learners perceived the non-linguistic social variables in a given situation much the same as native speakers. This suggests that Korean learners based many of their decisions on which speech level to use on social and cultural variables, rather than on perceptions of language distance or transferability. By contrast, Chinese learners perceived social variables differently from native speakers, but it was difficult to determine whether they were applying Chinese or Australian cultural norms to interpreting social variables in each situation. As discussed above, however, introspective comments show that some Chinese learners were drawing on Australian cultural norms in interpreting social variables. Others viewed the use of

the honorifics and the formal speech level as a pragmatic strategy, rather than as something largely determined by social variables in the frame of interaction. The wide variation among Chinese learners in their mean responses to different speech acts, as noted above in Table 77, confirms the hypothesis that sociolinguistic transfer is highly variable. A number of Anglophone learners also viewed the use of honorifics and the formal speech level as a way to indicate politeness. Unlike Chinese learners, many Anglophone learners expressed concern for using the appropriate speech level, which indicated sensitivity to metalinguistic issues. A frequency analysis of introspective comments on the DCT showed that "polite" appeared 15 times and was the second most frequent "content word" in the introspections (the most frequent content word was "know"). The concern for politeness among Anglophone learners compared with the other two groups suggests that they were concerned about developing sufficient metalinguistic and metacultural knowledge to compensate for the lack of transferable L1 linguistic and cultural knowledge. This finding lends support to the hypothesis that perceived language closeness causes learners to perceive more of their existing linguistic knowledge as transferable.

Hypothesis two was more difficult to confirm or reject because only three of the learners in this study had advanced intermediate proficiency as defined by the C-test and their performance on other instruments. In the case of the three learners who have high C-test scores (one Chinese, one Korean, and one Anglophone), none of their responses represented miscommunication, but the use of formal speech levels, particularly by the Chinese learner, caused sociolinguistic dissonance. The problem for the hypothesis, however, is that very few responses in the data set represented miscommunication because less-proficient learners produced short simple responses

that were also examples of sociolinguistic dissonance because of their brevity and simplicity. Those examples of miscommunication, however, came mostly from learners who scored low on the C-test, which provides tentative confirmation for the hypothesis.

Relating to hypothesis two, the data suggest that the last part of the hypothesis was refuted because the mean C-test scores for all learners was 36.49%, which is rather low for a proficiency test. Because there were few examples of miscommunication in the data, it is possible to argue that sociolinguistic proficiency among learners is higher than the low average of the C-test would indicate. For Anglophone learners, the difficulty of writing Chinese characters shows that learners who do not know Chinese characters have considerable difficulty with the Japanese writing system that extends to the intermediate levels of proficiency. This indicates that the writing system and production of writing are the more "marked" areas of difficulty for learners from non-Chinese-character languages than sociolinguistic areas of language. For Chinese learners, whose language uses Chinese characters but does not have an extensive system of lexically and grammatically marked honorifics, sociolinguistic areas of Japanese could be more difficult that other areas of language. This in turn causes sociolinguistic proficiency to be lower than overall language proficiency. Based on results here, the second hypothesis would need to be amended to address differences between Chinese-character-language learners and non-Chinese-character language learners. Overall concluding remarks on the hypotheses in this study and other relevant issues will be presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I present a brief evaluation of the hypotheses tested in this study, which will be followed by a discussion of the value and limitations of the research for L≥3 acquisition and of the pedagogical implications for teaching Japanese as an L2 and L≥3.

5.1. Hypotheses

In Chapter 1, I described the four hypotheses that this thesis was designed to investigate:

1. Language transfer is a salient phenomenon in L≥3 acquisition in written production and listening comprehension of speech acts.

2. Learner perceptions of L≥3 relatedness or closeness to the L1 and L2 will increase the likelihood of language transfer.

3. As a set of complex phenomena influenced by many social and cultural factors, sociolinguistic transfer will more variable and less predictable than lexico-grammatical transfer.

4. In intermediate and advanced learners, sociolinguistic transfer will create sociolinguistic dissonance rather than miscommunication. Because of the inherent

variability of sociolinguistic transfer, sociolinguistic dissonance may be greater than the learners' level of lexico-grammatical competence would lead one to expect.

As discussed in Section 4.3.1 of Chapter 4, the first hypothesis was supported. The small number of Korean learners (n=2) in this study makes it difficult draw strong conclusions from results reported for that group, but an analysis of C-test results shows that learners with Chinese (n= 8) or Korean as an L1 performed better than Anglophone learners on items that included Chinese characters. Chinese and Korean learners used more Chinese characters in their responses to the C-test, the DCT, and the SWT. These findings show clearly that previous knowledge of Chinese characters gives learners an advantage in writing Japanese and, from their answers on the C-test, in reading Japanese, particularly when they have to rely on context for information. In other areas of the C-test, Korean learners, whose native language is closer typologically to Japanese than any of the other languages in the data set, performed better than other groups. With the DET, the only other instrument that was evaluated on a binary correct-incorrect scale, Korean learners performed noticeably better than other groups. These findings confirm the overall facilitative role of language transfer from Korean into Japanese for Korean learners and in lexical areas for Chinese learners. In addition, transfer of knowledge of Chinese characters facilitates acquisition of all areas of language that contain are related to the lexicon. Throughout the data, there was only occasional circumstantial evidence, mostly lexical items or formulaic expressions, of linguistic transfer from L2 English into Japanese.

Results in Section 4.3.2 of Chapter 4 did not support the second hypothesis because Chinese and Korean learners perceived a number of areas of typological

similarity between their L1s and Japanese as difficult, which indicates that, even if they perceived a closeness between the languages, they did not perceive related features of the languages as readily transferable to Japanese. Of the 10 areas of language that learners were asked to rank for difficulty, Chinese learners chose "writing Chinese characters" and "reading Chinese characters" as the easiest areas of Japanese, whereas Korean students, whose L1 also contains Chinese characters, chose "culture" (i.e., sociolinguistic norms, etc.) and pronunciation as the easiest areas of Japanese. Other groups found each of these items average or difficult. Learner introspective comments contained relatively few references to the typological similarities between the L1 and Japanese. Together, these findings indicate that the common language of the educational and social environment, English in this case, may have hindered learners from developing sufficient metalinguistic awareness to perceive connections between Japanese and languages that share linguistic features with Japanese.

Results discussed in Section 4.5 of Chapter 4 supported the third hypothesis. Of all groups, Korean learners came closest to approximation to native-speaker sociolinguistic norms as measured by the DCT, the DET, and the SWT. Introspective comments showed that they perceived the underlying social variables in the situations given much as native speakers perceived them, and in a number of cases, these perceptions reflect how many native speakers of Korean would perceive the same situations. This finding is related to the perception of "culture" as being one of the easier areas of Japanese, and indicates that Korean learners perceived cultural similarities between Korean and Japanese. Results from Chinese and Anglophone learners support the second part of the hypothesis on variability of sociolinguistic transfer. Of all groups, Chinese learners were furthest from

native-speaker norms, and their responses varied considerably according to proficiency and among individuals. Introspective comments from a number of Chinese learners indicated that they drew on their knowledge of L2 Australian sociolinguistic norms to interpret the social variables in DCT situations. It is difficult to argue that Chinese is closer to Japanese in sociolinguistic areas than English is because, like English, Chinese does not have an extensive system of honorifics that marks speech levels. Thus, Chinese learners could have perceived English as closer to Japanese, but none of the introspective comments stated this explicitly. Anglophone learners also showed considerable variation, but, as illustrated in their introspective comments, they also showed evidence of the application of metalinguistic knowledge that was gained from classroom instruction in formulating responses. This suggests that metalinguistic instruction in Japanese sociolinguistic norms affected responses of Anglophone learners more than L1 sociolinguistic norms. Together, the complex interaction between sociolinguistic transfer from L1 and possibly L2 and metalinguistic knowledge of Japanese sociolinguistic norms shows how social, cultural, and pedagogical factors influence the development of sociolinguistic competence in L≥3 acquisition.

Results from this study are insufficient to evaluate the fourth hypothesis because, according to the C-test, only three of the 24 learners had what would be advanced proficiency in Japanese. The low mean for all learners (36.49%) meant that the mean during the third year of instruction was much lower than that of final-year students in Coleman (1996) using the C-test to measure the proficiency of European learners learning other European languages. In his study, the average for final-year was 70.34% for French, 65.51% for German, 91.91% for Spanish, and 44.18% for Russian. The low proficiency of learners in this study meant that it was

difficult to evaluate sociolinguistic dissonance either because they did not produce enough language to do so, or because they produced only simple sentences that were difficult to analyse for sociolinguistic features. The case of Chinese learners, however, lends tentative support to the hypothesis because they performed slightly better on the C-test than Anglophone learners, but slightly worse on measures of sociolinguistic norms than Anglophone learners. Throughout the data, there were no examples of miscommunication or breakdowns of communication, which lends further support to the hypothesis. Because learner responses used simple grammatical structures and formulaic expressions, the potential for miscommunication and breakdowns in communication cannot be discounted in extended spoken language and in listening comprehension.

5.2. Research Questions and Implications of the Study

The hypotheses in this study related to broader research questions in the acquisition of Japanese as a L≥3 as outlined in Chapter 1:

1. What are the major source(s) of language transfer in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?

2. What are the roles of sociolinguistic transfer and sociolinguistic competence in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3?

3. How do L2 proficiency, prior language learning experience, and residence in Japan affect sociolinguistic transfer and sociolinguistic competence in the acquisition of

Japanese as an L≥3?

4. What is the relevance of L≥3 acquisition research for general second language acquisition theory development?

The data in this study provide a number of different perspectives on these questions. Questions one and two were discussed above with reference to the hypotheses that were tested in this study. Regarding question three, because none of the learners in this study had learned an L2 or L≥3 that had any linguistic connections to Japanese, the L1 of learners was the major source of linguistic transfer. Learners who had learned an L2 and one or more L≥3s before learning Japanese had higher C-test scores, which suggests that additional language learning even of unrelated languages facilitates acquisition of subsequent languages. Only one learner in the study had spent a year in Japan by the time the data were collected, but she received the highest C-test score. She was one of the three learners in the group who were learning Japanese as an L2. No substantive conclusions can be drawn from one learner, but these findings suggest that residency in Japan has a greater effect on acquisition of Japanese than cognitive language learning skills gained from multiple language acquisition, or knowledge of a language that has Chinese characters or other linguistic similarities to Japanese.

Regarding the fourth research question, results from this study suggest that L≥3 acquisition research has important ramifications for SLA research and that there exists a need to distinguish the two fields from one another. Perhaps the most obvious ramification for SLA research is that monolingual subjects learning a second language can no longer be taken as the norm in university language classes around

the world. If the data from this study had been taken from French or German courses at the University of Sydney, many, if not most, of the students would have been studying the target language as an L≥3. As immigration and movements of people across boarders continue to expand, language classrooms at all levels of the educational system will become ever more diverse. The diversity in the language classroom as shown by this study requires that researchers abandon the prejudice that L≥3 acquisition is an exotic aside that is relevant only for bilinguals learning an L≥3 or for a few "good language learners."

The study has shown clearly a relationship between L1 language background and various phenomena related to Japanese proficiency. The combination of languages in the study influenced the relationship between L1 and Japanese as an L≥3 because none of the learners had learned or acquired a language that was typologically closer to Japanese than their L1. The influence of a closely related L2, such as Korean, or a partially related L2, such as Chinese, may have been stronger than the influence of an unrelated L1, such as English. Finding the right combination of subjects for such as a study is difficult with respect to Japanese because the number of languages that shares linguistic features with Japanese is small. It may be expeditious, for example, to examine the issues on native speakers of Japanese or Korean who have English as an L2 and are learning another European language as an L≥3. As noted in Section 2.1.1.1 of Chapter 2, Korean is the only major language that shares a number of features with Japanese. As mentioned above, the role of L1 in sociolinguistic transfer is less clear, particularly with regard to the Anglophone learners in the study. Given the consistency of the influence of L1 on transfer of lexico-grammatical areas of language, more research is needed on the role of L1 in sociolinguistic transfer in different groups of learners before

substantive conclusions can be drawn.

The study has revealed less about the role of L2 and other L≥3s in acquiring Japanese as an L≥3. Because the Chinese and Korean learners all had English as their L2, they had numerous opportunities to use English in Australia, thus maintaining their proficiency. Indeed, Chinese and Korean learners occasionally used English words in their Japanese responses to fill gaps in lexical knowledge. Introspective comments showed that Australian sociolinguistic norms affected responses of Chinese learners to some degree. For learners whose L1 is English, but who have learned one or more European language at school, however, the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3 may have caused gradual attrition of proficiency in those languages. These questions are highly relevant to SLA and to L≥3 acquisition research in particular because most research remains centred on the target language, which causes researchers to overlook the ever-changing relationship between previously acquired languages and the target language. More longitudinal studies of "language evolution" in educational settings and in everyday life would provide greater insight into these issues.

The study also underscores the need to distinguish between SLA research that focuses exclusively on L2 acquisition and L≥3 acquisition research. Though research methods and findings from each field are relevant to the other field, the essential cognitive difference between L2 learners who have no previous experience of learning a non-native language and L≥3 learners who have such experience creates the need for distinct research methods. This study has shown that it is not always easy to control for L1 and L2 in a diverse group of L≥3 learners. Adjusting the design of the study to focus exclusively on a set number of L1, L2, and L≥3 groups, as has been done in a number of L≥3 acquisition studies, is one way to

rectify this problem, but this risks creating artificial groups of learners that do not reflect actual conditions in the educational environment. Clearly, both types of studies are necessary to provide a complete view of L≥3 acquisition in a variety of education and non-education environments. Controlling for previous language learning experience in L≥3 acquisition research is thus a much more complex issue than it is in L2 acquisition research.

Research methods also need to provide insight into how learners perceive and draw on their experience of having learned a non-native language. In this study, the introspective comments on the instruments provided a chance for learners to comment on various aspects of their language learning experience. Few in this study chose to comment directly on their previous language learning experience, which suggests the need for an instrument that focuses on this issue more clearly. The questionnaire in this study was perhaps too simple to capture details of previous language learning experience, so an extended questionnaire or interview may have been a more effective instrument. The need for effective and valid measures of previous language learning experience, particularly for large groups of learners, is critical to the advancement of L≥3 acquisition research.

5.3. Pedagogical Implications

Though results from this study are somewhat equivocal regarding language transfer in the acquisition of Japanese as an L≥3, they have a number of clear pedagogical implications for teaching of Japanese as an L2 and L≥3. Perhaps the most obvious pedagogical implication is that different approaches to instruction, particularly at the *ab initio* level, are needed for learners who have knowledge of Chinese characters

and those who do not. Learners who are literate in Chinese or Korean possess a large potential vocabulary that other learners lack. Because much of Japanese language education in educational institutions in countries that do not use a Chinese-character language focuses on teaching Chinese characters from the beginning, such instruction is not efficient for learners who already how to read and write a number of Chinese characters. Instead, such learners need instruction in how to pronounce Chinese characters in Japanese and how to use them with *hiragana* in mixed writing. A number of language programmes in Japan divide learners according to Chinese-character and non-Chinese character backgrounds, but this is not done at the University of Sydney and at many other academic institutions that have diverse groups of learners. Though the number of learners at many institutions is smaller than in Japan, programme administrators should find a way to meet the needs of these two groups of learners. Finally, the fact that only one of the 24 learners had spent at least a year in Japan by the third year suggests that programme administrators need to expand exchange programmes that provide most learners the opportunity of studying in Japan by the time they complete university.

Two measures of language proficiency--the C-test and the Chinese-character density index--are useful for Japanese language education. The study showed that the C-test could be adapted to Japanese and used as a valid measure of proficiency. Results from the C-test were also useful in discerning differences in proficiency among learners as individuals and as members of an L1 group. The C-test is thus applicable to Japanese language education as a placement test. The item analysis of the C-test in this study also shows that it is a useful tool in researching lexical, syntactic, and morphological areas of learner language. Though not a measure of global language proficiency, the Chinese-character density index provides a clear

measure of proficiency and usage of Chinese characters compared with native-speaker norms. The index is especially useful in evaluating written Japanese, an area of language that is frequently overlooked in Japanese-language instruction and in standardized tests, such as the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT). Such a measure is useful not only in evaluating learner language, but also in evaluating native-speaker language and a variety of Japanese texts. This information will help teachers develop materials for advanced learners that reflect actual use of Chinese characters in various genres of language.

Through development of the HDI (Honorific Density Index), this study also broke ground in analysis of learner and native-speaker sociolinguistic competence. The HDI provides a simple yet reliable measure of the density of honorific and formal forms used in a given verbal or written text. It also allowed learner language to be compared with native-speaker language to show how closely learners approximated native-speaker norms. Approximating to native-speaker norms, of course, may not be a desirable ultimate goal for Japanese language instruction, but such information reveals much about learner sociolinguistic proficiency. Information on native-speaker norms, on the other hand, is useful in evaluating pedagogical models, such as dialogues and listening practice in textbooks. Results from this study showed that all groups of learners deviated considerably from native-speaker norms in the use of informal forms that lack honorifics and formal verb endings. Because many textbooks and much classroom instruction overlook the importance of informal forms, an analysis of instructional materials using the HDI will provide a clearer understanding of the degree to which informal forms are overlooked. It must be remembered, however, that the HDI provides a simple measure of honorific use and should be augmented by a qualitative discussion of

honorific use in the texts concerned. This information will help teachers and materials developers integrate informal forms into instruction more effectively.

