Learners' Choice: Exploring Pragmatic Subjectivity Through Video

Rie Wakui

Aoyama Gakuin University

There has been an increasing emphasis in L2 pragmatics on the importance of instruction that would allow for learners' subjectivity (Nguyen, 2010). The aim of this classroom-based qualitative action research project was to look at adult learners who were given an opportunity to develop their pragmatic awareness while being informed of various options and to investigate how they reflected their subjectivity in making pragmatic choices. Shown a video clip, learners were exposed to authentic examples of the language of both native and nonnative English speakers and learned and applied strategies for making clarification requests. Discourse completion tests and discourse analysis demonstrated that the learners expressed their subjectivity in selecting the language that best matched their intentions. Deep involvement arising from the use of authentic materials seemed to help to create an environment for pragmatic use and led to the development of learners' pragmatic competence.

L2語用論において、学習者の主観性を考慮に入れた指導の重要性が注目されてきている（Nguyen, 2010）。この教室における質的アクションリサーチでは、成人学習者が多様な選択肢に触れることで語用論的意識を養い、語用論的選択を行うにあたりどのように主観性を反映させたかを調査した。学習者はビデオを視聴し、英語母語話者および非母語話者両方を含む実際の使用例に触れ、説明依頼におけるストラテジーを学び応用した。DCT（談話完成タスク）と談話分析により、学習者は主観性に基づき自分の意図に最も即した表現を選んだことがわかった。また、本物で信頼に足る教材を使用した学習への取り組みが語用論的使用の環境を生み、学習者の語用論的能力の向上に寄与したと考えられる。

Pragmatic competence allows speakers to express their intentions through speech acts in ways that are appropriate within a particular social and cultural context (Nguyen, 2010), and pragmatic competence in a second language has been recognized as an element that could be enhanced through instruction (Ishihara, 2009). However, emphasis on pragmatic issues in second language teaching is far from prevalent (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). The complexity of performing pragmatically appropriate speech acts is not reflected in the teaching nor in many of the language instructional books on speech acts, which fail to specify when and for what purposes an act is appropriate (Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004; Jiang, 2006; Nguyen, 2010). In order for students to be truly competent in a foreign language, understanding of and sensitivity to such sociocontextual factors as the nature of an interaction and the relationship between speakers is critical (Jiang, 2006). Instruction that incorporates this kind of emphasis is especially important in an EFL context in which students benefit little from second language input and interaction outside the classroom (Rose, 2005). In this vein, a pragmatics-focused lesson was designed and implemented, with the following aims:

1. to raise the students' awareness of the relationship between linguistic features and contextual factors; and

2. to investigate whether, how, (or both) the students arrived at their own decisions in making pragmatic choices.

Relevant Literature

According to the noticing hypothesis proposed by Schmidt (1993), attention to input is essential for learning. Furthermore, Schmidt distinguished between *noticing* as "registering the simple occurrence of some event" and *understanding*, which implies "recognition of a general principle, rule, or pattern" (p. 26). For the learning of pragmatics in a second language to take place, therefore, it is argued that attention to linguistic forms as well as awareness of functional meanings and the relevant contextual features is required (Schmidt, 1993). In order to increase attention and develop pragmatic competence, learners' analyses of discourse and inductive discovery of general principles has been encouraged (Crandall & Basturkmen, 2004; Murray, 2012). In Takimoto's (2008) study, the explicit knowledge developed by the learners through inductive treatment was more

accessible especially when it was conducted along with awareness-raising or structured input tasks.

The use of naturalistic input has also been emphasized as a means of raising awareness. LoCastro's (1997) pedagogical intervention sought to enhance learners' politeness strategies in group discussion—strategies such as requesting answers, directing the talk, and seeking (dis)agreement—by tape recording group discussions. The intervention, however, apparently failed to achieve significant effects in the learners' ability to produce situationally appropriate language behavior. LoCastro stressed the need for more extensive exposure to and experience with naturalistic target language input.

