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In this Issue

Articles

We are pleased to publish four articles in this issue of JALT Journal. We open with a contribution from Neil Cowie and Keiko Sakui. Their paper adds a new perspective to motivation research with its dual focus on how teachers perceive student motivation and the influential role of teacher identities in shaping motivational strategies. In our second feature article, a CA study, Hanh thi Nguyen and Noriko Ishitobi compare language used in authentic fast-food ordering transactions with that presented in typical EFL textbook dialogs. The study represents a practical application of Conversation Analysis with important implications for classroom teachers and materials writers. In the third article, Wai-lan Tsang and Yuk Yeung report on the ongoing compilation of a learner database of written and spoken output from intermediate Mandarin learners. This study is a welcome addition to existing learner corpus resources. In the fourth article, a Japanese-language contribution, Hideki Sakai and Junichi Wada analyze junior high school English textbooks in terms of genre and text types. Based on findings from their study, suggestions are offered for how teachers can more effectively use different genre and text types.

Reviews

From the Editor

Publication of this November issue marks my last as Editor of *JALT Journal*. It has been a privilege to serve the JALT organization in this capacity. Upon the publication of each of my five issues as Editor, I have used this space to express thanks to the standing members of the Editorial Advisory Board and additional readers who referee submissions with just the right blend of scholarly expertise, sensitive criticism, and peer encouragement. When I look back over these five issues, I think first of these EAB members and readers who have given greatly of their time to help *JALT Journal* publish high quality research. On behalf of all the submitting authors who have benefitted from the hours and hours spent on their work by the many dedicated *JALT Journal* peer readers, I salute you. Collectively, you make the journal what it is. Heartfelt thanks as well to Aleda Krause and her journal production team—they have saved my skin more than once. Their tireless work on each issue helps to produce a journal that makes the whole JALT organization proud.

With this issue of *JALT Journal*, we welcome Hidetoshi Saito to the Editorial Advisory Board. He is based at Ibaraki University and will bring further specialization in language testing and assessment to the Board. We bid farewell to two long-serving members of the EAB. Aek Phakiti has been an EAB member since 2003 and has been valued for his expertise in quantitative research methods. Tim Riney has served *JALT Journal* for some 20 years and we will miss being able to rely on his expertise in phonology and pronunciation. Best wishes to you both.

Finally, I am pleased to announce that *JALT Journal* has recently become a member of the Committee of Publication Ethics (COPE). Membership in COPE will help us to maintain the highest possible standards of publication ethics.

*Darren Lingley*
Three Tales of Language Teacher Identity and Student Motivation

Neil Cowie  
*Okayama University*  
Keiko Sakui  
*Kobe Shoin Women’s University*

In this study we investigated how EFL teachers perceive student motivation and how their teacher identities influence their strategies to motivate students. The results of in-depth interviews with three Japan-based EFL teachers suggest that they have a complex understanding of learner motivation, which they formulate by amalgamating accepted motivation theories and their own experiences and observations about their students. The teachers recognize their own impact on influencing learner motivation but they also acknowledge their limitations. The strategies that the teachers use to motivate their students vary according to their experience, beliefs, and local contextual factors. We discuss implications for further motivation research as well as classroom practice.
Learning a foreign language is a difficult and challenging process and to keep studying, make progress, and sustain their enthusiasm students need to have high levels of motivation. In order to help students, many different kinds of practical motivational strategies are available that have been recommended for teachers to use both in and outside their classrooms (Dörnyei, 2001a, 2001b; Oxford, 1990). From a theoretical perspective, researchers have long been investigating student motivation to learn languages and have studied it from a wide variety of approaches. These, amongst others, have included social psychological (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972), cognitive-situated (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 2005; Ushioda, 2003; Williams & Burden, 1997), feminist and post-structuralist (Norton, 2000), and more recently, self and identity (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009).

Such approaches to motivation research and strategy use have tended to focus on students and their learning processes, but published research into how teachers themselves look at how and why they go about motivating their students is relatively scarce (Sakui & Cowie, 2011). This is an important omission because teachers’ motivational practices can play a critical role in influencing their students (Brophy, 2010; Dörnyei, 2005; Falout, Elwood, & Hood, 2009). Two studies in EFL contexts that focus on teacher practices are those carried out by Dörnyei and Cziser (1998) and Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008). In the first study, Dörnyei and Cziser identified a list of what they termed the “Ten Commandments” or 10 key strategies that EFL teachers in Hungary believed were most essential for student motivation. These include setting a personal example, creating a pleasant atmosphere, and presenting tasks properly. In the second study, carried out in South Korea, Guilloteaux and Dörnyei found a positive link between teachers’ general motivational practices and students’ reported motivation levels.

These two studies are useful to identify practical strategies that teachers can adopt and provide additional evidence that strategies can influence students. However, such research is relatively general in nature and has a tendency to “ignore[e] the realities of teachers’ lives both inside and outside of the classroom” (Simon-Maeda, 2004, p. 406). In other words, research on teacher knowledge of student motivation does not take much account of how individual teachers are affected by their experiences and beliefs as well as by local contextual factors and the wider socio-cultural milieu. Recent approaches to studies of teacher knowledge have gradually moved away from the idea that teachers are objects of study as sources of good or bad teaching. Instead teacher knowledge is increasingly recognised as socially
constructed and as being continually reworked through experience and reflection (Johnson & Golombek, 2002). It has been claimed for some time that teachers express this “personal practical knowledge” through the telling of stories or narratives about their lives (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986) and an ever-increasing number of narrative-based articles and anthologies from the education field are appearing in print. Narratives of English language teachers, too, have begun to emerge (for example, Casanave & Schecter, 1997; Johnson & Golombek, 2002; Kalaja, Menezes, & Barcelos, 2008; Kiernan, 2010; Simon-Maeda, 2004).¹

These publications reflect the fact that narrative inquiry is becoming an effective method for showing how teachers construct their professional knowledge and a way for teachers’ voices to be included in research agendas. One particular focus of such research is that of teacher identity (Beijgaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Lasky, 2005; Watson, 2006) and its strong connection with teacher-student relationships (Morgan, 2004; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005; Vásquez, 2011). By extension a teacher’s identity exerts a strong influence on the way in which that teacher will or will not attempt to motivate students.

Identity, from a poststructuralist perspective, is viewed as having a large number of components and aspects—it is multiple, conflicting, ever-changing, and created both by individuals and by the society they live in. For this study we adopt Giddens’s (1991) view of identity as an ongoing life narrative in which individuals constantly reconcile their self with the past, present, and future. Individual identity formation also takes place within social structures. One way to frame this for teachers is through a “communities of practice” approach (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in which teacher learning takes place through a sharing of understandings about what they do and what this means within a teaching community (p. 98). Varghese et al. (2005) suggest that learning to be a teacher is a process of identity formation in which different teachers have “different ways of being and engaging” (p. 29). In other words, teacher knowledge can be understood and expressed by teachers in many different ways as a result of differing identity development.

This study, therefore, investigates the following two research questions:

1. What perspectives do teachers have on student motivation and what strategies do they report that they use?
2. How do teacher identities influence the approaches teachers have to motivating their students?
The Study

Participants and Context

At this juncture we would like to introduce our own perspective into the study. We have dual identities as both outsider researchers and insider EFL teachers. We are outsiders in the sense that we aim to objectively research what knowledge EFL teachers have of student motivation and what practices they adopt to influence that motivation, but at the same time we are personally involved with the topic of student motivation as we are both practising EFL teachers. In our own classes at the two Japanese universities where we work we have taught students who were clearly not motivated to study English; in fact, they were resistant to learning English. This resistance inspired us to try different strategies to motivate our students; for one of us these strategies were successful and for the other, less so. We reported on these experiences in Sakui and Cowie (2008). We obtained our research data from a written survey of 32 Japan-based experienced EFL university teachers (see Appendix for the questions the teachers were asked). The participants were from six different countries, 25 had a master’s degree and seven a PhD, their average age was 46, and nearly 68% of them had over 11 years of university teaching experience.

Following a careful examination of this initial survey data (reported in Cowie & Sakui, 2011), we chose to carry out follow-up interviews with three of the teachers. What was particularly illuminating was how the three teachers could add so much more depth to the information uncovered by the survey. It became clear that their perceptions of student motivation and strategies that teachers use result from, and are embedded in, a complex web of personal and contextual factors. These are factors which are part of each teacher’s identity, and which in turn are uncovered through talk about teaching. The current study, therefore, focuses on the interviews with the three teachers. Although all are working in the same regional city in Japan, the teachers were recruited purposefully (Spradley 1979) to mirror a variety of characteristics of EFL teachers in the specific context of Japanese universities: male and female, full- and part-time, working at public and private universities, and both native and nonnative English speakers.

Method

Each of the three teachers was interviewed jointly by the authors. The 90-minute interviews were semi-structured with questions reflecting issues that had arisen during the previous survey. These included questions on the
participants’ knowledge of motivation theories, student autonomy, strategy use by teachers, and teacher identity, as well as their experience of dealing with resistant students. In order to illustrate these issues the teachers were encouraged to share their stories about individual students and classes as well as their other personal experiences. As interviewers we contributed to a co-construction of these narratives, particularly as our own work as EFL teachers allowed us a familiarity with the general teaching context of each participant and meant that we could relate to them. We are aware of the dangers of researching one’s own culture (Wolcott, 1994) but claim that our insider position encouraged the teacher participants to talk and reveal their “hidden stories” (Holvino, 2010, p. 263) in a sincere and open manner. At the same time our outsider research stance helped to maintain a distance and lend objectivity to our views of the participants’ experiences and stories.

The resulting 66 pages of interview transcriptions were analysed paradigmatically (after Bruner, 1985), a process in which categories were imposed on the data through content analysis (Manning & Cullum-Swan, 1994). In practice this meant that each author individually read and reread the interview transcriptions and placed extracts from the interviews into a gradually evolving table of categories or classes. Examples of such categories included goal setting, personal relations with students, and teaching style. The authors then jointly identified key themes (after Riessman, 2008) relating to the two research questions.

In the following sections each of the three participants (David, Alan, and Noriko—all pseudonyms) and their teaching contexts are briefly described. This is followed by details of their different motivation strategies and their claimed teacher identities, illustrated by excerpts from the interviews; the page numbers are from the transcriptions. There are also a small number of extracts from the participants’ original written survey answers. The subsequent discussion section provides commentary on issues that are raised in the “teacher tales” section.

Teacher Tales

One of the constraints and ironies of a qualitative paper is that there is often little room for the voices of participants. Researchers carefully select quotations from interviews or surveys to support their ideas but readers often do not “get to know” the person from whom the quotation has come from. We are aware of this limitation but would like to try, in this section, to give some background to our teacher-participants and give them a voice
in this paper, admittedly still limited. The tales that these teachers tell are focused on motivation strategies and teacher identity. These have been separated for ease of analysis but they overlap considerably. Themes that emerge include teacher decisions about whether it is their responsibility to motivate students and over what time frame, to what extent the teachers could or should try to create a personal relationship with students, and the different tensions involved in being either a native or nonnative speaker.