Finally, findings from the data on sociolinguistic competence and transfer show that the traditional emphasis on "politeness" and formulaic expressions in Japanese language education is useful in developing learner metalinguistic awareness of sociolinguistic appropriateness. The data also show that metalinguistic awareness does not, however, imply sociolinguistically appropriate production or comprehension of language. This suggests that sociolinguistic areas of language need greater emphasis in the curriculum, particularly in language programs located outside Japan where most learners have relatively little contact with the language outside of the classroom. As Siegal (1994) noted, however, Japanese education in Japan also suffers from a lack of attention to sociolinguistic areas of language. "The seriousness of inadequate Japanese language preparation cannot be underestimated. A lack of sociolinguistic proficiency can cause a 'glass ceiling' effect influencing learning career opportunities" (1994: 400). The inability of learners in this study to use informal forms of the language confirms the lack of sufficient opportunities to use different speech levels and to develop a "feeling" for the diversity of native-speaker language. This can be accomplished by increasing the presence of informal forms in instructional materials, by providing learners with greater access to authentic materials, and by incorporating a sociolinguistic dimension in all areas of language instruction from the *ab initio* level to the advanced level. By demanding that learners become competent in sociolinguistic areas of language, teachers will be arming their learners with the cultural capital necessary to become confident users of the Japanese language and informed interpreters of Japanese culture.

REFERENCES

Ahukana, J. G. W., Lund, N.J., & Gentile, R. (1981). Inter- and intra-lingual interference effects in learning an L3. *The Modern Language Journal, 65*, 281-287.

Anderson, R. (1983). Transfer to somewhere. In S. Gass and L. Selinker (Eds.) *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 177-201). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ard, J., & Homburg, T. (1983). Verification of language transfer. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 157-176). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Azevedo, M. M. (1978). Identifying Spanish interference in the speech of learners of Portuguese. *The Modern Language Journal*, *62*(1-2), 18-23.

Barnlund, D. C., & Araki, S. (1985). Intercultural encounters: The management of compliments by Japanese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *16*(1), 9-26.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R.C. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S.C. Krashen (Eds.), *On the development of communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Beebe, L.M., & Cummings M. (1996). Natural speech act data vs. written questionnaire data: how data collection methods effects speech act performance. In S. Gass and J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 65-86). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bentahila, A. (1975). *The influence of L2 on learning an L3*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University College of North Wales, Bangor.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, *3*, 29-59.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *8*, 165-180.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Appendix: The CCSARP coding manual. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (273-294). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of requests. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 255-272). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

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

Cenoz, J. & Valencia, J. F. (1994). Additive trilingualism: Evidence from the Basque country. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *15*, 195-207.

Chamot, A. U. (1973). Phonological problems in learning English as a third language. *IRAL*, 11(3), 243-250.

Chamot, A. U. (1978). Grammatical problems in learning English as a third language. In E. M. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Chandrasenkhar, A. (1978). Base language. *IRAL*, *16*(1), 62-65.

Chapelle, C. A. (1994). Are C-tests valid measures for L2 vocabulary research? *Second Language Research*, *10*(2), 157-187.

Chikamatsu, N. (1996). The effects of L1 orthography on L2 word recognition: A study of American and Chinese learners of Japanese. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*, 403-432.

Chumbrow, B. S. (1981). The mother tongue hypothesis in a multilingual setting. In J.-G. Savard and L. Laforge (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th AILA Congress* (Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism, pp. 42-55). Quebec: L'Université Laval.

Cleary, C. (1988). The C-test in English: Left-hand deletions. *RELC Journal*, *19*(2), 26-38.

Clyne, M. (1997). Some things trilinguals do. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *1*, 95-116.

Clyne, M. and Cassia, P. (1999). Trilingualism, immigration and relatedness of language. *I.T.L.*, *123-124*, 57-77.

Coleman, J. A. (1996). *Studying languages: A survey of British and European students*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Connor, U. & Kaplan, R. B. (1987). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Coulmas, F. (1989). Function and status of written language in East Asia. In U. Ammon (Ed.), *Status and function of languages and language varieties* (pp. 216-242). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Coulmas, F. (1992). Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice* (pp. 299-323). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Davies, E. E. (1987). A contrastive approach to the analysis of politeness formulas. *Applied Linguistics*, *8*(1), 75-88.

Dechert H. W., & Raupach, M. (Eds.) (1989). *Interlingual processes*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Dewaele, J.-M. (1998). Lexical inventions: French interlanguage as L2 versus L3. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(4), 471-490.

Dole, R. (1983). Linguistic interference in immigrants' interlanguage. *TEAL Occasional Papers*, *7*, 69-83.

Eisenstein, M. (1980). Childhood bilingualism and adult language learning aptitude. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, *29*, 159-174.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1986). One learner - two languages: investigating types of interlanguage knowledge. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication* (pp. 211-227). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Fargal, M. (1995). The Pragmatics of *'inshallah* in Jordanian Arabic. *Multilingua*, *14*(3), 253-270.

Farghal, M. & Borni, A. (1997). Pragmareligious failure in translating Arabic politeness formulas into English: Evidence from Mahfouz's *Awlad Haritna*. *Multilingua*, *16*(1), 77-99.

Feldmann, U. & Stemmer, B. (1987). Thin___ aloud a___ retrospective da___ in C-t___ taking: diffe___ languages - diff___ learners - sa___ approaches? In C. Færch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 54-81). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fouser, R. J. (1994). Justifying L≥3 research. *Asian Pacific Quarterly*, *26*(4), 10-22.

Fouser, R. J. (1997). *Pragmatic transfer in advanced language learners: Some preliminary findings* (Occasional Paper No. 50). Dublin: Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College.

Fouser, R. J. (1999). *What happens after L3?: A case study of a learner of Korean as a fifth language*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Third Language Acquisition and Trilingualism, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria, September 14-16, 1999.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass S. & Selinker, L. (Eds.) (1983). *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 157-176). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). The linguistic bases of communicative competence. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981* (pp. 323-334). Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Gutiérez, M. G. (1993). El español como lengua segunda de un italiano: transferencia y distancia lingüística [Spanish as a second language for a native speaker of Italian: transfer and language distance]. In J.M. Liceras (Ed.), *La linüística y el análisis de los sistemas no nativos* (pp. 81-123). Ottawa: Dorehouse Editions.

Haggis, B. M. (1973). Un cas de trilinguisme [A case of trilingualism]. *La Linguistique*, *2*, 37-50.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hannas, W.C. (1997). *Asia's orthographic dilemma*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Harada, S. I. (1976). Honorifics. In M. Shibatani (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 5: Japanese generative grammar* (pp. 499-561). New York: Academic Press.

Hattori, S. (1960). *Gengogaku no hōhō* [Methodology in linguistics]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shōten.

Hiyashi, D., Miyajima, T., Nomura, G. (Eds.) (1982). *Dosetsu Nihongo* [Japanese in Explained in Graphs]. Tokyo: Kadokawa.

Hinds, J., & Jenkins, S. (1987). Business letter writing: English, French, and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(2), 327-349.

Hinkel, E. (1997). Appropriateness of advice: DCT and multiple choice data. *Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1), 1-26.

Hoffmann, C. (1985). Language acquisition in two trilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *6*(6), 479-495.

Hori, M. (1986). A sociolinguistic analysis of the Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *10*, 373-386.

Hudson, T., Detmer, E., & Brown, J. D. (1995). *Developing prototypic measures of cross-cultural pragmatics* (Technical Report No. 7). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Hufeisen, B. (1991). *Englisch als erste und Deutsch asl zweite Fremdsprache: Emirische Untersuchung zur fremdsprachlichen Interaktion* [English as a first foreign language and German as a second foreign language: Empirical studies on foreign-language interaction] (Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 21, Linguistic Bd. 91). Frankfurt: Lang.

Hufeisen, B. (1996). *What is special about learning a second foreign language?* Unpublished paper.

Ide, S. (1979). *Onna no kotoba otoko no kotoba* [Female speech and male speech]. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Tūshinsha.

Ide, S. (1982). Japanese sociolinguistics politeness and women's Language. *Lingua*, 57, 357-385.

Ide, S. (1986). The background of Japanese sociolinguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10, 281-286.

Ikoma, T. & Shimura, A. (1994). Pragmatic transfer in the speech act of refusal in Japanese as a second language. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *5*(1 & 2), 105-129.

Janicki, K. (1985). *The foreigner's language: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Janney, R. W., & Arndt, H. (1993). Universality and relativity in cross-cultural politeness research: A historical perspective. *Multilingua*, *12*(1), 13-50.

Kambou, M. K. (1997). *Acquisition of the English article system by Francophone students: The case of Burkina Faso*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, *8*(3), 203-231.

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

Kasper, G., & Zhang, Y. (1995). "It's good to be a bit Chinese": foreign students' experience of Chinese pragmatics. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language* (Technical Report No. 5, pp. 1-22). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Kashiwazaki, H. (1993). Hanashikake kodo no danwa bunseki: irai, yokyu hyogen no jissai o chushin ni [Discourse analysis of conversational openers: focus on realization of request expressions]. *Nihongo Kyōiku*, *79*, 53-63.

Kellerman, E. (1977). Towards a characterization of strategies of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, *2*, 58-145.

Kellerman, E. (1978). Giving learners a break: Native language intuitions as a source of predictions about transferability. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, *15*, 59-92.

Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non-transfer: where we are now. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *2*, 37-57.

Kellerman, E. (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 112-134). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Kellerman, E. (1995). Crosslinguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *15*, 125-150.

Khaldi, K. (1981). *The use of the strategy of transfer by language learners with a bilingual background.* M. Litt. Thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Kikuchi, Y. (1994). *Keigo* [Honorific language]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.

Kikuchi, Y. (1997). Kawariyuku "sasete itadaku" [Changing uses of the "sasete itadaku" form]. *Gengo*, *26*(6), 40-47.

Klein, E. C. (1995). Second versus third language acquisition: Is there a difference? *Language Learning*, *45*, 419-465.

Klein-Braley, C. (1985). A close-up on the C-test. *Language Testing*, *2*, 76-104.

Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts and interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, *73*(3), 279-290.

Kumai, T., Kōno, R., & Chino, E. (Eds.) (1997). *Gengogaku serekshon: Nihon rettō no gengo* [Selections in linguistics: Languages of the Japanese islands]. Tokyo: Sanseido.

Lasagabaster, D. (1998). Learning English as an L3. *I.T.L.*, *121-122*, 51-84.

Lee, P-h. (1990). Jōkyū no nihongo kyōiku: Kankokujin gakushūsha no baai [Advanced learners of Japanese: The case of Korean learners]. *Nihongo Kyōiku*, *71*, 33-43.

LoCastro, V. (1987). *Aizuchi*: A Japanese conversational routine. In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures* (pp. 101-113). New York: Prentice Hall.

LoCoco, V. G.-M. (1976). A cross-sectional study of L3 acquisition. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, *9*, 44-75.

Mägiste, E. (1984). Learning a third language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *5*(5), 415-421.

Marriott, H. (1993). Acquiring sociolinguistic competence: Australian secondary students in Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *4*(4), 167-192.

Martin, S. (1964). Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language, culture, and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 407-415). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Martine-Daudeu, G. & Llisterri, J. (1990). *Phonetic interference in bilingual speakers learning a third language: The production of lateral consonants*. Paper presented at 9th World Congress of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA), Thessaloniki, Greece, April 12-21, 1990. ERIC ED 324909.

Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1996). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. Gass and J. Neu (Eds.) *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 155-187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matsumoto, K. (1993). Verbal-report data and introspective methods in second language research: state of the art. *RELC Journal*, *24*(1), 32-60.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *12*, 403-426.

McLaughlin, B. & Nayak, N. (1989). Processing a new language: Does knowing other languages make a difference? In. H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Interlingual processes* (pp. 5-16). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Meier, A. J. (1995). Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *24*, 381-392.

Miller, R. A. (1971). *Japanese and the other Altaic languages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, R. A. (1982). *Japan's modern myths*. New York: John Weatherhill.

Miller, L. (1994). Japanese and American indirectness. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *5*(1 & 2), 37-55.

Minami, F. (1987). *Keigo* [Honorific language]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shōten.

Möhle, D. (1989). Multilingual interaction in foreign language production. In H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Interlingual processes* (pp. 179-194). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Mori, J. (1993). Some observations in humble expressions in Japanese: Distribution of *o-* V(stem) *suru* and 'V (causative) *itadaku*. In S. Choi (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* (Vol. 3, pp. 67-83). Palo Alto: Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.

Moriuchi, M. (1992). *A study of cross-cultural communication: American students' use of Japanese honorific formalisms*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.

Mulamba, K. (1991). *Apologizing and complaining in Ciluba, French, and English: Speech act performance by trilingual speakers in Zaire*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ball State University.

Murayama, S. & Obayashi, T. (1973). *Nihongo no kigen* [The origins of the Japanese language]. Tokyo: Kobundo.

Murrell, M. (1966). Language acquisition in a trilingual environment: Notes from a case-study. *Studia Linguistica*, *20*, 9-35.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner* (Research in Education Series No. 7). Toronto: The Ontario Institute of Studies in Education.

Nation, R. & McLaughlin, B. (1986). Novices and experts: An information processing approach to the "good language learner" problem. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *7*, 41-56.

National Language Research Institute (1971). Denshikeisanki ni yoru shimbun no goi chosa (II) [A survey of newspaper vocabulary using an electronic calculator, Vol. 2]. Tokyo: National Language Research Institute.

Nayak, N., Hansen, N., Krueger, N., & McLaughlin, B. (1990). Language-learning strategies in monolingual and mulitilingual adults. *Language Learning*, *40*(2), 221-244.

Nelson, G., Al-Batal, M., & Echols, E. (1996). Arabic and English compliment responses: Potential for pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*(4), 411-432.

Neustupný, J. V. (1978). *Post-structural approaches to language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Neustupný, J. V. (1987). *Communicating with the Japanese*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Neustupný, J. V. (1995). Gaikokujin to no komyunikeeshon: gaikokujin mondai wa korekara dō naru ka [Communicating with foreigners: what will happen to the "foreigner problem"]. In *Shin kotoba shiriizu 1* (pp. 63-76). Tokyo: Bunkacho.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, *10*(4), 418-437.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ogino, T. (1986). Quntification of politeness based on the usage patterns of honorific expressions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *58*, 37-58.

Ogino, T. (1997). Keigo no genzai: 1997 [The status of honorific language in 1997]. *Gengo*, *26*(6), 20-30.

Okada Yamashita, S. (1996). *Six measures of JSL pragmatics* (Technical Report No. 14). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Okamoto, S. (1997). Social context, linguistic ideology, and indexical expressions in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *28*, 795-817.

Okamoto, S. (1998). *Situated politeness: competing concerns for the use of honorifics in Japanese conversations*. Paper presented at IPrA 6, Conferences of the International Pragmatics Association, Reims, France, July 19-24, 1998.

Ono, S. (1957). *Nihongo no kigen* [The origins of the Japanese language]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shōten.

Palmberg, R. (1985). How much English vocabulary do Swedish-speaking primary-school pupils know before starting to learn English at school? In H. Ringbom (Ed.), *Foreign language learning and bilingualism* (pp. 89-97). Åbo, Finland: Department of English, Åbo Akademi.

Poulisse, N. (1990). *The use of compensatory stategies by Dutch learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Purves, A. C. (Ed.) (1988). *Writing across languages & cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric*. London: Sage Publications.

Pyun, K.-s. (1987). *Korean-Swedish interlanguage phonology*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

Raabe, H. (1986). The influence of L1 and L3 in the foreign language classroom: An analysis of learners' questions. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning, teaching, and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 59-69). Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.

Reddinguis, E. A. (1998). *A fourth language learning experience as seen through the eyes of an experienced language learner*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, California State University at Dominguez Hills.

Ringbom, H. & Palmberg, R. (1976). *Errors made by Finns and Swedish-speaking Finns in the learning of English* (AFTIL Vol. 5). Åbo, Finland: Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation.

Ringbom, H. (1985). The influence of Swedish on the English of Finnish learners. In H. Ringbom (Ed.), *Foreign language learning and bilingualism* (pp. 39-58). Åbo, Finland: Åbo, Finland: Department of English, Åbo Akademi.

Ringbom, H. (1986). Crosslinguistic influence and the foreign language learning process. In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition* (pp. 150-162). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Ringbom, H. (1987). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ringbom, H. (1991). Crosslinguistic lexical influence and foreign language learning. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 172-181). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Robinson, M. A. (1992). Introspective methodology in inter-language pragmatics research. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as native and target language* (Technical Report No. 3, pp. 27-82). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Rose, K. R. (1992). Speech acts and questionnaires: The effect of hearer response. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *17*, 449-462.

Rose, K. R. (1994). On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-Western contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 1-14.

Sakurai, S. (1994). *Learning Japanese as a third language*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Michigan State University.

Sampson, G. (1985). *Writing systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sanders, M. & Meijers, G. (1995). English as L3 in the elementary school. *ITL*, *107-108*, 59-78.

Sawyer, M. (1992). The development of pragmatics in Japanese as a second language: The sentence-final particle *ne*. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Japanese as a native and foreign language* (Technical Report No. 3, pp. 83-125). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Schmid, S. (1993). Learning strategies for closely related languages: On the Italian spoken by Spanish immigrants in Switzerland. In B. Kettemann & W. Wieden (Eds.), *Current issues in European second language research* (pp. 405-418). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Serrill, B. (1985). *Non-errors of the third kind? An investigation of interlanguage production by L2, L3, and L4 learners of Italian.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of South Carolina.

Sharwood Smith, M. & Kellerman, E. (1986). Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition: An introduction. In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition (pp. 1-9). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Shibata, T. (1979). Keigo to keigo kenkyū [Honorifics and research on honorifics]. *Gengo*, *8*(6), 2-8.

Shibata, T., et. al. (1980). *Toshi no keigo no shakai gengogakuteki kenkyū* [Sociolinguistic study of honorifics in the city]. Tokyo: Department of Linguistics, Tokyo University.