To help learners make pragmatic choices, there has been an increasing emphasis in L2 pragmatics on the importance of instruction that would allow for learners' subjectivity (Nguyen, 2010). The native speaker community is clearly not homogenous, and therefore a pedagogical approach focused only on a single native speaker model is not sufficient to meet learners' communicative needs in increasingly diversified contexts (Nguyen, 2010). For learners to be communicatively competent and efficient in culturally and linguistically diverse environments, their individuality and freedom of choice should be recognized and respected (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Nguyen, 2010). Learners need to be informed of the pragmatic options that are available in English while being given the freedom to express the individuality that corresponds with their beliefs and identities (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). Such pragmatic choices can be made through negotiation and the exercise of agency (Ishihara, 2009).

Methods
Participants
Two adult learners residing in the suburbs of Tokyo participated in the lesson—one male learner and one female learner, both in their mid 30s. The male student, pseudonym Dai, whose first language was Japanese, had studied English for 10 years. The female student, pseudonym Karina, whose first language was Polish, had also studied English for about 10 years in school and spent a year working in England. Oral proficiency levels were judged by the teacher/researcher to be intermediate (Dai) and advanced (Karina). Dai was an engineer working for a Japanese electronics manufacturer, and Karina was a former municipal officer dealing with immigrants and promoting ethnic integration; both hoped to improve their English for career advancement and opportunities. Both had had occasional experiences of attending face-to-face business conferences with foreign executives from countries including target L2 communities and others. Students in similar situations often emphasize the need to improve speaking skills by describing how they are not

able to participate in such meetings and conferences. One way that might allow them to do so effectively is to request clarification. This is a strategy that learners can employ to participate in a conversation and confirm their understanding (Nakatani, 2005). Because the speakers with whom the students had had contact came from varied communities, it was assumed that developing flexibility in assessing the context for pragmatic judgment and knowing appropriate ways to make requests for responses in the situations described above would provide them with more assurance.

Target Pragmatic Feature
Thus, making a clarification request was selected as the target pragmatic feature. A request sequence in English consists of three parts: alerters, the head act, and supportive moves (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; LoCastro, 1997). The lesson focused on three different syntactic, phrasal, and lexical combinations employed as alerters, three strategies employing different levels of directness, and use of tense and interrogatives (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989).

Instructional Treatments and Instruments
The two students took part in a 60-minute English language lesson focused on pragmatic use of requests for seeking clarification. Instruction was in English except for occasional instances when Dai had difficulty understanding metapragmatic information.

A set of materials was devised to encourage the learners to analyze authentic language and to focus their attention on contextual factors affecting the use of the speech act. The materials were intended to raise learner awareness of what kinds of requests are made and how they are made to whom. The materials were derived from Brown and Levinson's (1987) theoretical framework on politeness and adapted from a teaching approach in Ishihara and Cohen (2010). They included a video clip <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yChtop17sd8>.

Authentic materials were selected with the assumption that exposing learners to a variety of authentic instances of requests being made, based on the varying contextual factors and including both L2 and L1 English speakers, would develop their pragmatic sensitivity and allow them more freedom to choose the strategies and expressions that best matched their intentions. Use of authentic materials for pragmatics instruction was encouraged by Ishihara and Cohen (2010) and LoCastro (1997). Appendices A through E show the lesson procedure and samples of the teaching materials developed.

Data Collection Procedures

To confirm whether the students had developed a better understanding of clarification requests after using the materials, discourse completion tasks (DCTs) were used that required them to read four descriptions on the worksheets and write what they would say in English both before and after an analysis of and explicit instruction on the metapragmatic information realized by linguistic features. Students read and wrote their responses based on one new description at the end of the session. Analysis of written responses allowed both the teacher and learners to efficiently reflect on learners' projected oral language (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

The class was recorded and transcripts were made of the interactions utilizing conversation analysis (CA) in order to conduct a discourse analysis on whether or how the students selected pragmalinguistic features of their choosing. See Appendix F for CA symbols used in the transcription.