**David**

David is a 45-year-old Canadian who has been working as a full-time teacher in a provincial Japanese public university for over 10 years. David has two master’s degrees; his first is in history and his second is in applied linguistics. He teaches a variety of classes including general EFL, comparative culture, and intercultural communication. His smallest classes have fewer than 10 students and the largest have about 40. As many of these students specialize in English but some take it as a compulsory credit, one may expect that their interest in English varies considerably. At the time of the interview David also had some part-time work at a technical college teaching general conversational English. According to David, the students at this college were not motivated to study and he expressed some irritation with them as they “just snub their noses at you” (p. 6).

**Motivation Strategies**

David told us that he was not comfortable with the idea of having to motivate students as he believes that “the final responsibility lies with the student” (survey). However, if he perceives students as already being motivated then he will respond to them with enthusiasm. He will share with them his high expectations, will frequently compliment them, and will refrain from criticism. David tries to identify what he terms “pre-existing motivational dispositions” (survey) in students and help them to sustain and nurture what they are already good at or interested in. In contrast, David also described how many students, even very talented ones, have a kind of superficial or false motivation in that they say they want to do well but they do not actually want to work hard enough to succeed:

They are more comfortable in a teacher-fronted situation where, as long as I’m using English . . . and they are listening to me and they are happy. They prefer that and the reason why they don’t
want to do group work is either that [they're] self-conscious or they can't get their English corrected or they feel that the other students don't understand them. Or they are not expressing themselves as well as they can so . . . I find there is a kind of a backlash against group work, with my students . . . so basically students [are] saying “I want to use English” but then not doing it in the class as much as we . . . would like. (p. 4)

In brief, David responds very positively to students who he believes are already motivated but less positively to those who he perceives are not motivated. He has some conflicting feelings about this as he admits that a “real” teacher would try to motivate all students:

A teacher should desire to switch on everybody. I'm not . . . what I’m saying is [it’s] impossible for a teacher to reach everybody but I think a teacher should, I mean a real teacher in the teaching teacher sense should enjoy reaching those students down here and get satisfaction from that. We're talking about teacher motivation [rather] than student motivation. (p. 14)

David’s image of motivated students derives from teaching previous students who epitomise what a motivated student does by their observable actions. One of these students was called Kaori. David initially did not want her to join the upper intermediate class that he was teaching but she showed through her hard work over time that she could improve enormously:

Her level wasn’t nearly as good as the other students. She talked her way into the course and she really performed well and tried hard and I could see . . . what she was trying to do . . . she went abroad for a couple of months and then she joined my seminar and by the time she graduated she was, at the end of the 4th year she was, she had improved so much through her hard work. (p. 7)

However, David admitted that it was not fair to judge motivation through external actions alone:

Sometimes it’s difficult for me to see the motivation. Sometimes because my Japanese is not that great and I only teach in English. And so I could have a very quiet Japanese girl in my class, for example, who I think is not motivated but she might
be very motivated but what she wants to get is not happening in my class. (p. 7)

Identity

David talked about several identities that he holds in relation to his students, each of which has a slightly different influence on his motivational style. David described himself as having been a language teacher for 10 years but he felt that he had been playing this role without any real training in language teaching. Instead he saw himself as a culture teacher:

I don’t really identify as a language teacher; I identify as a culture teacher. So a lot of what I do is talking about cultural things in English. (p. 10)

Some examples of these cultural things that David mentioned include teaching about the topics of gender and adoption of children and various systems such as education. David’s non-identification as a language teacher conflicts with his motivated students who he believes “want practical language training” (p. 16). A further source of tension for David is his self-image that he is not a good language learner; he mentioned learning French in Canada and Japanese in Japan. He thinks it is strange that a self-confessed poor language learner should be urging others to learn.

David is also very conscious that he is a native speaker of English and as such is markedly different from his students. To bridge this difference he tries to encourage closer relationships with his students by trying to spend time with them outside of class. He mentioned activities such as going caving, having barbecues, or drinking coffee together. Inside the classroom, a further way that he tries to encourage closeness is to talk about himself and his family. David shows that he is willing to share his vulnerability about language learning to his students and is confident that it is safe to talk about himself in English, even though the students do not always appear to reciprocate this:

David: Yeah. I talk about a lot about my family and they are very interested in how I raise my kids and how I met my wife and what international marriages are like and what are the problems. I’m very, very open about myself, frustratingly so because I hope that they, by doing so they would be more open with me but I usually find myself in a situation where I’m sharing too much about myself and they’re not giving back.
Sakui (researcher): Don’t you feel vulnerable? Opening up your . . .

David: No, no, no, no, but I mean I told, I told the, my students, you know, we talk about divorce and my kids that . . . my mother and father got divorced when I was in high school and they seemed very shocked that I would tell them something like that. Or that my father drank too much, or you know. I don’t feel vulnerable I quite like it. . . . Might feel more vulnerable if it was back in my own country but I quite like it here. (p. 11)

David uses his personal life as a springboard in lessons to encourage students to talk. This is his personal strategy but he claims he is responding to the expectations of some students who want native-speaker teachers to reveal something of themselves.

Alan

Alan is an American in his early 30s who has been teaching at the university level for almost 5 years. At the time of the interview he was just completing a master’s in applied linguistics by distance learning from a UK university. He teaches part-time at several different institutions, which is a common situation for many EFL teachers in Japan (Cowie, 2011). These institutions include a juku or cram school, a public university, and a private university. Alan felt that a number of the juku students were very motivated to learn, as they want to study abroad. He related several stories about these students and the kinds of behaviours that they show, which he termed intrinsic motivation. In contrast, Alan claimed that other students want to pass the tests that they have to take and he labelled this as extrinsic motivation. Alan’s hope for such students when taking his lessons is that they can care for English beyond the immediate concerns of the tests that they have to take. Alan teaches general conversational English, writing, listening, and various international exam courses such as TOEFL and TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) as well as the Japan-based test called Eiken. The average number of students in a class is 15.

Motivation Strategies

Alan does think that he can influence student motivation in the sense of giving students reasons to learn and providing supportive classroom condi-
tions which will help them learn; but in essence he believes that the students themselves must decide whether to learn or not. Alan provides supportive conditions mainly by focusing on good personal relationships with students and using interesting materials wherever possible. Alan believes that in this way he can provide temporal motivation only for the duration of his instruction (typically for one 3-month semester). He recognises the reality that many students will probably never need English in their future lives in Japan, but he hopes that he can motivate them to study during the short time that he teaches them:

To be completely honest a lot of students who never leave Japan never want to leave Japan and never want to work anywhere else aren't too likely to need English in their working lives especially here . . . . Yeah it will be great if they did but if they really aren't interested and never want to use it and just want to hunker down in their home country then there is only so much you can do I think, to motivate them. Just temporal motivation really, it’s not going to be long term. (p. 6)

One way in which Alan tries to support temporal motivation is to create a pleasant atmosphere by showing a personal interest in students’ lives. By remembering students’ individual stories and referring to them in subsequent lessons he can make the students more positive about study. Alan also encourages a helpful atmosphere by giving students opportunities to experience success and praising them often. Some of Alan’s other motivational strategies include encouraging peer teaching and trying to introduce topics that students are interested in, within the confines of the strictly controlled curriculum that he has to teach:

I try and find out the things they are interested in and include that in lessons when you’re doing, choosing topics whatever. Like at the women's university that I teach [at] we have a listening class and we have to take the listening broadcast from the Voice of America website as a special English section. So there I try to choose issues about women in the workplace, advancing women in Japan. (p. 7)

One of Alan’s criteria for a motivated student is that they will do extra work on their own outside of class. He stated that with a very controlled curriculum and clear test-oriented goals, there is little scope for students
to show initiative inside the class. One way he tries to promote out-of-class learning is by highlighting his own Japanese learning strategies and recommending DVDs and TV programmes with subtitles and various language learning websites. He finds it hard to personalise learning within a very set curriculum, yet tries with students in private lessons.

Alan expressed his belief that most students already have very clear goals based on school tests or exams such as TOEIC. He reported that these external goals can be overly influential and ideally he would like to “provide alternative goal orientation” (p. 17) that does not focus so much on exams.

Identity

Alan’s own experience of studying Japanese has influenced his teaching in that he believes students need practical reasons to study a language and that they need to make an effort to get better. He tries to use his own language learning experiences as a bridge with students to show them they are “co-learners” (p. 25):

But the main thing that I do to try and motivate those kinds of students is demonstrate that I’m also a language learner, ask them “Oh what’s this in Japanese, how do you read this Kanji?” “Oh I know this word; I remember learning it”—things like that. (p. 6)

In a similar manner to his identity as a co-learner, Alan views his international identity as a way of closing the gap between students and the teacher. He asks students for feedback on Japanese cultural issues by encouraging them to be “a representative of Japanese culture” (p. 11) and to explain their views on aspects of Japanese society that he finds puzzling. Alan also encourages students to show what they know about Japanese issues, and gets them to think and talk about their own culture. He is keen to react to his students’ inquiries about culture as part of his way of getting students to think about other places and people. However, he does not initiate lessons based on culture as he believes that nowadays the world is so connected through the Internet that students can find cultural input for themselves. Alan has an identity, not as an American, but as an international or multi-cultural person and he tends to promote that in lessons:

And then other identities, yeah well I guess this has to do with nationality you know, I don’t want to represent America, I want to represent me and I guess I look at it as an identity issue as
well. Being American is part of who I am but I’ve been overseas for a long time. I’m very different from other Americans so that’s another identity that I internationalised I suppose. (p. 25)

**Noriko**

Noriko is a 43-year-old Japanese woman who has been teaching at the university level for 20 years. She has a master’s in TESOL from a New Zealand university. She teaches part-time at two institutions: a private coeducational high school, (with up to 40 students in each class) and a public women’s university (with an average of 20 students per class). She teaches general English classes at both the school and the university and a writing class at the university.

**Motivation Strategies**

To Noriko, students are innately motivated and she believes that there is relatively little she can do to change their levels of determination to learn. However, although she said that there was little she could do, she also thinks that she can influence students in a temporary way and uses different strategies to influence short- and long-term motivation:

Noriko: Short-term learning motivation is, for example I can use topical events, music and video and game-like activities. Long-term motivation . . . sometimes I introduce some of my own learning history to higher level students. So sometimes I explain how I struggled as a high school student to learn basic grammar.

Cowie (researcher): How do they react to that?