Shibatani, M. (1990). *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siegal, M. (1994). *Looking east: Learning Japanese as a second language in Japan and the interaction of race, gender and social context*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California at Berkeley.

Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competence: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, *17*(3), 356-382.

Sikogukira, M. (1993). Influence of languages other than the L1 on a foreign language: a case of transfer from L2 to L3. *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 110-132.

Singh, R., & Carroll, S. (1979). L1, L2, and L3. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 51-63.

Singleton, D. (1987). Mother and other tongue influence on learner French: A case study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *9*, 327-346.

Singleton, D. (1999). *Explaining the second language mental lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singleton, D., & Little, D. (1984). A first encounter with Dutch: perceived language distance and language transfer as factors in comprehension. In L. M. Mathúa & D. Singleton (Eds.), *Language across cultures* (pp. 259-270). Dublin: Irish Association of Applied Linguistics.

Singleton, D., & Little, D. (1991). The second language lexicon: Some evidence from university-level learners of French and German. *Second Language Research*, *7*(1), 61-81.

Steffensen, M. (1986). Register, cohesion, and cross-cultural reading comprehension. *Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 71-85.

Swain, M. (1984). Large-scale communicative language testing: A case study. In S. Savignon and M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching: A book of readings* (185-201). Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley.

Swain, M., Lepkin, S., Rowen, N., & Hart, D. (1990). The role of mother tongue literacy in third language learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *3*(1), 65-81.

Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. M. (1987) The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal*, *8*, 131-155.

Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. M. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In S. Blum-Kulka & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 138-157). New York: Oxford University Press.

Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*, 189-223.

Thomas, J. (1988). The role played by metalinguistic awareness in second and third language learning. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *9*, 235-246.

Thomas, J. (1992). Metalinguistic awareness in second- and third-language learning. In Harris, R. J. (Ed.), *Cognitive processing in bilinguals* (pp. 531-545). Amsterdam: North Holland.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 93-112.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in language: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Thomas, J. (1996). *Methods in cross-cultural politeness phenomena research: A critical review*. Unpublished paper.

Ulijn, J. M., Wolfe, S. J., & Donn, A. (1981). The lexical transfer effect of French knowledge in the acquisition of English by Vietnamese speakers. *Foreign Language Acquisition Research THE* (Report No. 6). Einhoven, The Netherlands: Einhoven University of Technology.

Valencia, J. F. & Cenoz, J. (1992). The role of bilingualism in foreign language acquisition: Learning English in the Basque Country. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *13*(5), 433-449.

Vildomec, V. (1963). *Multilingualism*. Leyden: Sythoff.

Vogel, T. (1992). English und Deutsch gibt es immer krieg: Sprachverabeitungsprozesse beim erverb des Deutchen als drittesprache [German and English, they're always fighting: Language assimilation processes in the acquistion of German as a third language]. *Zielsprache Deutsch*, *23*(2), 95-99.

Voorwinde, S. (1981) A lexical and grammatical study in Dutch-English-German Trilingualism. *I.T.L.*, *52*, 3-30.

Wenger, J. R. (1982). *Some universals of honorific language with special reference to Japanese*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Arizona.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Williams, S. & Hammarberg, B. (1998). Language switches in L3 production: implications for a polyglot speaking model. *Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 295-333.

Wolfson, N. & Judd, E. (1983). *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Woo, B.-K. (1995). *Interlanguage interference in adult acquisition of Korean as a second and a third language*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of San Francisco.

Yoshioka, Y. (1997). Keigo kōdō to kihan ishiki no chiikisa [Regional differences in actual honorific usage and consciousness of standard honorific usage]. *Gengo*, *26*(6), 58-65.

Yoshioka, Y. (1990). Hatsuwabun no teineisa no suryōka: Keigo kōdō no yoin bunseki ni mukete [Quantification of politeness with respect to sentence forms in honorific expressions in Japanese: For categorical regression analysis in linguistic behavior of utterances]. *Kōdō Keiryōgaku*, *18*(1), 81-90.

Zobl, H. (1992). Prior linguistic knowledge and the conservatism of the learning procedure: grammaticality judgements of unilingual and multilingual learners. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language transfer in language learning* (Revised Edition pp. 176-196). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

APPENDIX A: Explanatory Letter and Consent Form

Original Instrument:

Information for Prospective Participants

Language Transfer in Japanese as a Third Language Research Project

Dear Learner of Japanese,

I am conducting a research project on the acquisition of Japanese as a third (or greater) language and would like to ask you to volunteer your time to participate in the project. Through the cooperation of your Japanese lecturer, some of the data collection will take place in class or in group sessions after class, but your participation in these activities is voluntary. If you volunteer for the project, I would like to ask you to participate in all of the data collection sessions so that I can obtain a complete data sample. Each of the sessions will take about a half an hour of your time. The following instruments will be used to collect data:

1. Questionnaire on your language learning experience
2. C-test (language proficiency test)
3. DCT (discourse completion task--written)
4. DET (discourse evaluation task--listening)
5. Short writing task

If you would like to volunteer, please read and sign the Consent Form that was distributed with this letter and return it to me or to your lecturer.

Thank you very much for your interest in my research.

With best wishes,

Robert J. Fouser
Visiting Scholar,
Language Acquisition Research Centre

Consent Form

Language Transfer in Japanese as a Third Language Research Project

I, (please print) _____, have read the Information for Prospective Participants and have agreed to participate in this research project. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the project anytime. I also understand that information from the language tests and questionnaire will be treated as research findings for presentation and publication, but that my name or other personal information will not be used in any publications, discussions, or correspondence related to this research, or entered into any computer file or database. I have the right to inspect the results of the tests that I took in connection with this research project.

Sincerely,

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B: Language Learning Experience Questionnaire

Original Instrument:

Language Learning Experience Questionnaire

Instructions:

Please answer the following questions by filling in the blank, ticking the box, or circling the number. Please read this questionnaire and sign the consent form if you agree to participate in the project. You may skip any question that you do not feel comfortable in answering, or that is irrelevant to your experience.

Thank you for your participation.

Part 1: General Information

1. Name: _____

2. Mailing Address:

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Telephone Number: _____

4. E-mail or Fax Number: _____

5. Sex: Female [ ]

   Male [ ]

6. Date of Birth: _____

7. Country of Birth: _____

   If not Australia, when did you come to Australia?

   _____

8. Degree Course in University: _____

9. Major Subjects of Present Course in University (in order of importance)

   1. _____ 3. _____
   2. _____ 4. _____

Part 2: Previous Educational Background

10. Primary School

Name: _____
Location: _____
Year of Completion:_____

11. Middle School:

Name: _____
Location: _____
Year of Completion:_____

12. Secondary School:

Name:_____
Location: _____
Year of Completion:_____

13 Other Pre-University Education:

	Name	Description	Year
1.			
2.			
3.			

14. Other University or College Education:

	Name	Description	Year
1.			
2.			
3.			

Part 3: Work Experience

15. Please list your work experience starting with the most recent first:

	Job/Title	Dates	City, Country
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

Part 4: General Language Learning Experience

16. What is your first language(s) (the language(s) that you spoke first as a child)?

_____

16. Please list the language(s) normally spoken at home

By you: _____
By your father: _____
By your mother: _____

17. 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th Languages

Please list all languages other than your first that you have learned in the past or are presently learning in the order in which you began learning them. Please include classical languages (Latin, classical Chinese, etc):

1. _____ 4. _____
2. _____ 5. _____
3. _____ 6. _____

18. Secondary School Language Examinations

Please list the language examinations, including English, that you took as a HSC. If you did not go to secondary school in Australia, describe the type of qualification received. Please evaluate your score or mark on these examinations in comparison with other students at the time on the following scale: 1 = top 10%; 2 = next 25%; 3 = middle 30%; 4 = next 25%; 5 = bottom 10%

	Language	Qualification	Units/Years	Score/Mark
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

19. Other Language Examinations

Please list other examinations (IELTS, TOEFL, etc.) or certificates, including score in comparison with other students on the following scale:
1 = top 10%; 2 = next 25%; 3 = middle 30%; 4 = next 25%; 5 = bottom 10%

	Language	Examination	Score	Year
1.				
2.				
3.				

Part 5. Japanese Language Learning Experience

20. At what age did you start learning Japanese? _____

21. How would you describe your ability in the following five skill areas in Japanese?

Please circle the appropriate number on the following scale:
1 = Excellent (near-native); 2 = Good; 3 = Average; 4 = Basic ('can get by'); 5 = Poor; NA = not applicable/no comment.

	Ability					
	Excellent	Good	Average	Basic	Poor	
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Listening	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Reading	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Writing	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Translating	1	2	3	4	5	NA

22. At what type of educational institution and in which country did you learn Japanese?

Type of Institution Location

---

23. How would you describe the following areas of learning Japanese?

Please circle the appropriate number on the following scale:
1 = Very Easy; 2 = Easy; 3 = Average; 4 = Difficult; 5 = Very Difficult; NA = not applicable/no comment.

	Easy/Difficult					
	Very Easy	Easy	Average	Difficult	Very Difficult	
Changes in verb endings	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Cultural background	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Grammatical particles	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Keigo (polite endings)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Pronunciation	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Reading kanji	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Word order	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Writing kanji	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Writing system in general	1	2	3	4	5	NA

24. Have you been to Japan before?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

If yes, please describe your visit/stay

Year(s) Length of Stay Purpose of Visit/Stay

_____

_____

25. Do you plan to go to Japan in the near future?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

If yes, please describe your plans

Year(s) Length of Stay Purpose of Visit

_____

_____

You have now reached the end of this questionnaire.
Thank you very much for your participation.

APPENDIX C: C-test (Instrument)

Original Instrument:

C-test

Name: _____

Instructions:

The last half of every second word has been deleted in the following four passages. Where a word is composed of an odd number of hiragana and/or kanji, the greater number of hiragana and/or kanji has been deleted. Please complete the words with deletions by filling in the blank given at the end of each word. In filling in the blank you may write in any combination of kana and kanji.

Example:

わたしは去年の4月から日本語学校で勉強しています。わたしの
クラ_____ いろいろな国_____ 人が15_____ います。み_____
明るくて、しん_____ いいクラスメ_____ 。

Passage #1

日本では、4月に新学期が始まりますので、あちこちで入学しきが行われます。東京では、ちょ_____ そのころサク_____ 花が満_____ なります。上野公園を始_____、あちこちのサク_____ 名所は、お花_____ 人でにぎ_____ なります。サク_____ 下で、お弁_____ 食べたり、パーテ_____ する人_____ 多いです。夜_____ なると、電気をたく_____ 並べて「夜桜」見_____ します。こ_____ 大へんきれ_____。

Passage #2

わたしは日よう日が大すきです。だれでも日よう日が大すきだと思いますが、そうでない人もいるのでしょうか。デパートやホテ_____ つとめてい_____ 人たちは、日_____ 休日は平日_____ 忙しそうで大へ_____ 思います。

日ようのかわ_____ 週日が休み_____ 友達と休_____ ちがうので、会え_____、かわいそうだと思い_____。でもわた_____ 日よう日には、学_____ アルバイトも休み_____、1日中、自由_____。何でもす_____ ことが でき_____。朝ねぼう、散_____、ブランチ、買_____、友人_____ おしゃべり、映_____、テレビ、スポー_____、したいこ_____ 次から次_____ でてき_____。でもー_____ くらしている_____、そうじ、せん_____、食料品の_____、いろ_____ 家の中_____ こともしな_____ なりません。

Passage #3

先週の日よう日に、わたしは友達の家でアルバイトをしました。友達の家は、ケーキ屋です。店の中_____ 小さいきっ_____ あります。友_____ お父さんとお母_____ ケーキを作_____、おばあさんが売_____ います。きっ_____ 白くてま_____ テーブルとい_____ あってテー_____ 上には花_____ おいてあり_____。かべ_____ 絵がか_____ あります。店の_____ コーヒーのにお_____ します。きっさ_____ 男の人_____、一人はた_____ いて、そ_____ 人がわた_____ 仕事を教_____ くれました。昼_____ お客さんがたく_____ 入って来ました。

Passage #4

ひろみさん、お元気ですか。ごぶさたしています。学校をそつぎょうしてから、ほとんど 会っていませんね。

実は、来_____ 木よう日、九月八日はわた_____ たんじょうびなんです。みん_____ ひさしぶりに会いた_____、たんじょうパーティーを開_____ ことにしま_____ 。わたしの部_____ アパートだし、せま_____、ちかくのお_____ かりました。 招_____ した人_____、まさこさんやともこさんな_____、ひろみさんが 知_____ いる人ばかり_____ たのしくな_____ でしょう。 プレゼン_____ ご心配はいり_____。時間は七時か_____。場所は地_____ 入れておい_____、ごらんにな_____ ください。

つごうが悪_____ 場合はお手す_____、前の日ま_____ わたしのとこ_____ お電話をおね_____ します。

それでは、ぜ_____ いらしてくだ_____ 。お待ちしてい_____ 。

APPENDIX D: Discourse Completion Task (DCT) (Instrument and Responses)

Original Instrument:

Discourse Completion Task

Name: _____

Instructions:

In this exercise you will be asked to write what you would say in Japanese in various situations. Please read the short description of each situation and think about what ***you*** *might say in response to this situation. Write your response in the space provided. You may say as little or as much as you wish, and you may also choose to say nothing. You may write in any mixture of* ***kana*** *and* ***kanji****. Please choose the gender of the person you are speaking with by circling* ***'him'*** *or* ***'her'*** *when you see these words in the description.*

In the ***'introspection'*** *section following each situation, please write why you wrote what you did immediately after finishing your response. Again, you may write as little or as much as you wish. Please feel free to write your comments in* ***any language*** *because your comments can be translated from that language into English later.*

Situations

1. You have to write a cover letter to send your resume in response to an advertisement for a good job. You need to finish the cover letter tonight, but don't have a computer. The public computer room at your university is closed at this time. You ring a Japanese friend who has a computer and a printer, and after exchanging greetings, you ask him or her to let you use his or her computer.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

2. A tutorial in one of your favorite Japanese subjects has just finished. On your way out of the classroom, your tutor asks you to visit his or her office to talk about your plans after graduation. You would like to speak with him or her, but refuse because you have another lecture in ten minutes.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

3. You run into a Japanese friend of yours by chance in the in the Manning Union. After exchanging greetings, you tell your friend of your plans to go out to dinner with a small group of friends and invite him or her to join you.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

4. You work for a Japanese company in Australia. Your boss has asked you to prepare a briefing on the company's activities in Western Australia in a week's time. He or she stresses that it is important to finish the briefing on time because he or she needs to present it at a convention in nine days. You agree to do the work and promise to finish it by the deadline.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

5. You have an appointment with a close Japanese friend. You were supposed to meet him or her at 3:00 p.m. at a café in Gleebe. You are usually on time, but this time you left home a little late and then missed the bus, causing you to wait 20 minutes for another bus. You arrive at 3:40 p.m. and apologize for being late.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

6. You have volunteered to show a group of Japanese high school exchange students around Sydney for the day. You have now come to the end of the tour and everyone thanks you for your time and consideration. Several students approach you and present you with a gift from the entire group in appreciation for the tour.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

7. You have agreed to take a trip to Melbourne with some Japanese friends. All of you have arranged to meet at a friend's house to discuss plans for the trip. You go to this meeting and discuss the group's plans. Some members of the group want to take the bus, but others want to take the train. You think that it is better to take the train, and you say so to one of the people who wants to take the bus.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

8. You are in Japan. You go out to a moderately priced restaurant for lunch with a friend. You have been waiting quite a while for your order, and both of you have something to do right after lunch. You are worried that you may not have enough time to eat. You get the waitperson's attention successfully. He or she comes over to your table, and you ask him or her to bring your order as soon as possible.

What would you say? _____

_____

_____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Responses:

Learner 1 (L1 English, L2 Latin, C-test 36%)

Situation 1
あの大学のコンピュターのへやはしまっているからあなたのコンピュターをちょっとつかってもいいですか、おそくのためにごめんね。
ano DAIGAKU no konpyutaa no heyawa simatte iru kara anata no konpyutaa wo chotto tsukattemo ii desu ka, osoku no tameni gomen ne.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
すみませんがほんとうに話したいんですけどあと十分ぐらいクラスがありますから、今日はできません。しつれいします。

sumimasen ga hontoo ni HANAshitain desu kedo ato JUPPUN gurai kurasu ga arimasu kara, KYOO wa dekimasen. sitsurei shimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
あしたのようね、三人ぐらいいっしょに食べに行くつもりだよ。私達といっしょに行こうか。
ashita no yoru ne, SANNIN gurai issho ni TAbe ni Iku tsumori da yo.
WATASHITACHI to issho ni iIkoo ka.

Introspection: I noticed when I was in Japan how important the plain form is between good friends. However sometimes it's a bit difficult to know when it's appropriate.

Situation 4
はいもちろん。出来ます。deadline のためにやくそくします。
hai mochiron. dekimasu. deadline no tameni yakusoku shimasu.

Introspection: I know this is incorrect, however, I find keigo very difficult. I can't remember how to say 'on time' or 'deadline'.

Situation 5
じゅんちゃんおまたせしましとにごめんね。すごいおそくなったのでながい時間からまていた、大へんだね、ごめんね。
junchan omatase shimashitoni gomen ne. sugoi osoku natta node nagai JIKAN kara mateita, TAIhen da ne, gomen ne.

Introspection: I used very casual, plain language as I was speaking to a close friend.

Situation 6
びっくりしました。みんなさんどうもありがとうございました。今日はとてもたのしかったです。
bikkuri shimashita. minna san doomo arigatoo gozaimashita. KYOO wa totemo tanoshikatta desu.