Findings

Subjective Assessment of Relationship

In working with Worksheet 1 (see Appendix B), when Dai was exploring his assessment of the relationship between himself and the listener who would receive his request, he exhibited a strong sense of self in how he viewed the listener. He seemed to prefer to view the listener (in this case, the guest speaker at a conference) as almost an equal despite the speaker's fame and position as chief executive officer of two multinational corporations. See Extract 1.

Extract 1

```
1   Dai     And uh: I eh: I'm also um business- eh business man?

2   T       Mhm?

3   Dai     So: that's uh (1) ((°nantsuno?°)) (what do you call it?) (2)
            just a business partner.=

4   T       =Mhm?

5   Dai     And a community and uh this time?

6   T       Mhm?=

7   Dai     =he's a leader? as main speaker.

8   T       Hm you mean (1) you- you too uh you would also have something to
            offer. to give.
```

```
9           (    ) back.

10  Dai     Oh yeah yeah?

11  T       Mhm.

12  Dai     Hm. if- if- uh: my situation like that >>da da da<< and uh (.)
            information exchange?=

13  T       Hmm,

14  Dai     It's a community maybe

15  T       Hmm,=

16  Dai     Hm. He also wants to need uh:: he- he needs more information,
```

When asked to determine the power relationship between himself and the listener, Dai demonstrated his negative personal attitude towards the concept. See Extract 2.

Extract 2

```
1   Dai     This question?

2   T       Mhm?

3   Dai     I don't like that,

4   T       Mhm?=

5   Dai     ↑But

6   T       Mhm?

7   Dai     Uh:m (1) respect or not? It's like, I can understand.

8   T       Mhm?

9   Dai     But society level? (.) feeling? even if feeling, (.) cannot say
            it easily.

10  T       °Mhm°=

11  Dai     =Because uh: so ((ahem)) for example farmers? generated
            vegetable or ne? I respect

12          them. (1)

13          Society level? is same. I think same.

14  T       Okay?

15  Dai     But business men? Society level high? (1) You think so?
```

```
16   T        I ↑uh you mean you mean d [the:
17   Dai                               [Workers, manager, ]
18   T        Uh huh?
19   Dai      How do you feel. Manager is high?
20   T        Mhm,
21   Dai      Worker is down?
22   T        Umm:
23   Dai      How do you feel.
24   T        Umm:=
25   Dai      =You can say?
```

Dai finally arrived at his own decision as to how he would like to view the listener based on his interpretation of the difference between the two and rated the listener's position very high compared to his own. See Extract 3.

Extract 3

```
1    Dai      But he- uh he still wants to know more culture, he wants to
              study more culture or human
2             it means highest. For me compared with me he's highest because
              uh (.) uh I got a feeling
3    T        Hm.
4    Dai      he wants more um: that emotion maybe (.) uh (1) ((°nantsuno°))
              (what do you call it) passion?
5    T        Mhm?=
6    Dai      His passion?
7    T        Mhm.
8    Dai      is stronger stronger than me.
9    T        Mhm?
10   Dai      (  ) that's why
11   T        Oh okay you respect him=
12   Dai      =keeping try to know more?
```

```
13   T        Mhm?
14   Dai      Hm that passion is stronger than me that's why high highest,
```

Karina also seemed to incorporate the subjective impression she got of the listener from watching him actually speak and behave, instead of merely considering his fame and job title, in deciding how close she felt towards him. See Extract 4.