Noriko: They seem to be interested. Sometimes I try to give them shock, especially at the beginning of the school year. I walk into the classroom with all fresh faces in front of me and I suddenly start talking in English, so they think “Wow! She can speak English” and they all look shocked. They seem to be interested in listening and communicating with English, but that won’t last long, maybe only twice, three times. (p. 7)

Noriko viewed the short-term strategies as less serious than the longer term strategies, which as well as sharing her language learning history in-
volved linguistic-oriented activities such as using TOEIC exercises and consolidating student knowledge of basic vocabulary and grammar. Noriko has some knowledge of research on motivation but considers that theoretical knowledge and classroom practice are different and that it is difficult to apply theory to complex classroom situations. She knows that learning English and achieving a high level of proficiency “requires long-term hard work and obsession with the language” (survey). She explained how her high school students are not at all this motivated and sometimes behave poorly. She described, for example, how the students are noisy during the lesson, how they sometimes fight each other, and how boys and girls often flirt rather than pay attention to the lesson. In contrast, her university students are better behaved and seem to be more motivated in order to pass tests.

Noriko believes that students are motivated because of a combination of talent and personality traits such as curiosity and persistence. She has developed this view as a result of her own experience in marrying an alcoholic. During the marriage (which has now ended) she gradually realised that she could not change her husband, and in an analogous way she thinks that she cannot change students but has to accept who they are:

Noriko: I learned a lot about teaching from raising my son and also my failed marriage life. My husband was an alcoholic, so it was really tough. That was the time my son was 1, 2 and a half years old and that was the most important time for a baby to have a physical and mental connection with their mother, but I couldn’t focus on him because I was always distracted by my alcoholic husband. So I tried to go through the tough time by learning from other alcoholic people or ex-alcoholic people.

Sakui (researcher): In what way?

Noriko: By that time I had been struggling a lot to let my students look at me, let my students work on their task, let my students practice with their classmates, that they had no interest. But . . . I realized, OK, that’s the way they are, I can’t change them, that’s how they are. I just have to accept them how they are. And my husband had lots of problems, and I tried to make him good, I tried to fix him, but I couldn’t because he didn’t want to change himself. And if you have the cancer in your stomach or liver, you try really hard to fix it, but if you are an alcoholic, you don’t want to change it, you don’t want to fix it. (p. 3)
Identity

Noriko has a strong identity as a Japanese teacher rather than a Western one. She tied her acceptance of her students’ motivational state to different educational philosophical traditions, in particular making a link with the psychoanalyst Takeo Doi’s (1971) concept of *amae* (dependence of a child on a forgiving parent). She contrasted Japanese and Western approaches to motivating students as being fundamentally different. Noriko perceived a Western approach to be one in which teachers try to push students to be autonomous and independent whereas, in her view, Japanese teachers take on greater responsibility to provide input for students. She described Japanese students as “blank sheet[s]” (p. 4) that the teacher has to fill in, whereas in other countries there may be more emphasis on drawing out children’s innate abilities:

> Japanese teachers are very serious and want all of their students to achieve a certain level. Even though each student is different, they constantly input information into the students. Western teachers are more understanding and, I think, try to raise the student’s motivation level. Western teachers probably put more energy into raising the student’s motivation and leave the inputting to the student’s own efforts. The teacher lets the students know that it’s not the teacher’s responsibility to study but the students’ responsibility to study but the students’ responsibility to study but the students’. It’s not the teacher’s problem what level the students reach, because it’s up to them, and I think that’s how things are in Western schools. (p. 5)

Noriko also wants to be a serious teacher, one that, in her view, can help students understand everything that they may come across in their English lessons. She stated that it is very important to explain all the language points that she possibly can. She tried a more “task-based approach” (Ellis, 2003) after her master’s study in New Zealand but soon gave it up as it did not seem to be an appropriate approach in Japan. By task-based she means a more autonomous style in which students can try to understand language input by themselves.

Noriko has different kinds of relationships with different students. She wants to accept her high school students whilst maintaining an authority over them, but with her university students she can build a closer relationship with some of them and occasionally she talks with them about what it is like to be a mother. She also identifies herself as a learner-leader who needs to show that learning is a lifelong task:
I think I want to be leader in learning, leader-learner. A senior in life, in learning. It doesn’t have to be in learning English, they’re still young and I want them to keep learning in life, and to be sort of a role model. That, no matter how old you are, still you can keep learning new things and there’s no end in learning that’s what I want to show them. (p. 9)

Discussion

These descriptions and extracts from the teacher narratives show how all of the teachers are highly committed to teaching and their students, and that they responded to the interview questions with an open and inquisitive spirit. We would now like to reflect on their perspectives and return to the twin research questions of student motivation and identity. Firstly, we show that the teachers’ views of motivation are various types of case study, and that the teachers acknowledge the dynamically changing nature of motivation in their choice of motivation strategies. Secondly, the link between different teacher identities and different motivational practices is explored.

Teacher Knowledge of Motivation is Based on Case Studies

All the teachers expressed their knowledge about motivational practice through narratives or tales that were grounded in “personal resources, values, and life experience” (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2007, p. 364). These grounded tales form a set of case studies based on the teachers’ experiences with individual students or whole classes or personal experiences outside of formal educational settings: David spoke of a specific student who showed great persistence and determination in her language learning; Alan told of his juku students for whom the most important goal was simply to get through the class and pass the exams; and Noriko realised she could not change her alcoholic husband and linked this experience to her students and how she cannot motivate them unless they have their own innate drive.

It seems that when these teachers develop their ideas about motivation, they tend to think about specific people: either students who they remember well, as in David’s and Alan’s cases, or an ex-husband, as in Noriko’s case. We propose that through this mental process, it is helpful for teachers to closely relate to specific individuals in order to generalize motivation concepts. Most motivation research has tended to fall into the category of individual-difference research in which features of student motivation are described in terms of the features of a group. This is useful when describing
general tendencies of learners but does lead to the somewhat limiting use of binary categories such as intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. An alternative approach, such as that taken by Norton (2000), is to describe learners in a more ethnographic way and to truly identify what the differences are between learners and to connect that to a deep knowledge of the context in which learners study.

The data in this paper are limited to interviews with just three teachers who appear to have used the lens of a case study to conceptualise motivation. Future research is necessary to see whether other teachers also think about motivation in this way. If it is found that many do, it is important to investigate what commonalities might exist across cases in order to enable further theorisation about the nature of teacher knowledge. For instance, it would be useful to uncover if different teachers hold similar views about motivated attitudes or motivated behaviours, views that are reflected and refracted through various kinds of case study.

**Teachers Acknowledge That Motivation Changes Over Time**

We would now like to show how the participant teachers’ practical knowledge of student motivation takes account of how motivation changes, especially over time. Noriko described how she tries to encourage different temporary motivation according to which kind of students she teaches; she tries to motivate her high school students with activities that give them a positive learning experience in the short term, whilst with her university students she will use other, more specific language learning activities aimed to have an effect over the long term. Alan admitted that he could not hope to influence his university students in the long term and spoke about the temporal motivation that his students showed and how he would try to engender that by creating a warm atmosphere in the class. David described students who appeared to be keen to study but in his view demonstrated only superficial or false motivation. David responded more fully with praise and compliments to other students that he felt were really motivated.

These processes seem to match most closely with Ushioda’s (1998) framework of motivation which depicts an “evolution” of motivational influences. Ushioda theorises that learners at an early stage in this evolution are motivated more by positive learning experiences and affective rewards than particular goals, whilst at a potential later stage they are much more influenced by goal-directed motives. We can see evidence from the interviews that supports such a view. The teachers appear to identify what kind of
stage students are in regarding their motivation and adapt their lessons accordingly. For students at earlier evolutionary stages, the teachers focus on creating a positive learning experience and good atmosphere, whilst those at a later stage can benefit from more specific goal-directed activities. As it is commonly acknowledged that good teachers adapt their lessons to reflect the needs of their students, it is salutary for the teachers to provide some evidence for how this can happen. Noriko, for example, would not share her serious language learning history-based strategies with her noisy high school students but would reserve that approach for her more test-oriented university students. For her high school students Noriko included activities based on music, videos, or game-like lessons in order to encourage short-term motivational change. Alan, on the other hand, felt that many of his students were already at the goal-directed stage of motivation. They were locked into a very tight curriculum with clearly defined tests as goals, which Alan tries to help them with.

The tales described above show that teachers are aware of how dynamic and variable student motivation is. They often teach students for a relatively short time and have to focus on what they can practically influence during that period. They know that they cannot always change student motivational dispositions so they concentrate on what they can do with a variety of different strategies, responding pragmatically in their various teaching contexts. Motivation research has often focused on how to increase student motivation in somewhat ideal conditions (Williams & Burden, 1997). This study shows that teachers take practical steps to reflect the changing nature of student motivation, in particular how this motivation reflects the context that they teach in and how it changes over time. Such a dynamic view of motivation is in tune with recent trends in second language research, such as dynamic systems theory and emergentism (Dörnyei, 2010), which acknowledge the apparent chaos and complexity of language learning. The teachers in this study, too, intuitively acknowledge the intricacy of student motivation and respond accordingly to the differing demands their students place on them.

**Different Teacher Identities Result in Different Motivational Practices**

Morgan (2004), drawing upon Simon (1995) and Cummins (2000), stated that a teacher’s identity or “image-text” (p. 173) is a pedagogical resource that is co-created or negotiated by both teachers and students. Morgan further suggested that this continuous interweaving of negotiation and language learning is a case of “teacher identity as pedagogy” (p. 178); in other words, a teacher’s identity will be reflected in and constructed by the peda-
gogical choices that the teacher makes. We would now like to highlight how each of the three participants in the current study use different pedagogical strategies to motivate their students and how these strategies reflect the co-created identities they have constituted in their relationship with their students.

It is axiomatic that identity is related to an individual’s social, cultural, and political context. Noriko stated how she identifies strongly with images of traditional Japanese approaches to teaching and focuses on explaining to students what she feels that they need to know. She contrasted Japanese approaches with “Western” ones, emphasising that in her opinion Western teachers are “more understanding” (p. 5) and encourage students to be more autonomous than Japanese teachers may seem to do. Noriko sees that it is her duty to take responsibility for her students’ learning. Clearly Noriko’s ideological beliefs have a strong influence on her identity as a Japanese teacher of English. She went to some length to explain how she had tried Western pedagogy—even studying task-based language teaching at the master’s level in New Zealand—however, she felt that this kind of teaching approach did not suit her students’ needs and that it was important for her to explain language in order that “everything should be understood” (p. 10) by her students.