Introspection: Something like 'you shouldn't have' should've been said but I don't know how to.

Situation 7
私のためにでんしゃをのったほうがいいですよ。
WATASHIno tameni densha wo notta hoo ga ii desu yo.

I'm not sure about the differences between male and female plain form or the difference between speaking to a male or a female.

Situation 8
すみませんがもうすぐ行かなかればなりませんから、食べものは早くもって来てもいいですか。
sumimasen ga moo sugu Ikanakareba narimasen kara, TAbemono wa HAYAku motte KItemo ii desu ka.

Introspection: I don't think a Japanese person would say this so nicely but that's how I would speak to them.

Learner 2 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 40%)

Situation 1
今忙しいですか。じゃ私はコンピイタを使れますか。
IMA ISOgasii desu ka. ja WATASHI wa konpiita wo tsukaremasuka.

Introspection: I just ask what I want directly so that my friend won't feel strange.

Situation 2
すみません、今クラスがありますから行かなければなりません。ランチタインがいいですか。
sumimasen, IMA kurasu ga arimasu kara Ikanakereba narimasen. ranchitain ga ii desuka.

Introspection: This question is boring because I don't think teacher would like talk about your plans motively. Normally we have to look for her to talk about it.

Situation 3
今晩は晩ごはんを食べましょうか。私達は外に食べます。たくさんの友達が行きます。私達と行きましょう。
KONBAN wa BAN gohan woTAbemashooka. WATASHITACHI wa SOTO ni TAbemasu. takusan no TOMODACHI ga Ikimasu. WATASHITACHI to Ikimashoo.

Introspection: This question is easy to answer.

Situation 4
私はこの仕事をさせると思います。来週の前に終わります。大丈夫です。
WATASHI wa kono SHIGOTO wo saseru to OMOimasu. RAISYUU no MAEni Owarimasu. DAIJOOBU desu.

Introspection: This question is not interesting and I don't feel confident in writing Japanese properly for this question.

Situation 5
ごめんなさいバスを乗らなでしたから遅いです。
gomen nasasai basu wo NOrana deshita kara okui desu.

Introspection: This language I used is very direct but there are some words that I can't write.

Situation 6
ありがとう、これは何ですか。そうですか。またありがとう。もう一度オーストラリアに来って下さい。
arigatoo, kore wa NAN desuka. soo desuka. mata arigatoo. moo ICHIDO oosutoraria ni KItte KUDAsai.

Introspection: The Japanese culture is different from Australian, so it might be strange to answer this way.

Situation 7
電車を乗るのはいいと思います。電車は速くて、バスはせまいです。
DENSYA wo NOru nowa ii to OMOimasu. DENSHA wa HAYAkute, basu wa semai desu.

Introspection: I have no idea why I answer like this.

Situation 8
私達の食べ物がありません。速くて下さい。二十分の後に仕事をしなければなりません。
WATASHITACHI no TAbeMONO ga arimasen. HAYAkute KUDAsai. NIJUPPUN no ATO ni SHIGOTO wo shinakereba narimasen.

Introspection: I can't write the proper way in writing Japanese for this question.

Learner 3 (L1 English, L2 German, C-test 23%)

Situation 1
ルスメのカーバーてがみはあしたまでかきなければなるので、あなたのコンプーターは私につかって下さい。
rusume no kaabaa tegami wa ashita made kakinakereba naru node, anata no konpuutaa wa WATASHI ni tsukatte KUDAsai.

Introspection: I couldn't remember how to say 'by tomorrow' I'm also not sure on how casual or formal I would make the request with a friend.

Situation 2
はい。私はせんせいにはなしにすきですが、今ほかのクラスがあります。あしたは会いになりますか。
hai. WATASHI wa sensei ni hanashi ni suki desuga, IMA hokano kurasu ga arimasu. asita wa Aininarimasuka.

Introspection: I think I have honourable and humble forms confused.

Situation 3
来週の上よう日は私とふたりともだちがレストランで行きます。あなたは私たちときます。
RAISHUU no DOyouBI wa WATASHI to futari tomodachi ga resutoran de Ikimasu. anata wa WATASHItachi to kimasu.

Introspection: I know this should be a basic question, but we don't have the casual speaking practise that we need.

Situation 4
はい。私はレポートがコンバンチオンまでおわります。
hai. WATASHI wa repooto ga konbantion made owarimasu.

Introspection: I can't imagine being in this situation with my level of Japanese.

Situation 5
すみません。すみません。バスはすみません。
sumimasen. sumimasen. basu wa sumimasen.

Introspection: Even in English I think I'd feel so bad that I'd just keep apologizing! With a close friend, I think it's alright that I wouldn't give a lengthly explanation.

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございました。
doomo arigatoo gozaimashita.

Introspection: I'd like to say something like 'you shouldn't/needn't have', but I can't think of the Japanese equivalent.

Situation 7
きしゃはバスよりとてもいいです。きしゃのまどからけしきはきれいです。
kisha wa basu yori totemo ii desu. kisha no mado kara keshiki wa kirei desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
しつれいします。私たちのたべものをはやくもって下さい。
shitsurei shimasu. WATASHItachi no tabemono wo hayaku motte KUDAsai.

Introspection: I don't know what level of language to use with a waiter. In English I would speak politely, but I know that some people treat waiters quite rudely.

Learner 4 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 39%)

Situation 1
今ちょっともんだいがあります。明日までしごとにてがみをかきなければならない。コンピュターをつかってもいいですか。
IMA chotto mondai ga arimasu. ashita made shigoto ni tegami wo kakinakereba naranai. konpyutaa wo tsukattemo ii desuka.

Introspection: Used kakinakereba naranai to try and convey the urgency of the situation. Used もいいですか as he's doing me a favour and its reasonably polite.

Situation 2
話したいですがつぎのクラスは十分にあります。あしたの十時にやくそくしてもよろしいですか。
HANAshitai desu ga tsugi no kurasu wa JUPPUN ni arimasu. ashita no JUUJI ni yakusoku shitemo yoroshii desuka.

Introspection: Used よろしい as it sounds polite.

Situation 3
こんばん、よていがありますか。私はともだちとクリープで食事します。行きましょうか。

konban, yotei ga arimasuka. WATASHI wa tomodachi to kuriipu de SYOKUJI shimasu. Ikimashooka.

Introspection: Casual but wanting them to feel included. Therefore not stressing formality.

Situation 4
はい、いいです。あさってはいいですか。
hai, ii desu. asatte wa ii desuka.

Introspection: Wasn't sure what to write. But wanted to convey idea it wasn't a problem -- as didn't want to be to formal. After all, it is an Australian working for a Japanese company.

Situation 5
ごめん下さい。うちからおそくでかけた。そして、バス時間をまちがいた。おちょこちょいですね。ごめんね。
gomen KUDAsai. uchi kara osoku dekaketa. soshite, basu JIKAN wo machigaita. ochokochoi desu ne. gomen ne.

Introspection: Really apologetic. Trying to remember another word for ばか therefore use おちょこちょい. Probably a bit colloquial.

Situation 6
ありがとう。いいですよ。今日は楽しかったですね。こんど、私にれんらくして下さい。
arigatoo. ii desu yo. KYOO wa TANOshikatta desu ne. kondo, WATASHI ni renraku shite KUDAsai.

Introspection: As I'm not much older than the students, I didn't want to sound too imperious. Trying to be friendly.

Situation 7
でも、電車をのるの方がいいと思います。バスは高いですよ。
demo, DENSHA wo noru no HOO ga ii to OMOimasu. basu wa TAKAi desu yo.

Introspection: Used でも as it really stands out -- that is a powerful conjunction. Also よ seems to add to the voice of experience -- a bit authoritative.

Situation 8
ちょっと時間がないですからもうちょっと早くおねがいします。
chotto JIKAN ga nai desu kara moo chotto HAYAku onegai shimasu.

Introspection: Wasn't sure what to write without appearing overtly rude. Therefore used ちょっと and おねがいします to soften the tone a bit.

Learner 5 (L1 Sinhala, L2 English, C-test 27%)

Situation 1
あなたのコムピュターをたかっていただけませんか。
anata no komupyutaa wo takatte itadakemasenka.

Introspection: It is difficult to respond in this situation because I never had a situation like this. And I am still confusing with the polite language. Also I don't know when I talk to a friend which kind of language I should use.

Situation 2
すみませんが、今クラスがありますからあとでしてもいいですか。
sumimasenga, IMA kurasu ga arimasu kara ato de shitemo ii desuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
友だちといっしょにばんごはんをたべに行きます。私たちといっしょに行きませんか。
TOMOdachi to issho ni ban gohan wo tabeni Ikimasu. WATASHItachi to issho ni Ikimasenka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はい。わかりました。はやくおわります。
hai. wakarimashita. hayaku owarimasu.

Introspection: It is hard to express in Japanese, because I haven't got enough experience.

Situation 5
すみませんが
sumimasenga

Introspection: If I am very close to my native friends, I'll just say sorry. Here I don't know how close is my Japanese friend.

Situation 6
はい。ありがとう。
hai. arigatoo.

Introspection: I might say It's my pleasure, but I don't know how to say it in Japanese.

Situation 7
でんしゃで行くのはとてもべんりですね。
densha de Ikuno wa totemo benri desu ne.

None

Situation 8
おくれたのでちょっと。
okureta node chotto.

Introspection: None

Learner 6 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

Situation 1
すみません、今晩でレスメをおわりるなければなりませんで、しかし、電脳がありませんであなたの家に来ますか。
sumimasen, KONBAN de resume wo owarirunakereba narimasen de, shikasi, DENNOO ga arimasen de anata no IEni KImasuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
ごめんなさいね。時間があります。次のクラスは十分からあります。
gomen nasai ne. JIKAN ga arimasu. TSUGI no kurasu wa JUPPUN kara arimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
今晩私と友達と一緒に晩御を食べたいで、あなたは今晩の時間がありますか。一緒に行きましょうか。
KONBAN WATASHI to TOMODACHI to ISSHOni BAN GO wo TAbetai de, anata wa KONBAN no JIKAN ga arimasu ka. ISSHOni Ikimashooka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はい。いいですよ。最後の限期の前に、パレセントをおわりなければなりません。
hai. ii desu yo. SAIGO no GENKI no MAE ni, paresento wo owarinakereba narimasen.

Introspection: None

Situation 5
ごめん、ごめん、バスをはやくて出発してから二十分のは次のバスをまっています。
gomen, gomen, basu wo hayakute SHUPPATSU shite kara NIJUPPUN no wa TSUGI nobasu wo matte imasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
いいよ。ありがとうございます。私はたのしくの日がいました。
ii yo. arigatoo gozaimasu. WATASHI wa tanoshiku no HI ga imashita.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
列車はバスよるにはやいでと思います。それから、旅行の時間が長いになります。
RESSHA wa basu yoruni hayai de to OMOimasu. sore kara, RYOKOO no JIKAN ga NAGAi ni narimsu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません。私達は二時から忙しいで、すぐ御飯をくれて下さい。
sumimasen. WATASHITACHI wa NIJI kara ISOGAshii de, sugu GOHAN wo kurete KUDAsai.

Introspection: None

Learner 7 (L1 Korean, L2 English, C-test 37%)

Situation 1
今、コーンプッタを使いますか。私は今コンピュッタを使いならければなりませんよ。コーンプッタを使うのはいいでしょうか。
IMA, konputta wo TSUKAimasu ka. WATASHI wa IMA konputta wo TSUKAinarakereba narimasen yo. konputta wo TSUKAu no wa ii deshooka.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
すみませんが、今ララスがあったのでもしごごにご時間がおありになったら私はいいです。
sumimasenga, IMA rarasu ga atta node moshi gogo ni go-JIKAN ga oarininattara WATASHI wa ii desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
今ばん時間があったら私のともだちといっしょにいいレストランへ行って食べましょうか。
KONban JIKAN ga attara WATASHI no tomodachi to issho ni ii resutoran he Itte TAbemashooka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はい、いいですよ。この日までもおわると思います。
hai, ii desu yo. kono Hi mademo owaru to OMOimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 5
すみませんがたくさんおそいですね。
sumimasen ga takusan osoi desu ne.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございます。私はあなたたちといっしょにすごしたときをとてもうれしかった。わすれのはできません。
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. WATASHI wa anatatachi to issho ni sugoshita toki wo totemo ureshikatta. wasure no wa dekimasen.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
バスもいいんですが、でんしゃはもう早くて安いですから...
basu mo iin desu ga, densha wa moo HAYAkute YASUi desu kara...

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみませんが、もう長い待ってのは不可態かもしれませんのでもう早いできませんか。
sumimasen ga, moo NAGAi MAtteno wa FUKATAI kamo shiremasen node moo HAYAi dekimasenka.

Introspection: None

Learner 8 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 61%)

Situation 1
この晩は職業を申請する信紙を書かなければなりません。だから雪子さんのコンピータを使ってもらっていただけませんか。
kono BAN wa SHOKUGYOO wo SHINSEI suru SHINJI wo KAkanakereba narimasen. dakara YUKIKO-san no konpiita woTSUKAttemo itadakemasenka.

Introspection: First I tell her it's urgent for uing computer. So as to convince her to let me use her computer. Although we are friends, but I use polite form as to make her to le me to use the computer.

Situation 2
すみませんが、十分の後で、授業時間があるんですが先生はほかの時間がよろしいでしょうか。
sumimasenga, JUPPUN no ATO de, JUGYOO JIKAN ga arun desuga SENSEI wa hoka no JIKAN ga yoroshii deshooka.

Introspection: I need to apologize first and ask her to offer me another time.

Situation 3
あした、三・四友達と一緒にレストランで晩ご飯を食べるつもりです。雪子さん、もし時間があり、一緒に行きましょう。
ashita, SAN/YO TOMODACHI to ISSHO ni resutoran de BAN goHAN wo TAberu tsumori desu. YUIKIKO-san, moshi JIKAN ga ari, ISSHO ni Ikimashoo.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はい、分かりました。来週の水曜日までこのビリフを書けます。
hai, WAkarimashita. RAISHUU no SUIYOOBI made kono birifu wo KAkemasu.

Introspection: I wrote an exact date b/c to ensure I can finish the briefing. The boss is a man.

Situation 5
お待たせられるので失礼します。
oMAtaserareru node SHITSUREI shimasu.

Introspection: 先生 (I am really getting tired (physically) to write all this)

Situation 6
ありがとうございます。
arigatoo gozaimasu.

Introspection: Actually, I want to say thank you and hope everybody really benefits from today's tour. But my Japanese is not good enough to say so, esp in such a rush!

Situation 7
汽車が安全で便利なので、汽車に乗ったことがいいです。
KISHA ga ANZEN de BENRI na node, KISHA ni NOtta koto ga ii desu.

Introspection: I need to tell the reason why I prefer train.

Situation 8
すみませんが、私は会議が二時にあるので私の注文した食べ物を早く下さい。
sumimasenga, WATASHI wa KAIGI ga NIJI ni aru node WATASHI no CHUUMON shitaTAbeMONO wo HAYAku KUDAsai.

Introspection: I think it's better to tell her the reason and probably she would try to help me.

Learner 9 (L1 English, L2 French, C-test 40%)

Situation 1
アルバイトのてがみを書かなければならないのであなたのコンピュータをつかってもいいですか。
arubaito no tegami wo KAkanakereba naranai node anata no konpyuuta wo tsukattemo ii desuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
すみません。したいのですけれどもつごうがわるいでクラスがあるんです。
sumimasen. shitai no desu keredomo tsugoo ga warui de kurasu ga arun desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
こんばんはニュータウンでレストランへ行くよていですがあなたも来ますか。
konban wa nyuutaun de resutoran he Iku yotei desu ga anata mo KImasuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はい、そうですが私はします。
hai, soo desuga WATASHI wa shimasu.

Introspection: deadline?

Situation 5
おまたせしまいました。花子さんすみません。バスに会いませんでした。
omataseshimaimashita. HANAKO-san sumimasen. basu ni Aimasen deshita.

Introspection: miss a bus?

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございました。すばらしそうです。
doomo arigatoo gozaimashita. subarashisoo desu.

Introspection: adjective?

Situation 7
あたまがわるいだよ。バスはあいないよ。
atama ga warui da yo. basu wa ainai yo.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
あのすみませんいそがしいですからちょっと速くたべものをください。
ano sumimasen isogashii desu kara chotto HAYAku tabemono wo kudasai.

Introspection: None

Learner 10 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

Situation 1
私はコンブイーターをありません。今、レストランの手紙をかかりますが、あなたのコンブイータが使用しますか。
WATASHI wa konbuiitaa wo arimasen. IMA, resutoran no TEGAMI wo kakarimasuga, anata no konbuiita ga SHIYOO shimasuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
卒業したら、日本へ行きたいですから日本語を勉強します。すみません、今カラスをありますが、午後に会っていいですか。
SOTSUGYOO shitara, NIHON he Ikitai desu kara NIHONGO wo BENKYOO shimasu. sumimasen, IMA karasu wo arimasuga, GOGO ni Atte ii desuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
今晩、友達を一緒に日本レストランへ行きます。あなたは来て下さい。
KONBAN, TOMODACHI wo ISSHOO ni NIHON resutoran he Ikimasu. anata wa KIte KUDAsai.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はい、もちろん。心配しないです。
hai, mochiron. shimpai shinai desu.

Introspection: Of course, I'll finish it, so please don't worry (I don't knonw how to write in order to be polite).

Situation 5
すみませんでした。
sumimasen deshita.

Introspection: I would say sorry to him.

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございました。私はとてもうれしいです。
doomo arigatoo gozaimashita. WATASHI wa totemo ureshii desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
バースを
baasu o

Introspection: Taking the bus is a good idea, but I think taking the train is better because it's faster and cheaper.