Extract 4

```
1    Karina   He's sitting just you know like that and he wants to talk and he
              wants to you know shared his
2             experience he wants to probably e:h know from the you know from
              the people questions or
3             something=
4    T        =Mhm?=
5    Karina   =>>It's like you know he behaves like<< .h friendly.
6    T        Mhm?
7    Karina   You know this is [like uh uh
8    Dai                       [A:::h        ]
9    Karina   he wants you to feel he knows he's a guest he's ((ichiban)) (the
              most important) right now
10            but he wants you to feel?
11   T        Mhm?
12   Karina   like u:m (1) like it's not a- it's not- it's not a meeting like
              he's here and you are uh sit over here.
13            He wants you to feel [uh we are same. Yeah?
```

On Worksheet 2 (see Appendix C), despite the high rating the participants gave to formality because of the respect they mentioned they had for the listener, both students spoke and wrote syntactic and lexical items that matched a lower level of formality:

```
Dai:     Excuse me, can I ask you question about what Nissan and Renault
         are planning in your country, Brazil, as possible as you can
```

say? Can I listen?

Karina: Excuse me, Mr. Ghosn, what do you think about the situation in Brazil and what Nissan and Renault have planned for the country?

Noticing the Gap and Making a Choice

As soon as the students finished reading the script of the video clip, Karina noticed the gap between her initial responses and how Speaker C used alerters in starting requests for answers in his self-introduction. See Extract 5.

Extract 5

1	Karina	I like him? He introduced himself huh, we didn't.
2	T	Mhm? Which one?
3	Karina	Brandon? He said second year? MBA? We didn't say-
4	T	Hmm okay
5	Karina	introduce

Karina then went on to clearly state her preference for such use. See Extract 6.

Extract 6

1	Karina	He introduced himself. And he said his name we should we should have said for example
2		that eh Dai Sakai BMI Tokyo.
3	T	So you like that- that (2) with a greeting? Without a greeting? [Um]
4	Karina	[With.]

In examining the relationship between linguistic items and contextual factors using Worksheet 3, after the teacher's explicit instruction on the use of the items, both participants seemed to be able to judge the nuances of each item fairly correctly by assessing the assumed intentions of the speakers.

Need for Realistic Contexts

Finally when working on Worksheet 4 (see Appendix E) to practice applying the use of the newly learned information in a different but similar hypothetical business context, Karina strongly maintained that she would not be able to consider contextual forces to determine which linguistic items to use unless she knew exactly to whom she was speaking. Her reactions seemed to vary greatly and she described how she rated the perceived distance between herself and the guest speaker based on her subjective and holistic impressions of the individual, not merely the person's position. See Extract 7.

Extract 7

1	Karina	I know but depends on the person cannot uh ((*choto wakannai*)) (I don't really know)
2		if I don't know the person you know?
3	T	Hmm[mmm)
4	Karina	[That's why I'm asking the person.]
5	T	[Hmmm. I see.]
6	Karina	I cannot u:h hmm behave [[(.) same.]
7	T	[A::h]
8	Karina	[U:m °um° °um°]
9	T	[You can] (1) visualize (.) or imagine.
10	Karina	Depends on person you know so then I know how I behave
11	T	↑Okay then maybe it would be easier with-=
12	Karina	=For example if you say that Kim Jong-un ne? so then I can judge.=
13	T	=A:::h.=
14	Karina	If you say for example Barack Obama I can say (.) like a person=
15	T	=Hmmm=
16	Karina	You know? with a name. With "the chair" I cannot answer?
17	T	Hmmm
18	Karina	I need a name?

Because Karina could not imagine a particular person who would fit the category, we decided to continue using the same guest speaker to practice using the items that matched the intention of the participants. This time, both srudents wrote an alerter with a rather extensive self-introduction by emulating the third speaker in the video clip.

```
Dai:      Hi thank you for your time. Dai Sakai. Belongs to BMI. Yokohama
          factory technical engineering department. Could I ask a question
          about …
Karina:   Good afternoon, Mr. Ghosn. My name is Karina Oleski, Marshal
          Office, Poland. What do you think about…? Thank you.
```

Raised Awareness

Dai's explanation for why he selected the language for the request seemed to indicate his new understanding of the relationship between usage and intention. See Extract 8.