Whether Noriko’s strategies are Western or Japanese is a moot point, but they are clearly different to those adopted by David and Alan in that Noriko has language resources and insider knowledge that is limited or unavailable to non-Japanese teachers. Instead, David and Alan draw upon their status as outsiders to motivate students by highlighting cultural differences, although they do this in their own ways. Instead of direct language teaching, David wants to share stories of his family, including his wife and children, in order to use those experiences as the basis for lesson content. Indeed, David expressed the belief that students expect native speaker teachers to reveal something of their personal lives in the classroom. As part of this co-created expectation he wants to get close to students and constructs opportunities to meet with them outside of class. In addition, David’s role as a language teacher is in conflict with his image as a poor language learner and so heforegrounds other identities that students can relate to such as native speaker and intercultural communicator. Here, it is clear that David’s identity as a native speaker and poor language learner leads him to use personal anecdotes and stories as part of a teaching repertoire that he feels will motivate students.
Alan is obviously also a native speaker but he wants to de-emphasise this aspect of his identity and narrow the perceived gap between himself and his students. He chooses to do this by revealing his knowledge of, curiosity about, and interest in the Japanese language. By projecting an identity as a “co-learner” of a language, Alan can share tips and hints for language learning with his students as an equal. Rather than a “representative” of America, Alan sees himself as a multi-cultural person. The resulting strategy that Alan uses as a reflection of this “image text” is to encourage his students to engage in English by explaining aspects of Japanese culture. Rather than embodying a culture from outside the classroom, as David does, Alan wants his students to look out, using the resources that they have as Japanese people.

There is one caveat to the above discussion on teacher identity. Missing from this analysis is any objective data regarding the way in which teacher identity is co-constituted by students. We rely on the teachers’ reported relationships with their students. This is an important omission; data from students could serve not just to create a wider picture than is gleaned from teacher-interview data, but also to gain insights into the power relations between teachers and students, which are always reflective in identity formation. Such power relations frame and constrain the pedagogical options that are available to teachers and the identity options that students themselves have (Cummins, 2000). In future research we aim to remedy this weakness by including observations of lessons and surveys of students.

**Conclusion**

We conclude with two implications for this paper’s focus on language teacher identity and student motivation. Firstly, motivation strategy research that focuses on teacher perspectives would benefit from recognising how important the professional identity of teachers is in establishing their pedagogical patterns and practices. A thorough exploration of teachers’ lives, their identities, and the conditions they work in could enhance motivation research greatly. Secondly, it would also be helpful for teachers themselves to explore the link between identity and motivation strategies. Just as Noriko, David, and Alan identified and described different cases to help them assess where their students’ motivation lies, we would suggest that a case study approach has the potential to facilitate this exploration process. It is often said that teachers’ ways of theorising are expressed through narrative (Morgan, 2004). We would add that reflection on case studies emerging from narratives of teaching lives can help develop teachers’ knowledge and widen their repertoire of teaching strategies. Teachers can do this in a
vicarious way by listening to or reading about other case studies, as in this paper, or they can make sense of their own experiences through the telling of their own teacher tales.

**Note**

1. There has also been a recent special issue of *TESOL Quarterly* on “Narrative Research in TESOL” (Barkhuizen, 2011).
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Appendix

Survey Questions (Cowie & Sakui, 2011)

Background Information
- Years of university teaching experience
- Type of ELT training
- Nationality
- Gender
- Age
- Employment status
- Type of institution
- Type of English classes
- Average number of students

Questions

Q1. How do you, as a classroom English teacher, understand learner motivation? In other words, what does learner motivation mean to you?

Q2. Do you, as a teacher, think that you can influence learner motivation? Why/why not?

Q3. What motivational strategies do you use?

Q4. When do you think that your strategies are limited in influencing learner motivation?

Q5. If you would like to make any further comments on this topic/area, please do.
Ordering Fast Food: Service Encounters in Real-Life Interaction and in Textbook Dialogs

Hanh thi Nguyen
Hawaii Pacific University
Noriko Ishitobi
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In this paper we compare authentic fast-food ordering transactions with EFL textbook dialogs in order to assist teachers and materials writers in the development of students’ communication skills. Using conversation analysis (CA) and drawing on the concepts of communicative competence and interactional competence, we first provide a detailed description of a small sample of real-life transactions and then compare these with the dialogs in textbooks used in Japan, including some successive editions. We demonstrate that the textbook dialogs differ from the recorded real-life interactions in the sequencing of actions and completeness of actions. In the context of the findings, we suggest implications for language teaching and materials development.

本論は、学習者のコミュニケーション能力の育成を目指す教師や教科書執筆者に助力するため、ファストフード店での注文のやりとりについて、オーセンティックな対話とEFL教科書にある対話文とを比較する。会話分析（CA）の手法を用い、コミュニケーション能力やインタラクション能力の概念に基づいて、まず現実のやりとりのデータサンプルを詳細に記述し、その後日本で使われている教科書の対話文と比較する。ここで検証された教科書の対話文が、録音された現実のやりとりとは一連の行為進行や行為の完了の面において異なっているということを論証する。この研究結果に照らして、言語教育や教材開発への提案を行う。
Over the past 20 years, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) has revised the English language curriculum several times in order to put more emphasis on developing Japanese learners’ communicative abilities. The current curriculum states the overall objectives of foreign language education in junior high school as “to develop students’ basic communication abilities such as listening, speaking, reading and writing, deepening their understanding of language and culture and fostering a positive attitude toward communication through foreign languages” (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, & Technology, 2011, emphasis added). This paper analyzes fast-food ordering transactions in authentic encounters in order to inform dialogs in textbooks currently used in Japan. Our goal is to assist textbook writers, publishers, MEXT, and teachers in the creation and use of language materials to develop students’ communicative competence.

Communicative competence involves the integrated use of grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence—in other words, the ability to understand and utilize linguistic forms, the sequential organization of language, the appropriateness of language use in context, and the strategies to handle communication breakdowns (Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). Elaborating on this concept, Hall (1993), He and Young (1998), H. Nguyen (2012), and Young (2009) proposed that an individual’s ability to participate in social interaction is comprised of the capability of managing several aspects of a given interactional practice, which include its sequential organization, topic management, turn-taking mechanism, linguistic forms, and participation frameworks, all being reflective of the social, cultural, historical, and political context of the interactional practice itself. To develop these abilities, it is important that learners engage in actual social interaction. This may not always be feasible in an EFL context, yet as a first step toward familiarizing students with social interaction, textbook writers and language teachers can at least provide students with authentic discourse samples and create authentic tasks in which students can practice the various components of communicative competence. To accomplish this goal, textbook writers and teachers need to first understand how real-life conversations are organized (McCarthy & Carter, 1994). This paper aims to assist textbook writers and teachers in this effort.

Language in Textbooks and in Naturally Occurring Interaction

Despite the fact that textbooks are the primary source of language input and language practice in most EFL classrooms (Richards, 2002), research-
ers have found that textbook language differs overwhelmingly from language used in real-life interaction (Gilmore, 2004, 2007). Textbooks do not always provide the type of language that matches naturally occurring language with respect to language forms such as modal lexical items (Altman, 1990; Holmes, 1988), idioms (McCarthy & Carter, 1994; Wray, 2000), or comparative and superlative structures (Shortall, 2003), to name a few. As for pragmatic features, textbooks have also been shown repeatedly to differ from authentic realizations of several speech acts, such as agreeing and disagreeing (Pearson, 1986), complaining (Boxer & Pickering, 1995), and inviting (Bouton, 1996).

Finally and most relevant to this paper, researchers have identified important differences between textbooks and natural language use regarding discourse phenomena. For example, Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988) compared directions-giving in textbooks and in authentic exchanges and found that whereas textbook dialogs present a three-step model (request for directions – giving directions – thanking), authentic encounters contain a richer array of interactional elements such as orientation checks, confirmation checks, parenthetical comments, non-fluencies (e.g., pauses, hesitation markers, cut-off talk), and notably, a post-question sequence in which the directions-giver may produce a filler, a pause, a repetition of the question, or a comment about the target location. Similarly, other researchers (Bardovi-Harlig, Hartford, Mahan-Taylor, Morgan, & Reynolds, 1991; Wong, 2002, 2007) have demonstrated that the sequential organization of natural conversation openings and closings in textbooks is much less dynamic and elaborate than what is found in natural interaction. Gilmore (2004) further observed that service encounters presented in textbooks (including a car rental transaction, a hotel reservation, asking for directions, asking for help at an information desk, and telephone inquiries about a rental apartment, a flight, and train schedules) lack interactional phenomena such as pauses, false starts, repetitions, terminal overlaps, latching, hesitation devices, and back-channeling.

The question, of course, is whether textbook dialogs need to be the same as authentic interaction. Richards (2006) argued that general English dialogs in textbooks do not necessarily have to contain the type of interactional phenomena found in real-life conversations, as long as they are not “contrived or unnatural” (p. 20). He further asserted that the findings from research in discourse analysis and conversation analysis are not relevant to language teaching materials. This position, in our view, is problematic in at least two respects. First, it does not provide guidance on how materials developers and teachers can come up with language that is not “contrived or
unnatural.” In contrast to Richards, we believe that the only way to avoid creating “contrived or unnatural” language samples is to reach out to research in discourse analysis or to perform discourse analysis with empirical data. Discourse analysis is important because intuition alone “cannot be expected to encompass the rich details and patterning of natural talk” (McCarthy, 1991, p. 145; see also Boxer & Pickering, 1995). Second, the fact that the language examples in textbooks lack the kind of interactional phenomena found in naturally occurring language may deprive learners of opportunities to comprehend meaning negotiation exchanges (Meyers-Scotton & Bernstein, 1988), handle and manipulate interactional practices to fit their agendas (see Goodwin, 1979, 1980, 1981), and select essential information from interactional disturbances (Meyers-Scotton & Bernstein, 1988)—all these are part of the ability to communicate successfully in a second language. We believe that although introducing authentic dialog samples to EFL learners may not always be possible, dialogs presented to students should at least have authentic sequential organization, typical expressions, and interactional phenomena frequently associated with the given situation as well as reflect the cultural context of the interaction (see also Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991). At a minimum, students should have the impression that they are “being taught authentic and naturally occurring structures and vocabulary to use in simulation of real-life talk” (McCarthy, 1991, p. 145). In fact, even Richards agrees that when it comes to using English for specific purposes, authentic materials are vital (Richards, 2006). In our view, the use of authentic materials should be extended to all language learning. Language use is always contextualized in specific situations and language exists nowhere but in discursive practices (Young, 2009) or speech events (Hymes, 1964) (see also Wittgenstein [1958] on the notion of “language games”).

In this paper, we provide a discourse analysis of a small sample of authentic conversations concerning a specific situation, ordering food at a fast-food restaurant, to help materials developers and teachers be better informed about the same type of dialogs presented in textbooks. We chose this specific situation because it is a basic and common situation that students may encounter when they travel in an English-speaking country, and because it is found in government-approved textbooks in Japan. Our study extends the body of research on textbook authenticity reviewed above in that we examine the sequential organization of the fast-food service encounter as an entire speech event rather than focusing on single language forms or speech acts across various situations. To date, the only study that has compared the sequential organization of a speech event in textbooks versus that in...
naturally occurring discourse is Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein’s 1988 work on directions-giving encounters. The authenticity of service encounters presented in textbooks has not been fully examined as an interactional practice and we hope to fill this gap in the literature. In the next section, we briefly describe what has been written about the service encounter under study, ordering food at a fast-food restaurant.