Situation 8
すみません。私の弁当をかかりません。
sumimasen. WATASHI no BENTOO wo kakarimasen.

Introspection: None

Learner 11 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 31%)

Situation 1
ちょっとお願いします。コンプータをつかってもいいですか。
chotto oNEGAi shimasu. konpuuta wo tsukatte mo ii desuka.

Introspection: You would only ask a close friend--no need for in depth detail.

Situation 2
すみません。ちょっと用事があります。しつれいします。
sumimasen. chotto YOOJI ga arimasu. sitsurei shimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
友達と外食へ行くのでーさんも行きませんか(も行かないか)。
TOMODACHI to GAISHOKU he Iku node -san mo Ikimasenka (mo Ikanai ka).

Introspection: feel sure the plain form would be used in this situation, but uncertain...

Situation 4
はい、分かりました。ぜひそれをしておきます。
hai, WAkarimashita. zehi sore wo shite okimasu.

Introspection: find it hard to use honorifics and put myself down, i.e., humble.

Situation 5
おそいね、すみません。
osoi ne, sumimasen.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございます。
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
汽車に乗って行った方がいいと思いませんか。
KISHA ni NOtte Itta HOO ga ii to OMOimasenka.

Introspection: polite suggestion to get him to change his mind.

Situation 8
用事があるので早く食べなければなりません。ちょっと早く持って来て下さい。
YOOJI ga aru node HAYAku TAbenakereba narimasen. chotto HAYAku MOtte KIte KUDAsai.

Introspection: I would use polite but maybe imperative is used here!

Learner 12 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

Situation 1
今晩はコーブ手紙を書いてなければならないのであなたの computer を使っていただきますか。
KONBAN wa koobu TEGAMI wo KAitenakereba naranai node anata no computer wo TSUKAtte itadakimasuka.

Introspection: I will strongly ask what I want because in this situation, I must be in a hurry.

Situation 2
すみませんが十分あとでほかのクラスに行きますがクラスから話しができますか。
sumimasenga JUPPUN ato de hoka no kurasu ni Ikimasu ga kurasu kara HANAshi ga dekimasuka.

Introspection: I probably not to go to the lecture in this case.

Situation 3
今晩はちいさい団の友達と一緒に夕飯を行きます。今晩のおひましたら一緒に行きませんか。
KONBAN wa chiisai DAN no TOMODACHI to ISSHOni YUUHAN wo Ikimasu. KONBAN no o-hima sitara ISSHO ni Ikimasen ka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
だいじょぶです。一生懸命を働くので九日の中にこの仕事をしまいます。
daijobu desu. ISSHOOKENMEI wo HATARAku node KOKONOKA no NAKA ni kono SHIGOTO wo shimaimasu.

Introspection: Some words I want to use, but I forgot what is in Japanese.

Situation 5
すみません。遅くれので20分ぐらいほかのバスを待ちます。
sumimasen. Okure node 20BUN gurai hoka no basu wo MAchimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
ありがとうございます。この日は楽しいです。次のオーストラリアに行くことは会いましょうか。
arigatoo gozaimasu. kono HI wa TANOshii desu. TSUGI no oosutoraria ni Iku koto wa Aimashooka.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
私は列車をかかりたいと思いますから友人の屋のとなりえきいがあります。

WATASHI wa RESSHA wo kakaritai to OMOimasu kara YUUJIN no YA no tonari ekii ga arimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません。昼食の時間はすこしなる、私たちの食物を急にあげて下さい。
sumimasen. HIRUSHOKU no JIKAN wa sukosi naru, WATASHItachi no TABEMONO oKYUU ni agete KUDAsai.

Introspection: None

Learner 13 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 23%)

Situation 1
すみません、電脳がありませんが重要な手紙を書てありければいけません。あなたの使えませんか。
sumimasen. DENNOO ga arimasenga JUUYOOna TEGAMI wo KAIte arikereba ikemasen. anata no TSUKAemasenka.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
すみません。十分にクラスがありますから、あとであなたに見えますか。
sumimasen. JUPPUN ni kurasu ga arimasu kara, ato de anata ni MIemasuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
みんなは晩ご飯を食べに行っています。来てましょう。
minna wa BAN goHAN wo TAbe ni Itte imasu. Kitemashoo.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
ぜひ、先年の休日中Western Australia へ行ったことがありました。計画をしえできると思います。
zehi, SENNEN no KYUUJITSUCHUU WesternAustralia he Itta koto ga arimashita. KEIKAKU wo shiedekiru to OMOimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 5
すみません。ちょっどバスに"miss"
sumimasen. choddo basu ni "miss"

Introspection: I forgot some of the expressions in apologising.

Situation 6

どうもありがとうございます。きょうは愉快ですね。下次の探訪にたのしみにします。
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. kyoo wa YUUKAI desu ne. KAJI no TANHOO ni tanoshimi ni shimasu.

Introspection: looking forward to, but I forgot

Situation 7
電車が安全とやさしですから良いと思います。
DENSHA ga ANZEN to yasasi desu kara Ii to OMOimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません。みんなの食物は来ません。もうやさいできますか。
sumimasen. minna no TABEMONO wa KImasen. moo yasai dekimasuka.

Introspection: None

Learner 14 (L1 English, L2 Arabic, C-test 20%)

Situation 1
すみませんがコーンプタをつくてもいいですか。
sumimasenga koonputa wo tsukute mo ii desuka.

Introspection: realitively polite, but simple, and it's what I've learnt.

Situation 2
すみませんがちょっとう... ほかのクラスがあります。
sumimasenga chottoo... hoka no kurasu ga arimasu.

Introspection: polite and explaining

Situation 3
いっしょうに友達と晩ごはんを食べに行きたいですか。
isshoo ni TOMODACHI to BAN gohan wo TAbe ni Ikitai desuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4
分かりました。仕事をおわれます。
WAkarimashita. SHIGOTO wo owaremasu.

Introspection: understand the situation and I will finish it.

Situation 5
ごめんなさい、わたしはばっかですよ。おそいですね。
gomen nasai, watashi wa bakka desu yo. osoi desu ne.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
いいえ、どもありがとうございます。
iie, domo arigatoo gozaimasu.

Introspection: no for "no problems" and thank you for the pleasure.

Situation 7
ちょっとう、電車がほうがいいですがバスはとてもおそいです。
chottoo, DENSHA ga hoo ga ii desu ga basu wa totemo osoi desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみませんがわたしははやくします。
sumimasen ga watashi wa hayaku shimasu.

Introspection: sorry but I'm in a hurry, but Japanese people I think aren't very polite to shopkeepers or waiters.

Learner 15 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 41%)

Situation 1
しつれいします。あなたのコンピエーターをつかってもいいですか。
shitsurei shimasu. anata no konpieetaa wo tsukattemo ii desuka

Introspection: I think it should be said more politely but I can't think how.

Situation 2
しつれいします。話たいんですが今クラスがあります。あとで話せませんか。
shitsurei shimasu. HANASItain desuga IMA kurasu ga arimasu. ato de HANAsemasenka.

Introspection: Perhaps should be a bit more polite.

Situation 3
すこしのともだちといっしょにレストランでばんごはんを食べます。あなたは行きませんか。
sukoshi no tomodachi to issho ni resutoran de ban gohan wo TAbemasu. anata wa Ikimasenka.

Introspection: This is a really useful exercise. We're made to think of everyday situations that we are likely to use.

Situation 4
はい、しごとをぜひします。九日前にそれをおわりますね。
hai, shigoto wo zehi shimasu. KOKONOKA MAE ni sore wo owarimasu ne.

Introspection: Not polite enough really! (I assumed a good relationship with the boss).

Situation 5
しつれいします。おくれったね。バスをmissed
shitsurei shimasu. okuretta ne. basu **wo missed**

Introspection: plain style for friend. I don't understand the difference in language when speaking to males and females.

Situation 6
ありがとうございました。あなたは私におくりものを上げはいけません。
arigatoo gozaimashita. anata wa WATASHI ni okurimono wo Ageru waikemasen.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
すみません。でんしゃは... と思っています。
sumimasen. densha wa... to OMOtte imasu.

Introspection: Wanted to say "I think the train would be better than the bus because..."

Situation 8
すみません。
sumimasen.

Introspection: This one's really hard.

Learner 16 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 43%)

Situation 1
Xるちゃん、ごめんなさい。レスメを書くのでコンピュタを使わなければならないので、今学校のコンピュタ部屋は休みだから使わません。コンピュタを使ってもいいですか。
Xru chan, gomen nasai. resume wo KAku node konpyutao TSUKAwanakereba naranai node, IMA GAKKOO no konpyuta HEYA wa YASUmi da kara TSUKAwamasen. konpyuta wo TSUKAttemo ii desuka.

Introspection: When I want to borrow something from someone, I would like to explain why, then she would then lend you.

Situation 2
すみません、先生。私の卒業してからの計画をあなたに相談したいのに今、クラスがあるのであとでご時間がある時、会いましょう。
sumimasen, SENSEI. WATASHI no SOTSUGYOO shite kara no KEIKAKU wo anata ni SOODAN shitai noni IMA, kurasu ga aru node ato de goJIKAN ga aru TOKI, Aimashoo.

Introspection: Just make it up.

Situation 3

今夜、私達の友達と一緒にばんごはんを食べに行きます。メリさんやスーさんは行きます。あなたは行きましょうか。
KONYA, WATASHITACHI no TOMODACHI to ISSHOO ni ban gohan wo TAbeni Ikimasu. meri-san ya suu-san wa Ikimasu. anata wa Ikimashooka.

Introspection: Usually, normal conversation b/w/ my friends.

Situation 4
はい。そうです。今、資料を探しています。九日間に終わりましょう。
hai. soo desu. IMA, SHIRYOO wo SAGAshite imasu. KOKONOKAKAN ni Owarimashoo.

Introspection: To the boss, usually say what he ask in the short simple sentences.

Situation 5
すみません。すみません。家を出した時、電話があった。バスがちょっと遅くから今着きます。
sumimasen. sumimasen. IE wo DAshita TOKI, DENWA ga atta. basu ga chotto OSOku kara IMA TSUkimasu.

Introspection: Just make it up.

Situation 6
ああ、いりませんですよ。今日、あなたたちととてもうれしいです。ありがとうございます。時間がある。も一回出きしょう。
aa, irimasen desu yo. KYOO, anatatachi to totemo ureshii desu. arigatoo gozaimasu. JIKAN ga aru. mo IKKAI DEkishoo.

Introspection: It've been that kind of situation.

Situation 7
汽車で安くて景色をよくみせます。時間がもすこしかかるのに汽車でつまいません。みんな汽車で行きましょう。
KISHA de YASUkute KESHIKI wo yoku misemasu. JIKAN ga mo sukoshi kakaru noni KISHA de tsumaimasen. minna KISHA de Ikimashoo.

Introspection: It's much easy to talk to male when discuss this kind of situation.

Situation 8
すみません。メンニュがありますか。友達はもう一時間遅ります。私は、メンニュを注文します。
sumimasen. mennyu ga arimasuka. TOMODACHI wa moo ICHIJIKAN OKUrimasu. WATASHI wa, mennyu wo CHUUMON shimasu.

Introspection: I've been this situation.

Learner 17 (L1 Korean, L2 English, C-test 58%)

Situation 1
京子、おそくまでごめんけど、いまあなたの家にいって computer を作ってもいい。
KYOOKO, osoku made gomen kedo, ima anata no IE ni itte computer wo tsukuttemo ii.

Introspection: She is my close friend and I am calling at night about 9 o'clock after writing my resume. I only need to use a computer to type.

Situation 2
もしわけありませんけどすぐほかのじゅぎょがあります。おじかんがよるしかったらこのあとでおうかがいしたいんですけど、先生の時間はどうですか。
mooshi wake arimasen kedo sugu hoka no jugyo ga arimasu. o-jikan ga yoroshikattara kono ato de oukagaisitan desu kedo, SENSEI no JIKAN wa doo desuka.

Introspection: I want to talk to her as soon as possible but I also want to attend the class, so I will make another appointment to talk to her.

Situation 3
この金曜日ともだち二・三人と町にあるさくらというレストランに食事するいこうと約束しました。じかんがあったら一緒に
行きましょうか。
kono KINYOOBI tomodachi NI/SANNIN to MACHI ni aru sakura to iu resutoran ni SHOKUJIsuru ikoo to YAKUSOKU shimashita. jikan ga attara ISSHO ni Ikimashooka.

Introspection: I've known her quite some time (but not very long) so I do not need to be very polite.

Situation 4
ご心配なさってください。ぜひ来週の月曜までおわります。資料はもうたくさんおっていますからすぐ終わることができると思います。
goSHIMPAI nasatte kudasai. zehi RAISHUU no GETSUYOO made owarimasu. SHIRYOO wa moo takusan otte imasu kara sugu Owaru koto ga dekiru to OMOimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 5
ごめんね。ながくまてったね。バースをmiss しまったらまた20分またなければならないでしたよ。あとにはこのoccasion がしないと努力しますよ。ごめんね。
gomen ne. nagaku matetta ne. baasu wo miss shimattara mata 20PUN matanakereba naranai deshita yo. ato niwa kono ocassion ga shinai to DORYOKU shimasu yo. gomen ne.

Introspection: close friend so I only need to speak casually.

Situation 6
どうもありがとう。めずらしいものです。以前からこんなものがほしかった。これを見るとあなた達をおぼえることができるね。
doomo arigatoo. mezurashii mono desu. IZEN kara konna mono ga hoshikatta. kore wo MIru to anataTACHI wo oboeru koto ga dekiru ne.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
太郎さんバースで行くのもいいけどオーストラリアにはバースがよくきなくて、このごろは休みのためとてもこんざっていますから、でんしゃでいくのがもっといいのがないか。もっともバースのほうがたかくて、三週間ぐらいまえ予約しなければならないですから、もう一度かんがえてくださいのか。
TAROO-san baasu de Ikuno mo ii kedo oosutoraria niwa baasu ga yoku kinakute, kono goro wa YASUmi notame totemo konzatte imasu kara, densha de ikuno ga motto iino ga naika. mottomo baasu no hoo ga takakute, SANSHUUKAN gurai mae YOYAKU shinakereba naranai desu kara, moo ICHIDO kangaete kudasai noka.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
どうもすみませんけど、私たちは三時まで、きっしゃてんでいってきしゃをのまなければなりません。はやくserviceもらうことができますか。
doomo sumimasen kedo, WATASHItachi wa SANJI made, kisshaten de itte kissha wo nomanakereba narimasen. hayaku service morau koto ga dekimasu ka.

Introspection: None

Learner 18 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 31%)

Situation 1
カンピュータを使えていただけますか。
kanpyuuta wo TSUKAete itadakemasuka.

Introspection: I have no idea, but I was trying to use very polite word so he won't refuse or feels that I'm rude.

Situation 2
午後にはいいですか。今経済科のクラスがありますので、すみません。
GOGO niwa ii desuka. IMA KEIZAIKA no kurasu ga arimasu node, sumimasen.

Introspection: I think that it's better to make it another time instead of refuse the tutor because it will be rude to refuse tutor.

Situation 3
今夜はお時間がありますか。友達とレストランへ行きます。一緒に行きましょうか。
IMA YORU wa o-JIKAN ga arimasuka. TOMODACHI to resutoran he Ikimasu. ISSHO ni Ikimashooka.

Introspection: I don't know how to finish the sentence in Japanese, but basically I would provide a certain day/date.

Situation 4
心配じゃないです。木曜日の前に
SHIMPAI janai desu. MOKUYOOBI no MAE ni

Introspection: I don't know how to finish the sentence in Japanese but basically I would provide a certain date.

Situation 5
X (no response)

Introspection: I have no idea.

Situation 6
X (no response)

Introspection: I don't know how to say it in Japanese, but if I can, I would say, thank you very much but you shouldn't be spending money give such an expensive gift -- it's my responsibility to look after you all.

Situation 7
電車がほうがいいと思います。とても安いですね。その上安全なtransportationです。
DENSHA ga hoo ga ii to OMOimasu. totemo YASUi desu ne. sono UE ANZENna transportation desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません、私達はもう一時間で待っています、今から五分の中になにももらったら、we'll leave and won't pay.
sumimasen, WATASHITACHI wa moo ICHIJIKAN de MAtte imasu, IMA kara GOFUN no NAKA ni nanimo momorattara, we'll leave and won't pay.

Introspection: Don't know how to say the last 2 sentences in Japanese, but basically customer means what she says.

Learner 19 (L1 Czech, L2 English, C-test 25%)

Situation 1
すみませんが、コンピュータをつかって下さい。
sumimasenga, konpyuuta wo tsukatte KUDAsai.

Introspection: They are friends so they would speak quite loosely with one another. Friends do each other favours, because it's late a woman would probably say more polite and apologetic things, even thoug they are friends. Men/boys (perhaps tactlessly) come right out and say what is on their mind.

Situation 2

どうもありがとうございます！すみませんがつぎのクラスは十分にはじめています。あしたはいいですか。
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu! sumimasen ga tsugi no kurasu wa JUPPUN niwa hajimete imasu. ashita wa ii desuka.

Introspection: The dialogue is between a tutor and student, but it seems as though they have quite a relaxed relationship, as the tutor invites the student to his/her office.

Situation 3
今晩はジョンさんとえりかさんといっしょにフランスのレストランへ行く。来て下さいよ。
KONBAN wa jon-san to erika-san to issho ni furansu no resutoran he Iku. KIte KUDAsai yo.

Introspection: The friend may sound like he is commanding his friend to come to dinner, but it is a joke between friends, meaning that he really does want his friend to join them tonight.

Situation 4
はい、いいでございます。デッドラインにおわります。
hai, ii degozaimasu. deddorain ni owarimasu.