Extract 8

```
1   Dai    U:h I read ne? and uh (  ) sounds good and uh ( ) first "thank
           you for your time" because I resp-
2          u:h (.) I respect mm him? And uh I found how to express respect.
           ( )? That's why I choose
3   T      Hm.
4   Dai    Hm
5   T      Sounds [great.]
6   Dai           [I feel like a gentleman?]
7   T      Hmm. Okay.
8   Dai    First ((arigato)) (thank you). Second uh um about uh about me.
           And then start question.
9   T      °Mhm°
10  Dai    And the: could- could- past things? I learned? That's why I
           chose "can I" o:r from "can I"?
           to "could I",=
11  T      A::h okay. ah that's-=
```

```
12  Dai    =So the point is that I learned respectivity? (1) uh how to
           respect.
13  T      Yeah yeah.
14  Dai    That's why I change
```

Discussion

This classroom-based research project was an attempt to raise the students' awareness of the links between linguistic features and contextual factors and to examine whether or how the students reflected their subjectivity in making pragmatic choices. The results of the DCTs, recordings, and ratings on the handouts all seemed to suggest that both participants became aware of various factors influencing the choice of linguistic items, and in the process they both clearly demonstrated their own individuality in evaluating the situations and selecting the language that best matched their intentions. More significantly, however, the results seem to point to the complexity of the effect of contextual factors on pragmatic use of the language, the powerful influence of noticing and inductive learning, and the need for instruction and practice in pragmatics.

The recordings of the participants' reactions and responses to the examination of contextual factors seem to indicate that a variety of subtle features concerning the listener may affect the subjective decisions of the speaker and that the scenarios for the DCTs have to be very specific and personal in order to accurately elicit the response that aligns most closely with the speaker's intention and for the practice in pragmatic usage to be truly effective.

The use of self-introduction as a signal for this particular pragmatic routine seemed to leave the strongest impression on the learners, which may have been due to the way it was noticed. This was the only pattern the learners inductively noticed as common in most of the speakers' questions. The rest of the items were explained by the teacher in a deductive manner. This result seems to reinforce the findings of Takimoto (2008) and Crandall and Basturkmen (2004) and to confirm the argument that pragmatic knowledge, when gained inductively through communicative interaction and generalizations made from it, may last longer and be easier to access (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Schmidt, 1993; Takimoto, 2008).

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

As this action research project was qualitative and conducted on a very small number of students, the results are not generalizable. Investigation of subjectivity with a larger

number of learners may reveal more general tendencies in learners' choices. Also, more time spent on deeper analysis of the pragmalinguistic features in focus may help confirm the positive effect of inductive instruction. Furthermore, more specifically designed DCTs may generate better facilitation of the usage in question, and more extensive practice for production may bear clearer signs of development in pragmatic competence.

Pedagogical Implications

Throughout the lesson, as the recordings showed, both participants clearly exercised their agency and reflected their subjectivity in interpreting the relationship, determining their attitude toward the listener, and selecting language. Even through very limited exposure, they established their sense of self in relation to the simulated interlocutor and imagined "a community" in which both the learner and the imagined interlocutor on the screen could "exchange ideas," to borrow Dai's words. Ishihara (2009) has also argued that learners express subjectivity in a foreign language context. For this to occur, the participants needed to reflect on how they related to the person and how imposing the content of the question might be for the listener. It seemed that both the vivid image and knowledge of the person as well as deeper processing of the information in combination helped to create a more realistic experience for these learners in pragmatic use of the language. This agrees with the conclusion drawn by Takimoto (2008). Thus although more practice for production may be needed, it may be equally as important for learners to immerse themselves in the experience of making pragmatic decisions before the practice becomes truly effective in developing pragmatic competence.

Conclusion

The primary purposes of the activities described here were to (a) raise learners' awareness of the interplay of contextual factors and choice of language items in a context familiar to the learners for their second language use and (b) explore the extent to which the learners expressed their own subjectivity and exercised agency in choosing the language that would most appropriately demonstrate their intentions. The findings indicated positive evidence in both areas. This suggests that many subtle factors may be at play when considering pragmatic choice and that inductive instruction seems to have a strong impact on learning. The overall implication of the outcome of this study is that deeper reflection and involvement using authentic materials lead to further development of learners' pragmatic competence.