**Fast-Food Service Encounters**

Fast-food restaurants such as McDonald’s have intentionally worked to make ordering food a highly routinized activity. Counter workers are trained to follow specific steps in transactions with customers (Leidner, 1993). They are, however, encouraged to add variations in greeting and thanking phrases in order to “minimize the customers’ sense of depersonalization” (p. 68). Empirical research on exchanges at fast-food restaurants has provided some glimpses into this speech event. In an observational study of directives used by customers at two fast-food restaurants, McDonald’s and Burger King, Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988) noted that customers in the Midwestern US frequently used an elliptical bald imperative (e.g., “A Big Mac.”), an imperative followed by please (e.g., “A Big Mac, please.”), and a need directive (e.g., “I want . . .”). Less frequent are permission directives (e.g., “Can I . . .?”), while even less frequent are permission directives followed by please (e.g., “Can I + please?”), bald imperative (e.g., “Give me . . .”), or no words (p. 381). The brevity of these language forms is perhaps due to the fast-paced nature of a fast-food restaurant and the impersonal nature of the worker-customer relationship.

Our present study aims to contribute to the existing literature an understanding about how participants use interactional practices (including verbal expressions) to construct the overall sequential structure of a service encounter and how this structure is similar to or different from those presented in textbook dialogs. Our focus on this aspect of this speech event is informed by the notion of interactional competence (Hall, 1993; He & Young, 1998; H. Nguyen, 2012; Young, 2009) and Canale and Swain’s (1980) concept of communicative competence mentioned above. After examining the recorded fast-food transactions, we turn to four government-approved textbooks in Japan as examples and analyze their fast-food ordering dialogs, focusing on their sequential structures and how these structures are expressed in interactional practices. We will also survey past editions of some of the textbooks to enrich our analysis.
Methodology

The naturally occurring data analyzed in this paper consist of six transactions recorded at two fast-food restaurants in 2010 in Honolulu, Hawaii. A voice recorder was placed on the counter of the restaurants. The customers as well as the counter workers were a mix of native and nonnative speakers, as is typical at most fast-food restaurants in Honolulu. Since our goal was to gather naturally occurring data, we did not attempt to select only native speakers for analysis.

The textbooks with which the authentic transactions were compared are three textbooks approved by MEXT for junior high school students, *New Horizon English Course 1* (2006), *Total English* (2006, 2012), and *Sunshine English Course 2* (2006, 2012), and one for senior high school students, *Mainstream Oral Communication I* (2010). These textbooks were chosen for analysis because they contain purported dialogs in fast-food restaurants.

To describe the organization of the service encounters, we used conversation analysis (CA). A central concern in CA is the description of how social interactions are sequentially organized. CA examines how each turn at talk is constructed and how turn taking is managed in order to uncover the action(s) being performed and the trajectory of the next relevant actions that are projected (Schegloff, 2007). As such, CA is particularly helpful in the description of the overall structural organization of a speech event, or speech-exchange system (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), in which actions are sequenced in a certain expected order. It is important to note that CA arrives at a description of action sequencing by basing the analysis on observable interactional practices—practices that participants themselves orient to in order to interpret each other’s actions. These interactional practices include, for example, turn-entry devices, intonation, periods of silence, hesitation markers, overlaps, volume shifts, and verbal expressions. CA’s data-driven approach and its focus on the unfolding of interaction are well suited to our interest in describing the sequencing of actions in the recorded transactions and the dialogs in the textbooks. Using CA’s fine-grained qualitative analysis, we start with a small data sample in order to explore patterns of sequential organization.

The recorded transactions were transcribed based on Jefferson’s (2004) notation system (see Appendix). For the dialogs from the textbooks, we obtained accompanying audio recordings whenever possible and transcribed these dialogs, also using Jefferson’s notation system. We then analyzed the sequential organization in both types of data and noted differences between the textbook dialogs and the actual service encounters.
Analysis

Naturally Occurring Service Encounters

The overall structure of the food ordering transaction in the authentic transactions in our data can be described by the following template:

OPENING:
(a) worker summons—customer responses

FOOD ORDERING:
(b) customer makes request—worker acknowledges
(c) worker offers choices—customer responds / makes request—worker acknowledges
(d) worker requests confirmation of order completeness—customer confirms / makes new requests—worker acknowledges (steps b-c may be repeated)
(e) worker states order summary—customer acknowledges / reminds worker—worker acknowledges
(f) worker offers choices of food presentation—customer responds / makes request—worker acknowledges

PAYMENT:
(g) worker requests payment—customer responds by paying—worker acknowledges amount

CLOSING:
(h) worker thanks customer—customer thanks worker
(i) customer leaves counter to wait for food in another area of restaurant

As a template, this structure captures the actions that take place in the transactions recorded, but each individual episode may vary slightly from this comprehensive outline. We will describe the organization of each sequence in detail below.

a. Opening

Excerpts 1 and 2 present examples of opening sequences. (In our transcripts, C stands for “customer” and W for “worker.”)
Excerpt 1 [Iced Coffee]
1 W: aloha::,
2 (1.2)
3 W: >aloha,<
4 C: hi.
5 (0.9)

Excerpt 2 [Happy Meal]
1 W: aloha:,
2 (4.0)
3 W: aloha:,
4 (.)
5 W: next please:,
6 (3.5)
7 C: ↑can I ha:ve ↓uh (0.5) happy meal?

In line 1 of both excerpts, the worker’s greeting functions to select and summon a particular customer (the first one in line) to the interaction (cf. Sacks et al., 1974, Schegloff, 1968). Simultaneously, this turn opens up the interaction by initiating a state of ratified mutual participation (Goffman, 1963). The importance of the establishment of ratified mutual participation is evident in the fact that after a pause when the customer does not respond (line 2 in both excerpts), the worker repeats the greeting (line 3 in both excerpts). In Excerpt 2, the worker even changes to a request to summon the customer again (line 5). Ratified mutual participation is established when the customer responds in line 7. In Excerpt 1, the customer responds to the worker’s greeting with a greeting (line 4), but in Excerpt 2, the customer responds right away with a request, which functions as an order for food. Of note, the workers’ greetings may reflect and renew the physical and cultural context of the interaction: The use of the Hawaiian greeting invokes the location as being in Hawaii and orients to the cultural image of Hawaii being sold to tourists as the welcoming Aloha State. This feature may be a strategy on the part of the fast-food chain to personalize a standardized service (Leidner, 1993).

b. Food Ordering

Food ordering involves several sequences and although they are often
The first sequence is request—acknowledgment, as can be seen in Excerpts 3-5.

Excerpt 3 [Happy Meal]

7 C: ↑can I have ↑uh (0.5) happy meal?
8 W: pardon?
9 C: happy meal,
10 W: happy meal.

The customer makes the request in line 7. The repair that follows (lines 8-10) shows that both participants treat the food name as the most important piece of information in this part of the interaction: When the worker indicates trouble understanding (line 8), the customer repeats only the name of the meal being ordered, and in the next turn, the worker receipts only that information (line 10).

Most customers in our data used the question format in their requests for food ("Can I have X?"), which is in line with the findings of Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988). Excerpt 4 below shows a different format of the request, the statement "I want X."

Excerpt 4 [Cranberry Pork]

3 C: I want a:
4 (4.0)
5 C: I want a: pork cranberry with cheese,
6 W: mhm,

We found that the worker produces the acknowledgement verbally in 14 (or 82%) of the 17 requests in our data. The next excerpt shows the multimodal format of the worker's acknowledgement in the context of a fast-food chain restaurant. In this excerpt, the worker had trouble finding the right key for the food being ordered, and her acknowledgement is not complete until the right key is pressed.

Excerpt 5 [Spam Platter]

2 C: ah (. ) may I have (. ) number (. )
In this excerpt, the customer makes the request in lines 2-3, using a question format (“May I have X?”). While the customer refers to the meal by a number, the worker reformulates it by the food content with a slightly rising intonation (line 5). As such, the worker’s turn does not function as an acknowledgement but as a confirmation request. The customer confirms the food order in line 6. With the brief pause in line 7, this sequence could close down. Indeed, in line 8, the customer initiates a new turn which, with the use of the turn-prefix and (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994), is hearable as another request. The worker, however, has not produced an acknowledgement of the food order yet. In line 9, she repeats the name of the food but it is pronounced as a stretched syllable with a leveled intonation (neither rising nor falling) as she is looking for a key to press on the register. Produced in this manner, this turn is marked as a non-acknowledgement (an acknowledgement typically has a definite falling or rising intonation) and it displays the worker’s orientation to a delay in the closing of the sequence. The customer seems to recognize this delay and does not take a full turn in line 11 nor...
during the long pause in line 12. The fact that this delay is out of the ordinary is then shown in the worker’s apology in a quiet voice in line 13. In line 14, however, the customer continues his previously abandoned request for another food item, and the worker utters a receipt (line 16), but in line 18, the worker returns to the first food order. She repeats the name of the food item with a clearly rising intonation and presses the key on the register (lines 19-20). Only after line 20 does this sequence close down and the worker initiates a new sequence (not shown in Excerpt 5). This excerpt shows that the worker’s receipt serves an important function in a food ordering sequence and when it is not produced, the sequence cannot close. In fact, the second food request made by the customer in such a delayed sequence may not be entered into the system at all (in the transaction recorded, the customer later reinitiates his second food item order). A reasonable implication for someone learning to interact in this type of transaction is to withhold a next request until the worker has pressed the key for the current order.

An interesting aspect of the format of the request for food we noticed in our data is that the full question form is usually used for the first food item, and subsequent requests tend to be produced as added items in the form of noun phrases (Excerpt 6, see also Excerpt 9 below).

Excerpt 6 [Mac Snack Wrap]
1 C: can I have the uh <Mac snack wr- wrap>?
2 W: Mac wrap?
3 C: yep.
4 (.)
5 C: and uh (0.3) ice tea?

The first request (line 1) takes a full question form, but the second request, made after the first order sequence has closed (line 3), takes an abbreviated form, and the requested food item is mentioned as an added item to the first request (line 5). Thus, like Meyers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988), we find that bare noun phrases are used frequently in requests, but, in our sample, we also find that their context is different from the context of requests in full question format: bare noun phrases tend to occur not in initial requests but in subsequent ones.

After the customer has made a food order, it is often the case that the worker follows up with food and drink choices. Excerpts 7 and 8 are examples of the next sequence: offer of choices—response / request—acknowledgement.
Excerpt 7 [Happy Meal]
10 W: happy meal. cheeseburger, hamburger, 
11 or nuggets?
12 C: nuggets.
13 W: nuggets.