Introspection: The "de gozaimasu" is used because the conversation is between the boss and employee. I wasn't sure of the polite form of します, though, for the 2nd part.

Situation 5
おそくなってすみませんね！
osoku natte sumimasen ne!

Introspection: I have caused my friend to wait for 40 minutes, so I must apologize whole heartedly. おそくなってすみません、may sound a little too formal? So it could be made a bit more relaxed with ね at the end?

Situation 6
どういたしまして。プレセントにいりないを上げます。どうもありがとうございました。
dooitashimashite. puresento ni irinai wo Agemasu. doomo arigatoo gozaimashita.

Introspection: I wanted to say that a gift was not necessary, but I know there's a set expression for it, but I can't remember it.

Situation 7
電車にのるはバスにのるはほうがいいです。電車は早いです！
DENSHA ni noru wa basu ni noru wa hoo ga ii desu. DENSHA wa HAYAi desu!

Introspection: a plain statement that the train is fast will suffice.

Situation 8
すみませんが、私たちのオーダに早く持って来って下さい。すぐでなければなりません。おじゃまします。

sumimasenga, WATASHItachi no ooda ni HAYAku MOtte KItte KUDAsai. sugu denakereba narimasen.

Introspection: I don't really know how polite one must be to "wait people," and I don't mean any speech to sound rude at all, but it is a situation which could be interpreted in the wrong way.

Learner 20 (L1 English, L2 German, C-test 37%)

Situation 1
すみませんが、今ちょっとこまっているのでゆみこさんのコンピューターとプリンターを使ってもいいですか。
sumimasenga, IMA chotto komatte iru node yumiko-san no konpyuutaa wo TSUKAttemo ii desuka.

Introspection: Wanted to say いただきます or 下さい but thought it might be too formal for friends.

Situation 2
すみませんですが先生に話したいですけどもうすぐクラスに行かなければなりません。ごめんなさい。
sumimasen desu ga SENSEI ni HANAshitai desu kedo moo sugu kurasu ni Ikanakereba narimasen.

Introspection: None

Situation 3
今ばん友だちとレストランに行くつもりで行きませんか。
KONban TOMOdachi to resutoran ni Iku tsumori de Ikimasenka.

Introspection: I don't see any difference b/w if it was a male or female.

Situation 4
はいできます。その時までぜったいあけます。
hai dekimasu. sono TOKI made zettai akemasu.

Introspection: Would like to ues more polite form but don't know あけます in polite form.

Situation 5
中むらさんおそくになったごめんなさいね。長い待ていた？
NAKAmura-san osoku ni natta gomen nasai ne. NAGAi MAte ita?

Introspection: None

Situation 6
ああ、びくりしたします。どうもありがとうございます。
aa, bikurishita shimasu. doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.

Introspection: Wanted to say "you shouldn't have" but forgot. Think we learnt it in second year.

Situation 7
しゃバスはちょっとあぶないですから電車で行くのはほうがいいと思う。
sha basu wa chotto abunai desu kara DENSHA de Ikuno wa hoo ga ii to OMOu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません。時間がないんので早くちゅうもんしておねがいします。
sumimasen. JIKAN ga nai node HAYAku chuumon shite onegaishimasu.

Introspection: None

Learner 21 (L1 English, L2 French, C-test 38%)

Situation 1
すみません。私はコンプターがありません。では、私はあなたのコンプターをつかって下さい。
sumimasen. WATASHI wa konputaaga arimasen. dewa, WATASHI wa anata no konputaa wo tsukatte KUDAsai.

Introspection: Simple conversation because it is with a friend.

Situation 2
しつれいします。十分に、私はクラスでいらっしゃいます。では、あしたおはなしになるかもしれません。
shitsureishimasu. JUPPUN ni, WATASHI wa kurasu de irasshaimasu. dewa, ashita ohanashi ni naru kamo shiremasen.

Introspection: It was a bit harder because polite language had to be used.

Situation 3
こんばんに、私はともだちといっしょうに、レストランに行きます。では、来ることができますか。
konban ni, WATASHI wa tomodachi to isshoo ni, resutoran ni Ikimasu. dewa, KUru koto ga dekimasuka.

Introspection: I wanted to use the potential to say "can you come?" but couldn't remember it.

Situation 4
はい。仕事をいたします。もんだいがありません。来週前で、おおわりになります。
hai. SIGOTO wo itashimasu. mondai ga arimasen. RAISHUU MAE de, oowari ni narimasu.

Introspection: I wanted to use "ma ni au" but wasn't sure how.

Situation 5
すみません。

sumimasen.

Introspection: Couldn't remember how to say "missed the bus."

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございます。私はたいへんうれしいです。プルザントが好きです。どうも。
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. WATASHI wa taihen ureshii desu. puruzanto ga SUki desu. doomo.

Introspection: You would have to say something that expressed your gratitude.

Situation 7
すみません。れっしゃはもはやいですと思います。れっしゃもやすいです。
sumimasen. ressha wa mo hayai desu to OMOimasu. ressha mo yasui desu.

Introspection: I tried to point out some advantages of taking the train.

Situation 8
しつれいします。わたしたちはちゅもんしました。では、今食べないですからわたしたちたいへんいそがしいです。
siturei shimasu. watashitachi wa chumon shimasita. dewa, IMA TAbenai desu kara watashitachi taihen isogashii desu.

Introspection: Tried to get the point across without being very rude.

Learner 22 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 37%)

Situation 1
コンピューターを使うのいいですか。私ははやくレスメを書くので、あなたのコンピューターとプリンターにいります。私はみじかいじかんしかかかります。
konpyuutaa wo TSUKAu no ii desuka. WATASHI wa hayaku resume wo KAku node, anata no konpyuutaa to purintaa ni irimasu. WATASHI wa mijikai jikan shika kakarimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 2
ああ、すみません。今ほかのクラスがあります。あしたに会ってもいいですか。
aa, sumimasen. IMA hoka no kurasu ga arimasu. ashita ni Atte mo ii desuka.

Introspection: I'm not that well at formal/honorific speech.

Situation 3
今晩にはともだちとレストランに行く。あなたは来るんですか。
KONBAN niwa tomodachi to resutoran ni Iku. anata wa KUrun desuka.

Introspection: None

Situation 4

はい。たぶんするのができます。
hai. tabun suruno ga dekimasu.

Introspection: This is quite difficult -- formal language must be used.

Situation 5
ああ、もうしわけ。家からちょっとおそく出きました。だから私はただしいバスに
乗りませんでした。
aa, mooshi wake. IE kara chotto osoku dekimashita. dakara WATASHI wa tadashii basu ni NOrimasen deshita.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
どうもありがとうございます。
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.

Introspection: I'm not sure of the usual polite greetings to thank someone.

Situation 7
私はでんしゃがバスよりはやくと思います。そして、でんしゃに乗るほうがいいです。
WATASHI wa densha ga basu yori hayaku to OMOimasu. soshite, densha ni NOru hoo ga ii desu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません、私たちはちょっとじかんしかありますので、すぐたべものをつれて行きませんか。
どうもありがとうございます。
sumimasen, WATASHItachi wa chotto jikan shika arimasu node, sugu tabemono wo tsurete Ikimasenka. doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.

Introspection: None

Learner 23 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 27%)

Situation 1
あした、ジョブインタビイはこんばんは、あなたのコーンプターを使ってもいいですか。
ashita, jobuintabii wa konban wa, anata no koonputaa wo TSUKAttemo ii desuka.

Introspection: Needs to be more polite, even though speaking to friend.

Situation 2
ざんねんながら、今ほかのケラスへ行かなければなりません。おねがいします。
zannen nagara, IMA hoka no kerasu he Ikanakereba narimasen. onegai shimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 3

友達といっしょにレストランに来るいただけませんか。
TOMODACHI to issho ni resutoran ni KUru itadakemasenka.

Introspection: I have really no idea how to word this politely. The difficulty lies in 'would you like to come'

Situation 4
もちろん。私は九日時間にはしょるいをおわられます。
mochiron. WATASHI wa KOKONOKA JIKAN niwa shorui wo owararemasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 5
ごめんなさい。
gomen nasai.

Introspection: I do not know how to say 'missed' (bus). Not much explanation is necessary, though.

Situation 6
ありがとうございます。あなたたちはとてもしんせつです。私はとてもびっくり。
arigatoo gozaimasu. anatatachi wa totemo shinsetsu desu. WATASHI wa totemo bikkuri.

Introspection: None

Situation 7
バスはあぶなです。私はれっしゃを乗りたいです。これはあんぜんと思います。
basu wa abuna desu. WATASHI wa ressha wo NOritai desu. kore wa anzen to OMOimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 8
すみません、ひろごはんはどのぐらいです。私たちはやくそくがあります。
suminasen, hiro gohan wa dono gurai desu. WATASHItachi wa yakusoku ga arimasu.

Introspection: I am not really sure.

Learner 24 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 59%)

Situation 1
おねがいしたいことがあるんですが...あしたまで大じなひつようもののじゅんびをしなくちゃいけないのでコンピータをかしてくれる？
onegai shitai koto ga arun desuga... ashita made DAIjina hitsuyoo mono no junbi wo shinakucha ikenai node konpiita wo kashite kureru?

Introspection: Is a good friend so didn't feel I had to use formal language.

Situation 2
わるいですが、ちょうどほかのクラスにいくところですが、もしもあしたになったらよろしいでしょうか？
warui desuga, choodo hoka no kurasu ni iku tokoro desuga, moshimo ashita ni nattara yoroshii deshooka?

Introspection: Would like to have used something more formal -- but never quite sure how to.

Situation 3
あしたみんなとたべに行くようていがあるんですが、ひろしくんのつごうはどうですか？いっしょうに行こうか？
ashita minna to tabe ni Iku yotei ga arun desu ga, hiroshi-kun no tsugoo wa doo desuka? isshooni Ikooka?

Introspection: None

Situation 4
はいかしこまりました。これからいしょうけんめいするのでぜひまにあいます。
hai kashikomarimashita. kore kara isshookenmei suru node zehi maniaimasu.

Introspection: None

Situation 5
よしこさん、おまたせいしました。ほんとうにごめんなさいね！私がつごいばかのでのるつもりでした。bus にのらなかったのでこんなにおそくなった。
yosiko-san, omatase ishimashita. hontoo ni gomen nasai ne! WATASHI ga tsugoi baka node noru tsumori deshita. bus ni noranakatta node konnani osoku natta.

Introspection: None

Situation 6
あら、うれしいは！ほんとうにみんなと会ってうれしいことです。ありがとうございます。
ara, uresii wa! hontoo ni minna to Atte ureshii koto desu. arigatoo gozaimsu.

Introspection: Probably would have said 'you shouldn't have' 'it's not necessary' if the words had come to mind.

Situation 7
でんしゃのほうがいいと思わないの？バスだったらかなり時間がかかるじゃない？
densha no hoo ga ii to OMOwanai no? basu dattara kanari JIKAN ga kakaru janai?

Introspection: Tried to get point across without saying my idea is definitely better.

Situation 8
おねえさん、もうそろそろいただきませんか？もうそろそろおねがいできますか？
onee-san, moo sorosoro itadakimasenka? moo sorosoro onegai dekimasuka.

Introspection: None

APPENDIX E: Discourse Evaluation Task (DET) (Instrument and Responses)

Original Instrument:

Discourse Evaluation Task

Name: _____

Instructions:

You will hear eight dialogues in Japanese. Each dialogue will be repeated twice. After each dialogue, you will hear three questions about the dialogue in English. Please listen to the dialogue and answer the questions using this form. Please answer the questions in the language, Japanese or English, that is specified in each question. The first question is the same for each dialogue, but the second and third questions are different.

In the 'introspection' section following each group of questions, please write any comments that you might have on the dialogue or on one or more of the questions immediately after finishing the last question. For example, your comments may be about how you came up with the answer(s) that you gave, or on any other topic that was one your mind when you listened to the dialogue and answered the questions. You may write as little or as much as you wish. Please feel free to write your comments in any language because your comments can be translated from that language into English later.

Dialogue 1: 'Let's go to the cinema'

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Dialogue 2: 'Please come again'

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Dialogue 3: 'Kenichi didn't show up'

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Dialogue 4: 'These comics are really funny'

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Dialogue 5: 'Could you proofread this?'

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Dialogue 6: 'How was work?'

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Introspection: _____

_____

_____

Script:

Dialogue 1 (invitation)
W: 映画の切符が二枚あるんでが、いっしょに行きませんか。
M: いいですね。
W: 今晩はどうですか。
M: じゃ、5時半に大丸デパートの前で会いましょう。

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is another way of saying いっしょに行きませんか in Japanese?
3. What is a more informal form of 会いましょう in Japanese?

Dialogue 2 (expressing thanks)
W: 先生、今日は楽しいお話をありがとうございました。
M: どういたしまして。この次はあなたのヨーロッパー旅行の写真を見よう。
W: はい。では、またおじゃまさせていただきます。
M: うん、じゃ待ってるよ。
W: 今日はこれで失礼します。

Questions:
1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. In English, why does the woman thank the man?
3. What is a more informal form of 失礼いたします in Japanese?

Dialogue 3 (apology)
M: 山本宏ですが、健一君いますか。

W: あ、宏君。健一は今出かけているわ。何か用事。
M: 今日僕の家で会う約束をしていたのに、健一だけが来ないから電話したんです。
W: あら、健一は忘れたのね。ごめんなさいね。

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. About how old do you think the man is?
3. In English, why does the woman apologise to the man?

Dialogue 4 (request)
W: どうしたの。何がおかしいの。
M: この漫画とてもおもしろいんだ。
W: じゃ、読み終わったら、私にもうちょっと見せてください。
M: いいよ。あとで見せて上げるよ。

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. In English, how polite do you think the word どうしたの is?
3. What is a more polite form of 見せて上げるよ in Japanese?

Dialogue 5 (refusal)
M: 和田さん。
W: はい。
M: あのう、すみませんが、今日このレポートをちょっと直して頂けませんか。
W: 今ですか。あのう、申し訳ないんですが、今日はちょっと都合が悪いんですけど。
どうもすみません。

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is another word for 申し訳ないんですが in Japanese?
3. In English, do you think that the woman wants to help the man?

Dialogue 6 (complaint)
W: 今日会社で何かあったの。
M: 別に何もなかったけどちょっと忙しかったんだよ。
W: なんで。
M: 大谷さんと木村さんが一日中出かけていて課長と二人だけだったんだよ。

Questions:

1. How would you describe the relationship between the speakers in English?
2. What is a more formal form of 何で in Japanese?
3. In English, how do you think the man feels about his day?

Responses:

(Note: "X" indicates that the learn left the item blank)

Learner 1 (L1 English, L2 Latin, C-test 36%)

Dialogue 1
1. friends, but not very close -- maybe acquaintances
2. 行きましょうか
3. 会おう
Introspection: None

Dialogue 2
1.teacher and student
2. because his talk was interesting, enjoyable
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: I found that by listening to the forms of verbs can give a lot of information. I find it hard to answer the next question if I am stuck on the previous one because I'm still thinking about it. I need more time between questions. friendly/informal

Dialogue 3
1. friendly -- use of kun indicates they are talking about someone
2. maybe a teenager.
3. Because the boy was late.

Introspection: My hearing is not so good today.

Dialogue 4
1. husband and wife
2. very casual -- not polite
3. 見せてあげます

Introspection: Giving and receiving verbs learnt in 2B. However, I never grasped it very well.

Dialogue 5
1. 2 colleagues. Not a close relationship
2. ごめんなさい。
3. yes, but she can't on that day.

Introspection: The use of polite language indicates the relationship.

Dialogue 6
1. husband and wife
2. なぜですか。どうして
3. He feels that is was just a normal busy day.

Introspection: None

Learner 2 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 40%)

Dialogue 1
1. they are friends
2. 私と行きますか 見ますしょう
3. I just get my answer by my memory.

Introspection: None

Dialogue 2
1. teacher and student
2. she thanks the man because she had a good time.
3. 失礼します。

Introspection: This dialogue is a bit fast to me.

Dialogue 3
1. College students
2. 20's
3. Have no idea

Introspection: Not good at informal language--too fast

Dialogue 4
1. They should be very close friend.
2. It is not polite. It's very colloquial language
3. 見せて上げております

Introspection: This question is very difficult. I have no idea what the people were saying.

Dialogue 5
1. They are classmates or friends
2. もし
3. No, she didn't want to help the man.

Introspection: This question is OK, but a little too fast.

Dialogue 6
1. They are workmate
2. 何か
3. He feels bad about his day.

Introspection: I don't really get the last part of the conversation.

Learner 3 (L1 English, L2 German, C-test 23%)

Dialogue 1
1. male and female adult friends
2. 行きましょうか
3. あい

Introspection: I'm not sure whether my answers are correct. I know I've learnt all these things, but I find changing things to and from polite verb froms difficult.

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. She thanks him for giving her something
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: As above, honorific language is even more difficult.

Dialogue 3
1. Quite friendly -- maybe male friend visiting another friend
2. Young man? used くん
3. X

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. peers
2. fairly colloquial
3. 見せて下さい。

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. The woman is below the man -- work colleague
2. ?
3. Yes, I think so, but she is busy.

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. friends or husband and wife
2. 何ですか。
3. I think he feels exhausted after such a busy day at work.

Introspection: This one was easier to understand than Dialogue 7. The level of language is easier.

Learner 4 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 39%)

Dialogue 1
1. The speakers are obviously friends or acquaintances
2. 私と行きませんか。
3. あよう

Introspection: Remembering what I've learned and applying the knowledge.

Dialogue 2
1. The man is a teacher, the female his student.
2. For telling her the story.
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: I missed a little of the dialogue but the questions pertained to what I caught. Hence information I had remembered.