Bio Data

Rie Wakui is currently teaching English at Aoyama Gakuin University, Toyo Eiwa University, and Nichibei Kaiwa Gakuin. She holds an MA in TESOL from Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research interests include pragmatics and teaching English as an international language. <rie0302@gmail.com>

References

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

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

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

Crandall, E., & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal, 58,* 38-49.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal, 59,* 199-208.

Ishihara, N. (2009). Teacher-based assessment for foreign language pragmatics. *TESOL Quarterly, 43,* 445-470.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Jiang, X. (2006). Suggestions: What should ESL students know? *System, 34,* 36-54.

LoCastro, V. (1997). Pedagogical intervention and pragmatic competence development. *Applied Language Learning, 8,* 75-109.

Murray, N. (2012). English as a lingua franca and the development of pragmatic competence. *ELT Journal, 66,* 318-326.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal, 89,* 76-91.

Nguyen, M. T. T. (2010). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? *RELC Journal, 42,* 1-14.

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System, 33,* 385-399.

Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning, and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the development of language learners' pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 92,* 369-386.

Appendix A
Lesson Procedure
Assessing the Context

Ask learners to read the description on Worksheet 1 and play the video (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yChtop17sd8) from 0:27 to 02:07. Play it one more time with the subtitles if necessary. After viewing the video, ask them to work in groups on the questions on the worksheet. Learners assess how high or low they feel their social status is compared to Mr. Ghosn and how close or distant they feel toward him.

Producing Oral and Written Inquiries

Ask learners to work individually on Question 1 on Worksheet 2 and produce oral and written questions individually in the way they would ask in the given context to elicit the information described. Collect the worksheets at the end of the lesson so that their production can be compared to the one made at the end of the lesson for the analysis and assessment of learners' pragmatic awareness of question-asking strategies employed.

Reflecting on Language Use

Ask learners to individually answer Questions 2 and 3 on Worksheet 2 and to share their written questions and answers in groups. Learners discuss the reasons for the choice of particular language and how they want it to sound.

Collecting Authentic Data

Play the video clip again and show where participants ask questions to Mr. Ghosn. Segment A is from 31:15 to 31:43, segment B is from 33:05 to 33:41, segment C is from 36:38 to 36:58, and segment D is from 47:05 to 47:33. Ask learners to fill in the blanks on Worksheet 3. Show the subtitles if necessary.

Assessing Language Use in the Authentic Data

Provide the answer key (in Appendix D) for confirmation to the blanks in Worksheet 3 and explicit instruction on pragmalinguistic contextual factors that affect differences in the phrases used.

Work as a class on question Items 2 and 3 on Worksheet 3, provide explicit instruction on use of language features that correspond with the contextual factors, and discuss how the sequences of question asking are presented.

Choosing Expressions

At the end of the second lesson, ask learners to work on the questions on Worksheet 4 and to consider choosing the attitude they wish to assume. Have learners orally produce questions based on that attitude and present them to the class as if they were asking the questions to the chair person, and play some of his response on the video from 50:22.

Ask them to write their responses on the sheet. Collect the responses and examine them for analysis of any change in language use compared to initial responses.

Appendix B
Student Worksheet 1

Read the following before viewing the video:

You are attending a conference where Carlos Ghosn, chairman and CEO of the Nissan-Renault Alliance, based in both Japan and France, is giving a talk. He was born in Brazil to Lebanese parents, grew up in Brazil, was educated in French schools in Lebanon and France, and spent his early career in Europe, South and North Americas. He speaks French, Portuguese, English, and Arabic fluently and has studied Japanese. The interview is being conducted in a room with about 100 people. While watching his interview, pay attention to what he says and how he moves and speaks.