In Excerpt 7, after the worker receipts the food order by repeating it, she immediately offers choices to the customer, in this case, it is the choice of the meat (lines 10-11). The customer responds with a selection, which simultaneously functions as a request for that selection (line 12). The worker then acknowledges the selection by repeating it (line 13). Of note, the food choices are presented elliptically as a list with rising intonation (the full form would be “Would you like a cheeseburger, hamburger, or nuggets in your Happy Meal?”). Someone who is not familiar with this speech event may have a difficult time understanding this elliptical question.

Another common item that often involves choices is the drink that goes with the meal. Excerpt 8 exemplifies this.

Excerpt 8 [Spam Platter]
21 W: what kind of drink?
22 (.)
23 W: soda:
24 C: u:[h:
25 W: coffee:
26 C: coffee.
27 W: coffee.
28 (.)
29 W: how many cream and sugar?
30 ((presses key on register))
31 C: no. no need.
32 (0.8) ((W presses key on register))

In line 21, the worker offers the customer the choice of drink in the form of a question. After a brief pause after the question, which indicates the customer’s delay in the answer, the worker provides a “candidate answer”
(Pomerantz, 1988) (i.e., a model for the customer’s answer, in this case, specific types of drinks) (lines 23, 25). The customer’s hesitation marker in line 24 indicates his recognition of the delay in his answer and at the same time claims the floor while an answer is not forthcoming yet. Finally, after the worker’s candidate answer, the customer is able to state his selection (line 26). Right after this, the worker acknowledges the customer’s selection (line 27).

After a brief gap (line 28), the same sequential structure recurs, with the worker asking another question about the choice of condiments to go with the drink (line 29). This time, the customer declines (line 31). The worker receipts this information by pressing a key on the register (line 32) and the sequence closes down.

While the above excerpts present the more common scenario, in some cases, such as in Excerpt 9 below, the customer includes enough details about the order that the sequence about choices is preempted and bypassed.

Excerpt 9 [Iced Coffee]

6   C: can I have a: large ice coffee >sugar
7      free vanilla<?
8   (1.0) ((W presses key on register))
9   C: and a: (.) medium fries?
10  (1.5) ((W presses key on register))

In lines 6-7, the customer makes a drink request. This request not only mentions the drink name (“ice[d] coffee”) but also the size (“large”) and his selections of drink (“sugar free”) and flavor (“vanilla”). Consequently, the worker receipts the information nonverbally by pressing the key without following up with a sequence about choices (line 8). Similarly, in line 9, the customer’s request mentions both the name of the food (“fries”) and a size (“medium”). As before, the worker only receipts the information without initiating a new sequence about choices. The customer’s inclusion of the order selections in the request may indicate his familiarity with the menu and the interactional routine of the restaurant.

After the details about the order are communicated, the worker sometimes requests the customer’s confirmation of the completeness of the order. If the customer provides the confirmation, the ordering sequence can be brought to a close. This pattern can be seen in Excerpt 10.
Excerpt 10 [Spam Platter]
36  W: >anything else?<
37     (.)
38  C: no that’s it,=
39  W: =nine forty.

Alternatively, if the customer does not provide confirmation or issues another order, the interaction is back to the order – receipt token sequences (Excerpt 11).

Excerpt 11 [Happy Meal]
17     (2.0)
18  W: ↑that’s it?
19  C: and UM (1.0) yeah cud- (. ) well uh (0.2)
20     w- one McChicken,
21  W: one McChicken,
22  C: mhm,
23     (0.3)
24  C: and: (0.2) two large frie:s.
25  W: two large fries.

In line 18, the worker requests the customer’s confirmation of the completeness of the order in the form of a question. In the next turn, the customer rejects the confirmation by producing a request for another item (lines 19-20). The customer’s request in lines 19-20 is worth further examination. Her turn begins with “and,” thus indicating that the upcoming turn is a continuation of the previous sequence (Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994), in this case, ordering food and drinks. Second, the customer’s use of several hesitation markers (“UM,” “yeah,” and “well”) functions to hold the floor before she can name the food to be requested. These floor-holding devices may seem messy as disturbances on the surface but in fact they are crucial in this moment of the interaction (see Goodwin, 1979) because they indicate to the worker the customer’s intention to continue her turn and place an additional order even when she is not yet ready to utter her desired item.

As Excerpt 11 shows, if the customer does not confirm the completeness of the order, further food ordering sequences can occur (lines 24-25). It is
important to note that in line 20, the customer ends her turn with a slightly rising intonation, but in line 24, her turn ends with falling intonation. These intonation contours seem to function as her implicit indication of when the order will still continue (line 20) and when it is complete (line 24). It seems that the worker orients to these cues from the customer, and in the next turn, she moves on to summarize the order (Excerpt 12 below).

The order summary sequence occurs in two of the six recorded transactions. This summary sequence serves to confirm both the completeness and the accuracy of the order (Excerpt 12).

Excerpt 12 [Happy Meal]

24  (5.5)
26  \textit{W}: so- (. ) for a chicken nugget happy meal:
27    with a \underline{Sprite}, (. ) one McChicken
28     and two large fries.
29  \textit{C}: mhm.

After a significant pause during which the worker enters the order information to the machine (line 24), in line 26, she takes a turn that begins with “so,” a turn-initial discourse marker to indicate the upshot of the preceding interaction (Schiffrin, 1987). Subsequently, she lists all the items that have been ordered (lines 26-28). The customer’s acknowledgement in line 29 confirms the accuracy of and her agreement to the order.

The final sequence in the food ordering phase involves the choice of food presentation, namely, whether the customer would like to have the food prepared for consumption in the restaurant or elsewhere. The fixed phrase used in the worker’s request is an elliptic “for here, or to go,” meaning “Do you want to eat the food here or take the food elsewhere with you?” This question, unique to fast-food and take-out restaurants, is an important one because based on the customer’s answer, the worker will package and serve the food differently. This sequence is usually quite brief and indicates the completion of the food-ordering phase (Excerpt 13).

Excerpt 13 [Happy Meal]

30  \textit{W}: for here, or to go ma’am.
31  \textit{C}: uh- (. ) \textit{t}o \textit{l}go.
32  (0.7)
We found that the sequence about food presentation choice occurs after the confirmation of order completeness in all of the six real-life transactions recorded. This is perhaps because while both the confirmation of the order completeness and food presentation choices are pre-closing, the former signals the potential closing of the customer’s preceding requests while the latter orients to the upcoming food delivery phase. The closing-implicative nature of the sequence involving choice of food presentation can be seen in Excerpt 14, where the customer actually requests confirmation of certain items on the order when the worker introduces the choice of food presentation before the entire order has been repeated. Prior to Excerpt 14, the customer has placed an order for a filet-o-fish meal (the choices were either a meal or a sandwich), two nachos, and two chillies. At that point, the worker checks if the order is for only one meal (line 35) and the customer subsequently adds another order, a filet-o-fish sandwich (starting from line 36).

Excerpt 14 [Filet of Fish]
34 (2.0)
35 W: uh: just wa- one meal:, right?
36 C: mhm, and (actually) can I have an
37 extra: plate please?
38 W: yeah.
39 C: for a sandwich.
40 W: for a sandwich.
41 C: uh huh,
42 (3.0)
43 C: same way, no sauce?
44 W: sandwich also no sauce?
45 C: yeah.
46 W: okay.
47 (3.0)
48 W: so one filet of fish meal:,
49 (.)
50 W: uh: what kind of drink do you want?
51 (0.2)
52 C: u:::h maybe a coke,
53  W: coke
54  C: mhm,
55        (4.7)
56  W: for here or to go sir.
57  C: to go,
58        (0.2)
59  W: to go?
60        (.)
61→  C: you get the sandwich too?
62  W: yeah.
63  C: mhm. good,
64  W: one meal one sandwich.
65        (0.2)
66  C: thanks,
67        (.)
68→  C: you get um the sauce?
69        (0.2)
70→  C: two [ranches
71  W:     [yep,
72→  C: two- two chili sauce?
73  W: okay.
74  C: thank you.

In line 48, the worker produces the order summary but before the entire order is mentioned, she offers the customer the choice of drink for the food she just mentioned (line 50). After this sequence closes, she moves on to ask for the customer’s choice of food presentation (line 56). When this sequence ends, the customer issues a question in line 61 to confirm an item he has previously ordered but that the worker did not mention in her summary in line 48. The fact that he asks this question after the sequence about the food presentation choice illustrates that this sequence implies the completion of the food-ordering phase; thus, any corrections need to be made right away.

It is worth noting that after the worker provides an affirmative answer (line 62) and the customer gives a positive assessment (line 63), the worker
verbalizes a summary of the order (line 64). It seems that by saying the order summary, the worker is orienting to her institutional role: It is the worker and not the customer who should produce the summary. The customer aligns with this participation framework and acknowledges the worker’s summary in line 66.

Interestingly, the worker’s summary in line 64 does not mention all of the items that have been ordered. This seems to prompt the customer to ask a question to confirm the order for the other food items. There is no immediate response from the worker, resulting in a pause in line 69. The customer then reformulates his question to be more specific and names the food item in line 70. With the worker’s positive response (line 71) in slight overlap with his turn, the customer asks another question to confirm the other food item (line 72). With all the items ordered being confirmed, the customer thanks the worker, thus closing the sequence.

This particular example thus shows how the sequence about the choice of food presentation implies the closing of the food ordering sequence and how customers may participate in the summarizing of the order when the worker fails to list all the items being ordered.

c. Payment

When the order summary sequence closes, the interactions typically move to the payment sequence, in which the worker initiates a request for payment by announcing the amount due and the customer responds by handing over cash or a credit card. If it is cash, the worker acknowledges the amount received, and if change is due, the worker gives back the change to the customer while also announcing the change amount. Excerpt 15 is an example.

Excerpt 15 [Happy Meal]

32 (0.7)
33 W: nine thirty-nine please,
34 (4.0) ((C takes out ten dollar bill and hands to worker))
35 W: ten.
36 (5.0) ((W counts change from register))
37 W: <sixty one>. ((W hands change to C))
38 (.)
The request for payment is made in line 33, with the politeness marker “please.” It is interesting to note that the customer’s response is nonverbal (line 34) but the worker announces verbally the amount received (line 35). In line 37, the worker hands the change over to the customer while also announcing the amount. Throughout this sequence, neither party mentions the currency units (dollars and cents), displaying their familiarity with this transaction.

d. Closing

Finally, after the payment, the food-ordering transaction typically closes with the customer and worker thanking each other (Excerpt 16).

Excerpt 16 [Happy Meal]
38     (.)
39  W: thank you,
40  C: thank you. ((C leaves counter))

The use of thanks by both parties indicates their mutual orientation to the closing of the conversation. In all the cases we examined, the worker seems to assume the customer’s familiarity with the setting of fast-food restaurants and provides no explanation concerning where to wait for the food. When the food-ordering phase ends, the customer typically waits in another area of the restaurant away from the counter to pick up the food when it is ready.\(^{14}\)

Now that we have examined in detail the sequential organization of the food-ordering transactions at fast-food restaurants, we turn our attention to some dialogs about ordering food at a fast-food restaurant in three junior and one senior high school textbooks used in Japan.