Dialogue 3
1. Formal -- polite
2. Adult
3. The fact that Kenichi isn't there

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. Like husband and wife / girlfriend / boyfriend
2. fairly colloquial; not rude, but not overly polite.
3. みせてくれます。

Dialogue 5
1. Seemed to be a fairly warm, friendly conversation.
2. Like co-workers or the woman is slightly higher.
3. わけがないですが

Introspection: She wants to help, but doesn't have the time.
If she could she would.

Dialogue 6
1. Like husband and wife
2. どして
3. the man hasn't had a good day at work -- he's tired. You can tell he's tired by his tone and the short phrases he uses.

Learner 5 (L1 Sinhala, L2 English, C-test 27%)

Dialogue 1
1. Husband and wife
2. いっしょにいってもいいですか。
3. X

Introspection: Easy to listen. Some parts can't remember, but I think we have done it before.

Dialogue 2
1. Student and the teacher
2. Because he's told a nice story.
3. さようなら

Introspection: easy to understand

Dialogue 3
1. Co-workers, friends
2. About 20
3. X

Introspection: Difficult because of colloquial language

Dialogue 4
1. brother and sister
2. How funny is it
3. みせておあげりして下さい。

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. Lecturer and student
2. すみません
3. No, she doesn't

Introspection: We have done all these grammar but can't remember

Dialogue 6
1. Husband and wife
2. なぜ
3. He doesn't feel good. He is tired.

Introspection: None

Learner 6 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

Dialogue 1
1. かれらは友達です。
2. 行く
3. 会う

Introspection: friends are going to see a movie

Dialogue 2
1. Teachers and student
2. She thanks for his enjoyable class
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: The student gives thanks to the teacher.

Dialogue 3
1. Teacher & student
2. Teenager
3. Because Kenichi didn't show up

Introspection: I don't know who Kenichi is

Dialogue 4
1. friends
2. fairly polite
3. みせてくれる

Introspection: 2 people went to see comics and they found it very interesting. They wanted to go again.

Dialogue 5
1. teacher and student
2. X
3. Yes

Introspection: I don't understand the topic. Words are difficult.

Dialogue 6
1. husband and wife
2. どうして
3. The day was bad because he has been so busy.

Introspection: This dialogue between a husband and wife, the wife is concerning about the husband work progress.

Learner 7 (L1 Korean, L2 English, C-test 37%)

Dialogue 1
1. The older person and the younger one
2. いっしょうに行きましょう。
3. 会いましょう → 見ましょう

Introspection: None

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. Because the man gave her happy speech

3. しつれいします

Introspection: I've guessed some of them and I've heard some easy words.

Dialogue 3
1. friends?
2. early twenties
3. Kenichi is her friend

Introspection: Sounds like friends, but not close

Dialogue 4
1. Friends
2. not so polite
3. o-me ni naru（お目になっていただけませんか）

Introspection: from the way of speaking

Dialogue 5
1. not close
2. もしあけないんですか
3. No, I don't think so, she is refusing politely.

Dialogue 6
1. Wife and husband
2. どして
3. feel bad.

Learner 8 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 61%)

Dialogue 1
1. Friends
2. 一緒に行こう
3. 会よう

Introspection: Because I think they are using polite form, so they're friends. I just remembered the other form we've learnt in year 2.

Dialogue 2
1. The man is the teacher, superior to the woman.
2. Because she thought the lecture is very interesting and enjoyable.
3. 失礼します

Introspection: Because the woman addresses the man as '先生'

Dialogue 3
1. Mother and her son's classmate
2. teenager/student
3. Because her son forgot to go

Introspection: everyday life situation

Dialogue 4
1. close friends
2. It is common expression when speaking to a friend -- not really polite, but not rude as well.
3. みせてあげます

Introspection: They use informal speech. I find it's not easy for me at this stage to understand all the informal ending.

Dialogue 5
1. the woman is a bit superior than the man.
2. 失礼します
3. no, not so

Introspection: The woman seems making excuse, so as not to help the man.

Dialogue 6
1. They're very close, maybe living in the same family.
2. なんですか / どうしてですか
3. He found it war really busy and tired.

Introspection: Using informal speech and whole day working.

Learner 9 (L1 English, L2 French, C-test 40%)

Dialogue 1
1. good friends
2. 行きましょうか 見ましょう
3. X

Introspection: 1) I guessed from the context 2) Learnt it 3) Not sure

Dialogue 2
1. teacher and keen student
2. for the good lecture / seminar
3. しつれいします

Introspection: 1) from context 2) Learnt 3) Learnt

Dialogue 3
1. Not very close -- they don't know each other
2. Young man くん was mentioned
3. Because he wasn't there to speak to

Introspection: 1) polite language 2) kun is for young men 3) from context

Dialogue 4

1. friends
2. polite enough for friends
3. 見せていただきます。

Introspection: 1) level of speech 2) study of honorifics 3) study of honorifics

Dialogue 5
1. not the same group
2. しつれいします。
3. No

Introspection: 1) use of 'さん'3) she doesn't set another time

Dialogue 6
1. husband and wife
2. 何をしますか
3. I was too busy because the bosses were out

Introspection: 1) language and situation

Learner 10 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

Dialogue 1
1. They're friends
2. 一緒にいきましょう
3. 会う

Introspection: I came up with the answer by learning the context, but I'm not too confident about different forms of the verbs.

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. Because he helped her to take a photo
3. すみません

Introspection: I came up with the answer by guessing it. I heard something like "shashin", so I guess it means photo.

Dialogue 3
1. colleagues
2. 20's
3. X

Introspection: I don't understand the conversation well

Dialogue 4
1. Friends
2. it's just a general way of common conversation
3. みせていっらしゃいます。

Introspection: Most of them are guessing question

Dialogue 5
1. Teacher / student relations
2. ひまがありません
3. Yes, but she is not able at the moment

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. Colleagues
2. どうしますか
3. busy and tired

Introspection: None

Learner 11 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 31%)

Dialogue 1
1. close -- friends perhaps
2. 行きましょうか
3. じゃまたね

Introspection: feelings for the language

Dialogue 2
1. polite, formal
2. For giving an interesting talk
3. しつれいします

Introspection: I believe we learnt this from the book!?!

Dialogue 3
1. formal -- polite
2. 40
3. Because Kenichi was not there

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. friends, informal
2. informal
3. みせていただけます

Introspection:

Dialogue 5
1. very formal
2. X
3. yes

Introspection:

Dialogue 6
1. X
2. 何と言う
3. worn out!

Introspection: tone of male voice

Learner 12 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

Dialogue 1
1. friends
2. 映画を行きましょう
3. あいたい

Introspection: Some is learn and some is guess

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. for helping her something
3. すみません

Dialogue 3
1. classmates
2. 25 -- 30
3. Because Kenichi made a mistake

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. friends
2. How about this
3. みせてあげてください

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. X
2. X
3. Yes, but she has something else to do.

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. friends
2. なにをどうですか
3. very busy

Introspection: None

Learner 13 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 23%)

Dialogue 1
1. normal friends
2. AとB
3 会よう

Introspection: It's OK. Just that I forgot the basic things!

Dialogue 2
1. between teacher and student -- very polite
2. for helping her
3. しつれいあります

Introspection: Problems in formal languages

Dialogue 3
1. Not close, but they know each other
2. 30
3. X

Introspection: Too difficult

Dialogue 4
1. Friends
2. not a very polite form, but common language between friends
3. 見せて与える

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. Employer and worker
2. おじぎ
3. Not really. She apologised for that

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. Husband and wife
2. どうして
3. He has a busy and tiring day

Introspection: None

Learner 14 (L1 English, L2 Arabic, C-test 20%)

Dialogue 1
1. possibly friends -- not close.
2. issyo ni 行きますか
3. あいよう
Introspection: None

Dialogue 2
1. one is being more formal than the other. one older / higher level occupation
2. for having an enjoyable time
3. shitsurei shimasu

Introspection: relatively easy to listen to. Nice and slow. I still find it hard to understand conversation too fast, too detailed.

Dialogue 3
1. Not very close -- awkward relationship?
2. Older than Kenichi
3. Because he wasn't there

Introspection: Polite forms used, but use of くん is hard to understand.

Dialogue 4
1. Friends
2. not so polite -- just particle ending
3. みせていらっしいますか

Introspection: interesting -- relationships

Dialogue 5
1. not friends (being too polite)
2. 日間がありません
3. perhaps want to but can't

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. familiar
2. 何ですか。
3. was very busy.

Introspection: None

Learner 15 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 41%)

Dialogue 1
1. They are friends
2. いっしょに行きましょうか。
3. 会いたいです。

Introspection: Learnt it (colloquial Japanese) (not sure about #3)

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student or respected + other
2. She thanks him for the enjoyable story
3. しつれいします

Introspection: learnt it in colloquial Japanese

Dialogue 3
1. friend and relative
2. teenage
3. Kenichi forgot the appointment

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. acquaintances
2. どうしての is very polite (I think?)
3. を見せるになってよ。

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. work colleagues
2. ?
3. Not really

Introspection: Voice not too clear on tape

Dialogue 6
1. friends
2. なんです。
3. badly

Introspection: (guesses)

Learner 16 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 43%)

Dialogue 1
1. They are friends
2. 行きましょうか

3. 会う

Introspection: Answers from above was basic -- learned in the Japanese textbook.

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. Because he gave her the interesting speech on Europe
3. すみません

Introspection: Answers of above were learnt from the text.

Dialogue 3
1. family/relatives
2. early 20s
3. Because Kenichi forgot the appointment

Introspection: The woman's speech was fast

Dialogue 4
1. They are friends
2. What is so ..., it is not very polite to use between friends.
3. 見せてあげていただきますか。

Introspection: Above the passage is not really difficult.

Dialogue 5
1. Teacher and student
2. X
3. Not very much

Introspection: The voice is not very clear -- can't understand the whole meaning of conversation.

Dialogue 6
1. They are friends
2. なんですか。
3. Not very happy.

Introspection: The passage was not easy.

Learner 17 (L1 Korean, L2 English, C-test 58%)

Dialogue 1
1. Friends
2. いっしょうにいきましょうか。いっしょうにいこう。
3. あおう。あいますか。

Introspection: They seem like friends but not like a childhood friends because they used quite polite language.

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. because he told her a happy story
3. しつれいします

Introspection: She used very polite language, so he must be the old teacher of her.

Dialogue 3
1. middle age woman and teenager
2. student
3. Kenichi didn't keep his promise

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. friends
2. casual speech
3. みせてあげましょう。

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. tutor and student
2. すみませんが
3. No

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. Colleagues
2. なんですか。
3. Bad, uncomfortable.

Learner 18 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 31%)

Dialogue 1
1. Friends (not too close)
2. 私と行きますか。
3. あう

Introspection: None

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. He helps her
3. しつれいします

Introspection: Some of them have been taught for the words which I can't catch. I guess the answers according to the conversation.

Dialogue 3
1. co-workers
2. middle age
3. the man forgot something

Introspection: mostly guess

Dialogue 4
1. brother and sister
2. ?
3. 見せてあけて下さい。

Introspection: All were in plain form and guessed they were brother and sister or school friends, etc.

Dialogue 5
1. Teacher and student
2. She doesn't
3. The man used polite form

Dialogue 6
1. Husband and wife
2. ない
3. busy

Introspection: guess

Learner 19 (L1 Czech, L2 English, C-test 25%)

Dialogue 1
1. Friends
2. 行きましょうか。
3. 会う

Introspection: They are friends, or perhaps acquaintances because the language used was not formal, and they are going to the movies together. It was perhaps not a relationship which is very close.

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. Because he gave an interesting talk in class on that day
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: They are teacher and student because of the language used -- she called him 先生 and spoke with politeness. He called her あなた。

Dialogue 3
1. Relatives?
2. Late 20s
3. Kenichi forgot to tell the woman something.

Introspection: The speed is rather fast.

Dialogue 4
1. Friends
2. Not very polite in Japanese, but for friends it's OK
3. 見せてくれますか。

Introspection: They are friends, but the man is angry maybe

Dialogue 5
1. Secretary and boss
2. すみませんが
3. Yes, she has to, he's her boss.

Introspection: Maybe she personally doesn't feel like it, but she will do it. The woman is very humble, the boss demanding.

Dialogue 6
1. Husband and wife
2. どうして
3. He's tired, exhausted, it was a busy day.

Introspection: I said it was a conversation between husband and wife because it seemed that (from cultural aspect) the wife was the devoted wife, asking the husband about his day before serving him his たべもの.

Learner 20 (L1 English, L2 German, C-test 37%)

Dialogue 1
1. friends, maybe work colleagues
2. 私に行きたいですか。
3. 会いよう。

Introspection: Understood dialogue, however not sure whether the form of verb Q3 is correct.

Dialogue 2
1. teacher-student
2. because he gave an interesting talk in class
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: Have learnt these dialogue types before, fairly easy dialogue.

Dialogue 3
1. Polite -- not close friends
2. Early 30's
3. Because Kenichi didn't come.

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. friends
2. colloquial (What's up?)
3. 見せていただきますか。

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. work colleagues
2. ごめんなさい
3. Yes, but she can't today.

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. husband and wife
2. どうして / なぜ
3. he is tired because he was so busy

Introspection: None

Learner 21 (L1 English, L2 French, C-test 38%)

Dialogue 1
1. They are friends
2. ikimashoo ka -- let's go or 行きますか。
2. 会う

Introspection: Friends talking about going to the movies and at what time and where they will meet. Simple to understand.

Dialogue 2
1. Teacher and student
2. Because he gave and interesting and enjoyable talk in class
3. しつれいします。

Introspection: The language was more respectful, but still easy to understand.

Dialogue 3
1. Use of ね indicates closeness
2. middle aged!
3. Because K didn't show up.

Introspection: Unfortunately missed key words

Dialogue 4
1. Friends
2. Moderately polite
3. みせてくれます。

Introspection: These are grammar questions and relate to Japanese society. It helps to understand the difference between colloquial and formal Japanese.

Dialogue 5
1. teacher/student boss/employee
2. None
3. If she could, she would, but doesn't have the time more polite language was used.

Dialogue 6
1. similar to husband and wife
2. どうして
3. It was very hectic

Introspection: This was the easiest to understand

Learner 22 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 37%)

Dialogue 1
1. Couples or lovers
2. 一緒に行きますか
3. あいます

Introspection: The answers were based on the information I heard from the tape.

Dialogue 2
1. teacher/student relationship
2. Because he told her an interesting story
3. すみません。しつれいします。

Introspection:

Dialogue 3
1. Friendly -- use of kun indicate that they are talking about someone younger than themselves.
2. Older than Kenichi
3. X

Introspection: None

Dialogue 4
1. standard/friendly relationship
2. standard politeness
3. X

Introspection: None

Dialogue 5
1. Formal relationship
2. X
3. Yes

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. Colloquial/Friendly relationship
2. なんですか
3. X

Introspection: It would be better if questions were asked between the dialogues

Learner 23 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 27%)

Dialogue 1
1. friends
2. いっしょに行きたいですか
3. 会う

Introspection: I know difference between formal and informal

Dialogue 2
1. Man is respected. I use much more formal language **patterns**
2. She thanks him for speaking today
3. どうもありがとう

Introspection: Q3 don't really know answer

Dialogue 3
1. Co-workers from different company
2. Early 20's
3. Because Kenichi had forgotten about the appointment

Introspection: They seem to know each other

Dialogue 4
1. acquaintances
2. quite polite
3. みせて下さい

Introspection: Q2 there are words that are more polite

Dialogue 5
1. Polite -- work colleagues
2. X
3. Not really

Introspection: None

Dialogue 6
1. X
2. 何ですか
3. X

Introspection: Difficult to hear -- a bit muffled.

Learner 24 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 59%)

Dialogue 1
1. the speakers are friends
2. いっしょうに行きましょうか
3. 会います

Introspection: I could understand the passage quite easily -- assumed it was a social meeting, going to the movies. It was casual conversation.

Dialogue 2
1. a student-teacher relationship
2. because he is her teacher and has given and interesting lecture/story and it is polite to do so.
3. ありがとう

Introspection: harder to understand polite speech, had to guess some answers.

Dialogue 3
1. polite but they know each other
2. teenager
3. Kenichi missed the appointment

Introspection: Use of くん means teenager/young man.

Dialogue 4
1. friends/couple
2. not polite, but natural with friends
3. 見せてあげます。

Introspection: A little hard to understand, but seems like a young couple -- just a guess

Dialogue 5

1. boss and worker
2. どうもすみませんが
3. not really

Introspection: She seems bothered or angry about something.

Dialogue 6
1. husband and wife
2. どうして/なぜ
3. He is exhausted

Introspection: Typical conversation between husband and wife.

APPENDIX F: Short Writing Task (SWT) (Instrument and Responses)

Original Instrument:

Short Writing Task

Name: _____

Instructions:

Please write a one-paragraph note to your Japanese teacher in Japanese based on the following situation in the space provided below. You may write in any combination of kana and kanji that you wish.

Situation:

You have an appointment with your Japanese teacher to discuss the results of a recent homework assignment. Something came up suddenly in your life, forcing you to cancel the appointment. Please leave him or her a note apologising for not being able to keep the appointment. Begin with the greeting and end with the closing.

Note:

Introspection:

Responses:
(Note: Names of persons in response have been changed to "XYZ" to protect privacy.)