Discuss the following questions with your partner.

a.   What is the relationship between you and Mr. Ghosn in this situation?

b.   How high or low do you <u>feel</u> Mr. Ghosn's social status is as compared to yours in this situation?

Status   Low   1   2   3   4   5   High

Why do you feel that way?

c. How close or distant do you <u>feel</u> towards Mr. Ghosn in this situation?

    Distance   Close   1   2   3   4   5   Distant

    Why do you feel that way?

Appendix C
Student Worksheet 2

Information you would like to obtain: You would like to know what Mr. Ghosn thinks about the situation in Brazil (his home country) and what Nissan and Renault have planned for the country.

1. In addition to the feelings you had about status and distance, think about how difficult the question may be to answer for Mr. Ghosn. Explain why.

    Difficulty   Minor   1   2   3   4   5   Major

2. How do you want your question to sound and why?

    Formality   Informal   1   2   3   4   5   Formal

3. How would you ask a question to Mr. Ghosn to obtain the information above?

Appendix D
Student Worksheet 3

a. (   ). (   ) Igor... Umm, I am from Brazil and I would like to...
(   ) the country and what Nissan and Renault have planned for the country.

    1. Fill in the blanks by paying attention to the language the speaker uses.

    2. How do you assess the speaker's relationship with Mr. Ghosn and the question's difficulty for Mr. Ghons? Explain why.

        Status   Low   1   2   3   4   5   High

        Distance   Close   1   2   3   4   5   Distant

        Difficulty   Minor   1   2   3   4   5   Major

    3. How does the question sound to you and why?

        Formality   Informal   1   2   3   4   5   Formal

    (The format of Item a was used for all the items in the worksheet.)

b. Umm, so we talked... and (   ) what's the indications that... We've seen a number of Chinese companies acquire assets, umm, and form brands and (   )? (   ) it will be successful or not?

c. (   ). Brandon Nolstien, second year MBA, Joint North Engineering School... (   ) talk a little bit about that and how you see green cars in the future?

d. (   )...(   ) an effective choice in this alliance?

Answer Key

a. (Hi, thanks, Carlos, for being here).
(My name is)
(I would like to)
(I'd love to hear your perspective about)

b. (I'm wondering)
(what's your view)
(Do you think)

c. (Hi, thank you for your time)
(I was wondering if you could)

d. (Good afternoon. Good afternoon)
(Why has that been)

Appendix E
Student Worksheet 4

You are working for a multinational corporation. You are at a regional conference in Asia conducted by your group companies.

Information you would like to obtain: You would like to know what the chair thinks about the role of the government and how it might affect the industry in various countries.

1. How do you assess your relationship with the chair and the question's difficulty for him/her?

Status	Low	1	2	3	4	5	High
Distance	Close	1	2	3	4	5	Distant
Difficulty	Minor	1	2	3	4	5	Major

2. How do you want your question to sound and why?

Formality	Informal	1	2	3	4	5	Formal

3. How would you ask a question to the chair to obtain the information above?

Appendix F
CA Transcription Symbols

Symbol	Description
.	(period) Falling intonation
?	(question mark) Rising intonation
,	(comma) Continuing intonation
–	(hyphen) Marks an abrupt cut-off
::	(colon(s)) Prolonging of sound
wo:rd	(colon after underlined letter) Falling intonation on word
wo:rd	(underlined colon) Rising intonation on word
word	(underlining) Stress on word
word	The more underlying, the greater the stress
°word°	(degree symbols) Quiet speech
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch
>>word<<	(more than and less than) Quicker speech
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) Inhalation
[ ]	(brackets) simultaneous or overlapping speech
[ ]	
=	(equal sign) Latch or contiguous utterances
(2)	(number in parentheses) Length of a silence in seconds
(.)	(period in parentheses) Micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
( )	(empty parentheses) Nontranscribable segment of talk
(word)	(words in parentheses) English translation
((gazing left))	(double parentheses) Description of nonspeech activity
$word$	(dollar signs) Smiley voice