Textbook Dialogs

The first textbook we examined, *New Horizon English Course 1*, contains the following fast-food ordering dialog.\(^{15}\)

((2.2 seconds of background music and soft background noise))
There are several striking differences between this dialog and the authentic conversations analyzed above. First, there are no actions to establish a state of ratified mutual participation (see Goffman, 1963). The lack of openings in textbook dialogs has also been noted by Wong (2002) in a study comparing telephone openings in textbooks and ordinary conversations. Further, while we find in our data a full question format for the first request in authentic transactions, the customer in the textbook dialog uses noun phrases, which we find in subsequent requests but not in a first request in our data. In addition, “cola” is not an actual drink item on the menu of most fast-food restaurants and is not a common expression in English to refer to a type of soft drink. The unnaturalness of the textbook dialog can be seen further in line 3, when the worker offers the choice of size. Since the customer in line 1 mentioned two kinds of item (food, drink), it is unclear for which of them a size is to be selected. Also, the two options of food/drink size mentioned (large or small) can be misleading, as most fast-food restaurants offer three options: regular/small, medium, and large. A third difference is the lack of a confirmation of the order’s completeness and an order summary. A fourth difference is the inclusion of food delivery (“here you are,” line 11) during the food-ordering phase—delivery normally occurs minutes after the food-ordering dialog has ended. Including this expression in the dialog is thus not realistic and could be misleading about how fast-food
restaurants operate (in contrast to food/snack bars for example). Another difference is the noninteractive nature of lines 11-15, in which the worker delivers the food, requests payment, and thanks the customer, all without any turns from the customer. Of note, the use of a full sentence to announce the price is not found in our data, where workers typically uttered only the amount due without mentioning even the currency units. More importantly, actions in the textbook dialog are sequenced without signs of negotiation, often done in a natural dialog via interactional phenomena such as receipt tokens, discourse markers, hesitation tokens, restarts, and overlaps (cf. Gilmore, 2004). Although these details may seem minute, they are important interactional practices that participants in conversations use to negotiate turns, actions, and the organization of the whole interaction (Sacks et al., 1974). If the goal of language teaching is to enable students to communicate in the target language, introducing students to these interactional practices in context is of paramount importance (Wong & Waring, 2010).

The second textbook we examined is Total English, and we will consider the fast-food ordering dialogs in its 2006 and 2012 editions.

1 ((1.2 seconds of silence, heading in written version: “Order”))
2 Worker: next, please
3 (1.0)
4 Jun: I want a hamburger.
5 (0.5)
6 Jun: French fries, and tea, please,
7 (1.0)
8 Worker: for here, or to go,
9 (1.0)
10 Jun: here, please,
11 (2.0) ((heading in written version: “Size? What kind?”))
12 Worker: large, or small French fries.
13 (1.0)
14 Jun: large, please,
Worker: hot, or iced tea.

Jun: hot, please,

Jun: how much is it.

Worker: here you are:

Jun: thank you.

Worker: two dollars and sixty cents, please.

Worker: thank you.

This dialog contains opening and closing sequences and uses a full question form for the customer’s first request (lines 4-6), quite similar to what we found in the naturally occurring transactions. However, there are important differences. Notably, the sequence on food presentation choices, a pre-closing sequence, is placed in line 8, immediately after the customer’s first request and before the food and drink choices. Another difference is in line 24. In our data, the workers often announced the amount due as a way to close up the transaction (five out of six transactions). Given this interactional function of the price announcement, having the customer asking for the price implies a delay in the worker’s announcement of the price, while in fact there is nothing in the dialog that indicates such delay. This misuse of the question about price thus makes the dialog unnatural. Finally, as also found in the dialog from New Horizon English Course 1, other differences from the real-life interactions analyzed above include the limited format of the choices of size (line 12), the inclusion of the food delivery sequence (line 20), the mentioning of the currency units (line 26), the lack of a confirmation of the order completeness, and the absence of interactional practices to negotiate actions and action sequencing throughout the dialog. For example, in line 4, the customer’s turn ends with a falling intonation, followed by a pause (line 5), which may indicate the completion of the request. However,
in line 6, the request continues. One would expect the customer to lengthen the final syllable of her turn in line 4 and use some turn-holding devices such as hesitation markers during the silence in line 5.

The 2012 edition of this textbook presents a slightly more authentic dialog, although it still contains some noticeable differences compared to the real-life transactions.


1 ((1.0 second of silence, heading in written version: “Order”))
2 Worker: next please?
3 (1.0)
4 Meg: <can I have a hamburger?>
5 (0.3)
6 Meg: French fries, (. ) and an iced tea?
7 (0.7)
8 Worker: large, or small French fries.
9 (0.7)
10 Meg: large, please,
11 (0.7)
12 Worker: for here, ↓or to go
13 (0.7)
14 Meg: for here,
15 (1.2) ((heading in written version: “How much?”))
16 Worker: here ↓you are,
17 (0.7)
18 Meg: ↑thank ↓you.
19 (0.4)
20 Meg: <how much is it.>
21 (0.7)
22 Worker: two dollars and: seventy five cents. please,
23 (0.3)
24 Worker: thank you.
The differences include the format of the choices of size (line 8), the inclusion of the food delivery sequence (line 14), the price request by the customer (line 20), the inclusion of the currency units in the payment sequence (line 22), the lack of a confirmation of the order completeness, and the absence of interactional practices to negotiate action sequencing.

Next, we examined the fast-food ordering dialogs in *Sunshine English Course 2*, in its 2006 and 2012 editions.


1  ((1.2 seconds of silence))
2  Worker: can I help you?
3      (0.4)
4  Customer: yes:, a: hamburger. please,
5      (.)
6  Worker: okay? is that all?
7      (.)
8  Customer: one large orange juice, please.
9      (.)
10  Worker: okay?
11     (0.2)
12  Customer: how much is it.
13  Worker: four ninety.

This dialog does contain an opening sequence (lines 1-3) and a confirmation of the order completeness (line 5), as found in the authentic transactions analyzed above. It also presents the food request separately from the drink request (lines 3, 7), and has the worker announcing the price in elliptical form, making it more natural. However, it still differs in important ways from the authentic transactions we analyzed. First, the worker receipts the order request by saying “okay” (lines 5 and 9) while in our data, the workers tended to acknowledge the request by repeating the name of the item being ordered (see Excerpt 3 for example). Second, the sequence on food presentation choices, a unique and important sequence in fast-food ordering transactions, is absent. Third, this dialog contains the unnatural question for the price from the customer, as also found in *Total English*. Finally, similarly to the dialogs from the other two textbooks, this dialog also misses the interactional phenomena that participants use as basic practices to negotiate turns.
and sequences. For example, in line 7, since the customer’s request for the drink occurs after the worker’s confirmation of the order’s completeness (line 5), one would expect the customer to begin the turn with some non-alignment with the projection of the worker’s turn, such as by using “and” to indicate the continuation of the ordering action (see our analysis of Excerpt 11 above, cf. Heritage & Sorjonen, 1994).

The 2012 edition of *Sunshine English Course 2* contains a dialog that appears to be much more similar to the authentic transactions we found in our data. This dialog is broken up into four parts, each introduced by an announcer who says the number of that part (lines 1, 9, 14, 21).

**Textbook Dialog 5: Sunshine English Course 2 (2012, p. 52)**

1  ((Announcer: number one))
2  ((1.0 seconds of background noise))
3  Worker: hello.
4  (.)
5  Worker: may I help you?
6  (0.5)
7  Maki: yes. (.) I’ll have a hamburger, (.) a small French fries, (.) and a cola. please,
8  ((Announcer: number two))
9  Worker: which size cola would you like.
10  (.)
11  Worker: small, (.) medium (.) or large.
12  Maki: medium please.
13  ((Announcer: number three))
14  Worker: for here, or to go:,
15  (0.4)
16  Maki: for here please.
17  (0.4)
18  Worker: would you like anything else?
19  Maki: no. (.) that’s all. (.) thanks.
20  ((Announcer: number four))
21  Worker: okay. that’ll be three eighty please,
This dialog contains all the key components that we found in the overall structure of the naturally occurring transactions, including an opening sequence (lines 3-5), a sequence about choices (lines 10-13), a sequence about food presentation (lines 15-17), a sequence to confirm the completeness of the order (lines 19-20), and a payment sequence (lines 22-28). One difference between this dialog and the real-life transactions we analyzed, however, is the relative positioning of the confirmation of order completeness and the food presentation choices. As shown above (Excerpts 12, 13), confirmation of order completeness occurs before food presentation choices in the real-life transactions, but that order is reversed in this dialog. As we also noted above, while these are both pre-closing actions, they have different orientations that match their sequential order. Because the textbook dialog groups actions into four parts, it would make more sense to place the confirmation of order completeness in part two, which involves food ordering. A second difference is the absence of the worker’s verbal acknowledgment in response to the customer’s request, which occurs regularly in our data (see Excerpts 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 for examples). Including the verbal acknowledgment, normally a repetition of the customer’s request, could facilitate listening comprehension while also increasing authenticity.

Finally, we turn our attention to a MEXT-approved senior high school textbook that includes a fast-food ordering dialog, *Mainstream Oral Communication I* (2010). Constructed for students of a higher proficiency level, the dialog still contains several features that are not authentic.


1  A: What would you like, sir?
2  Shota: Well, I’d like to have a ham sandwich.
3  A: Large or small?
4  Shota: Small, please.
5  A: Two hundred yen, sir. Anything else?
Nguyen & Ishitobi

6 Shota: I’ll take a chocolate shake and a medium French fries.
7 A: To eat here or to go?
8 Shota: To go, please.
9 A: That will be five hundred yen, sir. Enjoy your meal.

Note. Line numbers are added for reference.

Noticeably, unlike the real-life transactions analyzed above, the payment sequence is initiated in line 5, right after the first request and before a confirmation of the order completeness. There is an absence of acknowledgement by the worker after each request by the customer throughout the transaction. In addition, the routine question in fast-food restaurants, “for here or to go?” is not presented idiomatically in line 7. In line 9, the worker announces the price and produces a closing wish without any responses from the customer. Finally, at this point in the transaction, the food has not been delivered and thus the expression “enjoy your meal” does not seem to be sequentially appropriate.

In sum, our examination of the fast-food ordering dialogs in four government-approved textbooks in Japan shows that while there are some positive changes in the recent publications (a trend also found in international textbooks) (Gilmore, 2004), there is still much room for improvement in order to increase the authenticity of these textbooks.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings above should be taken as preliminary only, in view of the small data sample size for both the real-life transactions and the textbook dialogs. In addition, the lack of video data for the real-life transactions meant that valuable information on nonverbal actions (such as eye gaze, gesture, facial expression) was not available except for the actions recorded in our limited field notes.