Learner 1 (L1 English, L2 Latin, C-test 36%)

XYZ先生、
しつれいします。
私は水よう日で先生に会えません。きのう私の父はびょういんにつれて生きました。びょういんで土よう日までいます。だから水よう日に私は大学に来ませんだと思います。あした、私は先生にでんわをかけ□ワす。たぶん来週、私たちは会いましょう。
しつれいします。すみません。
より

XYZ SENSEI,
shiturei shimasu.
WATASI wa SUIyooBI de SENSEI ni Aemasen. kinoo WATASHI no CHICHI wa byooin ni tsurete Ikimashita. byooin de DOyooBI made imasu. dakara SUIyooBI ni WATASHI wa DAIGAKU ni KImasen da to OMOimasu. ashita, WATASHI wa SENSEI ni denwa wo kakemasu tabun RAISHUU, WATASHItachi wa Aimasyoo.
sitsurei shimasu. sumimasen.
Yori

Introspection: Keigo was difficult to remember.

Learner 2 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 40%)

XYZ先生へ
お元気でいらっしゃいますか。
来週の水曜日の約束は参らないだと思って、ごめんなさい。
来週にアメリカにいるおばあさんの家に参ります。彼女は病気ですから、見って行かなければなりません。だから、約束を取消します。まだごめんなさい。

XYZ

XYZ SENSEI he
o-GENKI deirasshaimasuka.
RAISHUUno SUIYOOBIno YAKUSOKU wa MAIranai da to OMOtte, gomen nasai.
RAISHUU ni amerika ni iru obaasan no IE ni MAIrimasu. KANOJO wa BYOOKI desu kara, MItte Ikanakereba narimasen.
dakara, YAKUSOKU wo TORIKEshimasu. mada gomen nasai.

XYZ

Introspection: This topic was hard to write about.

Learner 3 (L1 English, L2 German, C-test 23%)

せんせいへ:
もうしわけありませんが、今日二時にせんせいとやくそくあったですが、きょうに大事なことができたのでやくそくのまもることができなくなりました。本当にすみませんが来しゅうになったらせんせいにたいしていかがでしょうか？

XYZ

sensei he:
mooshi wake arimasenga, KYOO NIJI ni sensei to yakusoku atta desuga, kyoo ni DAIJIna koto ga dekita node yakusoku no mamoru koto ga dekinaku narimashita. HONTOOni sumimasenga RAIshuuni nattara sensei ni taishite ikaga deshooka?

XYZ

Introspection: I think I should have used more kanji.

Learner 4 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 39%)

せんせいへ、
　　こんにちは！先生とそうだんしたかったが今、私はちょっと忙しいです。英語のクラスにテストがありますから。そしてやくそくをキャンセルしなければなりません。ごめんなさい。
　　どうもすみません。
　　XYZ より

sensei he,
　　konnichiwa! SENSEI to soodan shitakattaga IMA, WATASHI wa chotto ISOGASHII desu. EIGO no kurasu ni tesuto ga arimasu kara. soshite yakusoku wo kyanseru shinakereba narimasen. gomen nasai.
　　doomo sumimasen.
　　XYZ yori

Introspection: I wanted to a give a clear reason why I had to cancel the appointment.

Learner 5 (L1 Sinhala, L2 English, C-test 27%)

こんにちは、
XYZ先生へ
　　今日のデスカションのためにくることができませんからあとで電話をします。先生ほんとうにすみません。

XYZより

konnichiwa,
XYZ SENSEI he
　　KYOO no desukashon no tameni kuru koto ga dekimasen kara ato de

DENWA wo shimasu. SENSEI hontooni sumimasen

XYZ yori

Introspection: Don't know enough words to say what I want.

Learner 6 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

XYZ先生、よろしくお願いします。
すみません。とつぜん、急事がありから今日の約束に行けませんね。ごめん
なさい。先生にでんわをしています。
どうもありがとうございます。

XYZ
五月三十一日

XYZ SENSEI, yoroshiku oNEGAishimasu.
sumimasen. totsuzen, KYUUJI ga arikara KYOO no YAKUSOKU ni Ikemasen ne.
gomen nasai. SENSEI ni denwa wo shite imasu.
doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.

XYZ
GOGATSUSANJUICHINICHI

Introspection: None

Learner 7 (L1 Korean, L2 English, C-test 37%)

XYZ先生様
お元気ですか。私は元気です。
特に(は)なにもありませんが、
ざんねんですけれど、今日先生に会うことができません。すみませんが、私は明日からいつ
にもいいですので、先生の便利な時間であうの機会をお願い
します。
私の電話ばんごは674－3301.
一千九百九十五年六月一日

XYZ

XYZ SENSEI SAMA
o-GENKI desuka. WATASHI wa GENKI desu.
TOKUni(wa) nanim arimasenga, zannen desu keredo, KYOO SENSEI ni Au koto ga
dekimasen. sumimasenga, WATASHI wa ASHITA kara itsunimo ii desu node,
SENSEI no BENRIna JIKAN de auno KIKAI wo oNEGAIshimasu.
WATASHI no DENWAbango wa 674-3301.
ISSENKYUUHYAKUKYUUJUUGONENROKUGATSUICHINICHI

XYZ

Introspection: None

Learner 8 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 61%)

XYZ先生へお元気ですか。
明日は本当に先生との約束があります。しかし、今日ホンコンにある父から電話がありました。叔母は明日ホンコンからオーストラリアへ行きます。だから私は空港へ迎えなければならないんです。明日の約束時間に来た事ができません。申し訳ありません。
今、先生に会えません。だからこのメモを残ってあげます。
5月30日　　学生
XYZ

XYZ SENSEI he o-GENKI desuka.
ASHITA wa HONTOO ni SENSEI tono YAKUSOKU ga arimasu. shikashi, KYOO honkon ni aru chichi kara DENWA ga arimashita. SYUKUBO wa ASHITA honkon kara oosutoraria he Ikimasu. dakara WATASHI wa KUUKOO he MUKAenakeba naranain desu. ASHITA no YAKUSOKU JIKAN ni Kita KOTO ga dekimasen. MOshi WAKE arimasen.
IMA, SENSEI ni Aemasen. dakara kono memo wo NOKOtte agemasu.
5GATU30NITI　　GAKUSEI
XYZ

Introspection: I explained the situation and then apologised.

Learner 9 (L1 English, L2 French, C-test 40%)

XYZ先生へ、
すみません、私たちは会いませんでした。きのうやくそくしましたが父がなくなったので明はつごうがわるくてかえてもいいですか。来週はやすみですからもういちど会ってもいですか。私のでんわばんごは 550-7225 です。またすみません。
XYZより

XYZ SENSEI he,
sumimasen, WATASItachi wa Aimasendeshita. kinoo yakusoku shimashitaga CHICHIga nakunatta node AKA wa tsugoo ga warukute kaetemo ii desuka. RAISHUU wa yasumi desu kara moo ichido Attemo i desuka. WATASHI no denwa bango wa 550-7225 desu. mata sumimasen.
XYZ yori

Introspection: None

Learner 10 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

先生、
お元気いらしゃいますか。私は日本語の三年生です。今日、宿題について予約をありましたが私は来ませんでした。すみませんでした。実際、今朝は交通事故がありました。だから、来週の月曜日の午後三時で予約をしましょうか。

五月三十日
午後二時

学生。

SENSEI,
o-GENKI irasshaimasuka. WATASHI wa NIHONGO no SANNENSEI desu. KYOO, SYUKUDAI ni tsuite YOYAKU wo arimashitaga WATASHI wa KImasendeshita. sumimasendeshita. JISSAI, KONCHO wa KOOTUU JIKO ga arimashita. dakara, RAISHUU no GETSUYOOBI no GOGO SANJI de YOYAKU wo shimashooka.

GOGATUSANJUUNICHI
GOGO NIJI
GAKUSEI.

Introspection: Tried to be polite because she is a teacher.

Learner 11 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 31%)

先生、
すみませんが家族のために急に用事があります。それからよやくに来ることができません。先礼（しつれい）します。
どうもうありがとうございます。

XYZ

SENSEI,
sumimasenga KAZOKU no tameni KYUU ni YOOJI ga arimasu.
sore kara yoyaku ni KUru kotoga dekimasen. SENREI(shitsurei) shimasu.
doomoo arigatoo gozaimasu.

XYZ

Introspection: Have to be polite to explain why I couldn't keep the appointment.

Learner 12 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 34%)

先生、
おはようございます。すみませんが先予約は変りたいから空港に行かなければなりませんので妹が香港から来ます。それでは、ほかの時間が論文を相論することができますか。ありがとうございます。

IIIB三年生
XYZ

SENSEI,
ohayoo gozaimasu. sumimasenga SENYOYAKU wa KAEritai kara KUUKOO ni Ikanakereba narimasen node IMOOTO ga HONKON kara KImasu. sore dewa, hoka no JIKAN ga RONBUN wo SOORON suru koto ga dekimasuka. arigatoo gozaimasu.

IIIB SANNENSEI
XYZ

Introspection: I wanted to ask for another time -- have to use polite speech.

Learner 13 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 23%)

A 先生、

お身体ですか。私は日本語の三年生でございます。前に、電話をかかるので会いるに今学期の成績をぐらい言いたいます。しかし、重要なことがありますから、約会に来ることができない。すみません。

拝啓、
XYZ

A SENSEI,

oSHINTAI desuka. WATASI wa NIHONGO no SANNENSEI degozaimasu. MAE ni, DENWA wo kakaru node Airuni KONGAKKI no SEISEKI wo gurai Iitaimasu. shikashi, JUUYOna koto ga arimasu kara, YOKAI ni KUru koto ga dekinai. sumimasen.

HAIKEI,
XYZ

Introspection: None

Learner 14 (L1 English, L2 Arabic, C-test 20%)

XYZ先生へ
すみません、今日は時間がありませんがごめんんさいです。ほかの日は会てもういいでようか。XYZ

XYZ SENSEI he
sumimasen, KYOO wa JIKAN ga arimasenga gomennasai desu. hokano HI wa Atemoo ii deshooka.
miragu miraa

Introspection: Probably too short to do the job, but don't know enough words.

Learner 15 (L1 English, L2 Italian, C-test 41%)

XYZ先生
すみませんが今日のやくそくに行くことができません。きのう母はびょういんにつれていってされましたからかのじょを見に行かなければなりません。しつれいします。
XYZより

XYZ SENSEI
sumimasenga KYOOno yakusoku ni Iku koto ga dekimasen. kinoo HAHA wa byooin ni tsurete itte saremashita kara kanojo wo MIni Ikanakereba narimasen. shitsurei shimasu.
XYZ yori

Introspection: Better use more polite speech, but can't remember.

Learner 16 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 43%)

XYZ先生へ
まず、すみませんといわなければなりません。先週先生と宿題について丁約をしておりましたが友達は厳しく病気だから今病院に連れっております。この約束はまたケンソしていいでございますか。来週の月曜日の同じ時間で約束をしましょうか。すみません。

XYZ
31/5/95

XYZ SENSEI he
mazu, sumimasen to iwanakereba narimasen. SENSHUU SENSEI to SHUKUDAI ni tsuite TEIYAKU wo shite orimashitaga TOMODACHI wa KIBIshiku BYOOKI da kara IMA BYOUIN ni TSUrette arimasu. kono YAKUSOKU wa mata kenso shite ii degozaimasuka. RAISHUU no GETSUYOOBI no ONAji JIKAN de YAKUSOKU wo shimashooka. sumimasen.

XYZ
31/5/95

Introspection: Guessed a lot.

Learner 17 (L1 Korean, L2 English, C-test 58%)

XYZ先生へ、
今日、午後二時に、先生と約束がありますけど、急にびょういんへ行かなければならないことが出来ました。ひるごはんで食べたサシミが問題だったと思います。もうしわけありませんですが、別の日にお目にかかりたいです。私の電話番号は 838-3533 です。お時間があったら、私の家に電話させていただけませんか。午後四時後はいつでもいいです。とてもありがとうございました。
XYZより

追伸先生の電話番号を忘れてしまったのでどうもすみません。

XYZ SENSEI he,
KYOO, GOGO NIJIni, SENSEI to YAKUSOKU ga arimasu kedo, KYUU ni byooin he Ikanakereba naranai koto ga DEKImashita. hiru gohan de TAbeta sashimi ga MONDAI datta to OMOimasu. mooshi wake arimasen desuga, BETSU no HI ni oMEni kakaritai desu. WATASHI no DENWA BANGOO wa 838-3533 desu. o-JIKAN ga attara, WATASHI no IE ni DENWAsasete itadakemasenka. GOGO YOJI ATO wa itsudemo ii desu. totemo arigatoo gozaimashita.
XYZ yori

TSUISHIN SENSEI no DENWABANGOO wo WASUrete shimatta node doomo sumimasen.

Introspection: Tried to be polite because I feel sorry about missing the appointment.

Learner 18 (L1 Chinese, L2 English, C-test 31%)

先生へ、
　拝啓、お元気いらっしゃいますか。今日の約束はテストがありますから先生に会うできません。すみません。

敬具
学生：A
五月三十一日

SENSEI he,
　HAIKEI, o-GENKI irasshaimasuka. KYOO no YAKUSOKU wa tesuto ga arimasu kara SENSEI ni Audekimasen. sumimasen.

KEIGU
GAKUSEI: A
GOGATSUSANJUUICHINICHI

Introspection: I have no idea.

Learner 19 (L1 Czech, L2 English, C-test 25%)

先生に、
　すみませんが今日の会ぎへ行きません。お母さんはびょういんへいかなければなりません。私は私の家ぞくにばんごはんをりょうりしなければなりません。もーどう、すみません。私の電話ばんごは五六一の二四三一です。お電話をかけて下さいとつぎの会ぎをするできます。

しつれいしました、
どうもありがとうございました、
XYZから

SENSEI ni,
　sumimasenga KYOO no KAIgi he Ikimasen. oKAAsan wa byooin he ikanakereba narimasen. WATASHI wa WATASHI no KAzokuni ban gohan wo ryoori shinakereba narimasen. mo ichidoo, sumimasen. WATASHI no DENWA bango wa GOROKUICHI no NIYONSANICHI desu. o-DENWA wo kakete KUDAsai to tsugi no KAIgi wo suru dekimasu.

shitsurei shimashita,
doomo arigatoo gozaimashita,
XYZ kara

Introspection: Best to apologise several times to show that I mean it.

Learner 20 (L1 English, L2 German, C-test 37%)

XYZ先生に
　すみませんですけど今日のよやくは来ないです。大せつなものがありますのであいません。ざんねんです。
　しかしアイサインマントのけいけんについてせんせいに会いたいです。明日電話をします。ごめんなさい。

XYZより

XYZ SENSEI ni
sumimasen desu kedo yoyaku wa Konai desu. TAIsetsuna mono ga arimasu node aimasen. zannen desu.
shikashi aisainmanto no keiken ni tsuite sensei ni Aitai desu. ASHITA DENWA wo shimasu. gomen nasai.

XYZ yori

Introspection: None

Learner 21 (L1 English, L2 French, C-test 38%)

せんせいへ、
すみません。私はたいへんいそがしいです。でも、今日会うことができません。母はたいへんびょうきですが私はびょういんで行ったほうがいいです。来週もやくそくをしたいですけれども、私はさくぶんのせいせきはわるいですね。
どうも　　おねがいします。
XYZ

SENSEI he,
sumimasen. WATASHI wa taihen isogashii desu. demo, KYOO Au koto ga dekimasen. HAHA wa taihen byooki desuga WATASHI wa byooin de Itta hoo ga ii desu. RAISHUU mo yakusoku wo shitai desu keredomo, WATASHI wa sakubun no seiseki wa warui desu ne.
doomo　　onegaishimasu.
XYZ

Introspection: Wanted to be honest and polite, but don't know enough polite language.

Learner 22 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 37%)

先生:
今日、私はあなたの会うために行きません。じつは、けさでは、私の車のじこがあります。だから、それからけいさつに見に行きます。もうしわけもありません。(I'm terribly sorry)今はやく行ければいけません。
XYZ

SENSEI:
KYOO, WATASHI wa anata no Au tameni Ikimasen. jitsu wa, kesa dewa, WATASHI no KURUMA no jiko ga arimasu. dakara, sore kara keisatsu ni MIni Ikimasu. mooshi wakemo arimasen. (I'm terribly sorry) IMA hayaku Ikereba ikemasen.
XYZ

Introspection: Couldn't think of polite form for "I'm terribly sorry."

Learner 23 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 27%)

先生XYZへ、

ざんねんながら、今日のやくそくの二時には行きません。私はかぜをひきました。いしゃに行かなければなりません。ごめんなさい、しつれいします。

よりXYZ

SENSEI XYZ he,
zannen nagara, KYOO no yakusoku no NIJI niwa Ikimasen. WATASHI wa kaze wo hikimashita. issha ni Ikanakereba narimasen. gomen nsai, sitsureishimasu.

yori XYZ

Introspection: I'm not confident about this.

Learner 24 (L1 English, L2 Japanese, C-test 59%)

先生、しつれいします。

明日さいきんしょくどうをそうだんしません。理由は強いでございます。昨年私の友だちはこうつうじこうがあって今かなじょうの家にとまって、子どもを世話しています。一週間ぐらいかのじょうは病院にいると思っております。

しかし私のしょくどうも大へんだいじですが今週時間がありません。来週またそうだんしに会いませんか？

ありがとうございます。

XYZより

SENSEI, sitsurei shimasu.

ASHITA saikin shokudoo wo soodan shimasen. RIYUU wa TSUYOi degozaimasu. SAKUNEN WATASI no TOMOdachi wa kootsuu jikooga atte IMA kanajoo no IE ni tomatte, KOdomo wo SEWAshite imasu. ISSHUUKAN gurai kanajoo wa BYOOIN ni iru to OMOtte orimasu.

shikashi WATASHI no shokudoo mo TAIhen daiji desuga KONSHUU JIKAN ga arimasen. RAISHUU mata soodan shini Aimasenka?

arigatoo gozaimsu.

XYZ yori

Introspection: Tried to be clear about the reason.