As an initial analysis, however, we have identified the overall sequential structure and how actions are constructed and sequenced in a few real-life food ordering transactions. For example, a customer may utilize the full question form rather than the elliptic form to re-initiate the food ordering sequence and hesitation markers to hold the floor, thus sustaining the current sequence and withholding the transition to a new sequence. When we compared these transactions with textbook dialogs, we found that the textbooks deviate from authentic conversations in material ways, namely,
the sequencing of actions, the completeness of actions, and the interactional practices used to perform actions.

We are aware that textbook writers have to operate within certain constraints; for example, they may have felt the need to make the dialogs fit the linguistic focus of the lesson or the students’ proficiency level, and in so doing, they omitted important aspects of social interaction such as openings, closings, receipt tokens, order summaries, and means to negotiate turns in talk. However, there is a danger in acceding to such constraints. First of all, as our analysis of the authentic transactions show, choices of language expressions and other interactional practices at each moment of talk are indexical of the context and the unfolding sequential organization of the interaction. Altering the language and other interactional features may also create misleading cues about the context of the target linguistic forms as well as the structure of the interaction itself (as in the inclusion of the phrase “here you are” in a fast-food ordering transaction). Second, since it is often difficult for EFL teachers and learners to experience authentic English conversations, they need to rely on the textbook dialogs as model language samples, and if textbook dialogs are so deprived of authentic features, teachers and students may be led to believe that these dialogs are the norm and find themselves unprepared to handle real-life situations when the opportunity arises (see also Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Wong, 2002). For these reasons, in our view, simplifying conversations for textbooks can potentially make it more difficult for students to develop the communicative competence needed for real-life communication. In fact, introducing authentic language can only benefit students. Gilmore (2011) demonstrated that students exposed to authentic input developed higher communicative competence compared to those exposed to only textbook materials.

Where exposure to authentic input is not possible outside of the classroom, we would like to encourage textbook writers to analyze samples of authentic conversations and introduce them to students as transcripts, audio samples, or video clips (see, for examples, Barraja-Rohan & Pritchard, 1997; Reber, 2011). Teachers should be encouraged to provide students with exposure to authentic interactions and opportunities to practice them. We believe that presenting speech events with authentic sequential organization and interactional practices can help students become more familiar with how language is used in the target context. Further, interactional phenomena such as pauses, overlaps, and restarts—while seemingly messy—are inherent to social interaction. Since students deal with these phenomena in their first language as well, learning how to utilize them in
the target language should be a part of language acquisition. We hope that our study, albeit performed on a small scale, can inform textbook writers and teachers with both its findings and methodology, so that they can be more effective in developing students’ communicative competence.

Notes

1. It should be noted, however, that textbooks should not be considered as the sole determiner of the learning outcomes in the language classroom.

2. See also Williams (1988) for a survey of differences in speech act realizations in business meetings as given in textbooks versus naturally occurring discourse and M. Nguyen (2011) for a critical evaluation of several speech acts in textbooks used in Vietnam.

3. We do not suggest that textbooks should include CA transcripts in their written dialogs, but including interactional practices, such as these non-fluencies, in the audio version of the dialogs might increase textbook authenticity.

4. Future research on a wider range of textbooks in various countries would be desirable.

5. Permission to record the conversations was obtained from the restaurant workers and customers either beforehand or as they were waiting in line.

6. While video data would have been ideal, we decided to use audio recording to minimize the intrusiveness of the recording device.

7. The pick-up phase is separate from the ordering phase. It may occur a few minutes after the ordering phase and may be handled by the same worker or a different worker.

8. A multimodal action involves multiple meaning-making modals, such as verbal expressions, embodied actions, and manipulation of objects. The nonverbal details in the transcripts were noted by the researcher who observed the transactions while recording them.

9. The importance of the register key in this type of interaction can also be illustrated by Excerpt 9 (lines 8 and 10), where it is sufficient for the worker to receipt an order by pressing the register key without any verbal production.
10. A customer may employ this feature of the full question format to reinitiate the food-ordering phase (Excerpt 14, lines 36-37).

11. The talk between Excerpt 7 and Excerpt 11 is:

[Happy Meal]

14  W: ↑what kind of drink?
15  C:  uh: (.) Sprite.
16  W:  Sprite.

12. Whether the summary sequence occurs or not seems to depend on the size of the order. In both cases where it occurs, the order involves several food items. In contrast, the other cases involve only one or two items. This is a pattern worth exploring in further research.

13. It is worth noting that the customer in lines 36-37 uses the full question form, which is often found in the initial request. By using the full question form right after what may sound like a summary by the worker (line 35), he seems to imply a reinitiation of the food-ordering sequence.

14. Examples of the pick-up phase are:

Example 1
1  W: here you go Big Mac,
2  C: thank you.

Example 2
1  W: FILET OF FISH FOR YOU:, I HAVE A FILET OF FISH?
2     (3.0)
3  W: FILET OF FISH FOR YOU:, I HAVE A FILET OF FISH?
4     (2.0)
5  W: FILET OF FISH FOR YOU:,
6     (5.0)
7  W: thank you:,

16. The textbook’s choice to use *cola* here is perhaps due to the fact that government authorized textbooks need to avoid using a trade name (e.g., “Coke”). If that is the case, then this is an example of how authenticity is compromised by political policies.

17. We were not able to obtain the audio recording of this dialog from the publisher.

18. These constraints should not prevent textbook writers from presenting speech events with natural sequential organization, however.

19. Another worthwhile strategy is to incorporate commercial video materials such as films and TV shows, which, although not the same as naturally occurring interaction, have been demonstrated to have high authenticity (Tatsuki, 2006; Tatsuki & Nishizawa, 2005).
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Appendix

Transcription Conventions

(Based on Jefferson, 2004, with additional attention to nonverbal details)

.: falling intonation
?: rising intonation
,: slightly rising intonation
↑: rising pitch in the following segment
↓: falling pitch in the following segment
↑↓: pitch rises and falls within the next word
:: lengthened speech
=: latched speech
-: cut off word
underline: stressed syllable
CAPITALS: louder volume
superscript zero °: beginning and end of quieter speech
((  )): vocal effect accompanying speech or transcriber’s notes
[ : beginning of overlap of speech or nonverbal actions
> < : speech faster than surrounding speech
< > : slowed down speech
(number): duration of silence in seconds
( . ) : a pause of roughly one-tenth of a second
→: line of interest to analysis
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In this paper we report on the recent construction of a small-scale learner corpus with written and spoken output from pre-intermediate to intermediate Mandarin learners of different first languages—The Mandarin Interlanguage Corpus (MIC). The learners attended a 2-year certificate course on Mandarin Chinese at a tertiary institution in Hong Kong. Both their written and spoken production in the form of coursework and examinations, amounting to a total of about 50,000 characters and 60 hours of oral output, has been included in the database so far. The rationale, methodologies (i.e., collection, transcription, and annotation), and design of the database are described. Challenges in compiling the database are also addressed.

本論文は、The Mandarin Interlanguage Corpus (MIC) という、様々な母語話者から構成される初中級から中級までの中国語学習者の書きことばと話しことばの小規模学習コーパスの構築過程を報告する。学習者たちは香港の高等教育機関における2年間の中国語コースに参加しており、授業および試験において収集されたサンプルは、これまでに約50,000文字の書きことばと60時間に相当する話ることばが収録された。本コーパス構築における論理的根拠、方法論（収集、書き起こしと注釈の付記）、およびデータベース設計について紹介し、データベースを編纂する際の諸問題についても考察する。

*JALT Journal, Vol. 34, No. 2, November 2012*
Building on a foundation laid by previous projects on corpora on Mandarin Chinese (e.g., *The Lancaster Corpus of Mandarin Chinese*, McEnery & Xiao, 2004; *The Sheffield Corpus of Chinese*, Hu, Williamson, & McLaughlin, 2005; *The UCLA Chinese Corpus*, Tao & Xiao, 2007), this paper presents a project which has compiled a small-scale database with both written and spoken output from learners of different first languages (L1s) in a certificate course in Mandarin. It is intended that the database will serve as another public resource for researchers, teachers, and students of Chinese as a second or foreign language.

The project was motivated by the development of corpus linguistics in the 1980s and subsequent corpus development in China. As reviewed by Feng (2006), the notion of corpora appeared on the mainland as early as the 1920s, in the form of small-scale non-machine-readable corpora (e.g., *The Applied Glossary of Modern Chinese*). Since the development of corpus linguistics worldwide in the late 1980s, many corpora have been or are being compiled (see Feng, 2006, and Zhan, Chang, Duan, & Zhang, 2006, for their detailed reviews of the development of corpora in China). The majority of the corpora are of the general monolingual written type, serving as databases of written Mandarin Chinese in various genres (e.g., newspapers, literary texts, and textbooks, as in *The Academia Sinica Balanced Corpus of Modern Chinese*, discussed in Huang & Chen, 1992). While some spoken corpora were constructed (e.g., *The Contemporary Beijing Spoken Chinese Corpus*, as recorded in X. J. Yang, 2006), their advancement has been far behind that of the written counterpart, as shown in the aforementioned reviews. Therefore, spoken corpora certainly deserve much more investigation, as noted in Jia (2006), J. Yang (2008), X. J. Yang (2006), and Zhou (2007).

Yet to be fully developed are not only general spoken corpora but also learner corpora (or interlanguage corpora), one type of specialised corpus. Both X. J. Yang (2006) and Zhan et al. (2006) cite *The Chinese Interlanguage Corpus* (or *The Corpus of the Chinese Language as Interlanguage*) as the only example of an interlanguage corpus (disappointingly, it is not accessible to the public or available on the Internet). According to their descriptions, the corpus started in 1995 and comprises written texts from foreign students. From 1993 to 1995, the Beijing Language and Culture University (BLCU) constructed the BLCU Chinese Interlanguage Corpus, storing 1,371 compositions written by 740 students. Some years later, the International R&D Center for Chinese Education at the BLCU compiled *The Inter-Media HSK Essay Corpus* (Beijing Language and Culture University, 2003, 2009), which appears to be the most extensive one and is open to the public (HSK = Hanyu
Shuiping Kaoshi, or the Chinese Proficiency Test, a standardized test at the state level to assess the Chinese proficiency of nonnative speakers. Another recent searchable corpus, the Modern Interlanguage Chinese Corpus, comprises compositions and sentence-making tasks collected from Chinese studies students in years 2 to 4 at six Korean universities between 2004 and 2006, totalling 10,135 sentences. Another interlanguage corpus consists of written work done by elementary-level Chinese heritage learners in the US (Ming & Tao, 2008). Some other interlanguage corpora with written data are also currently being constructed, such as those by Lutong University and Shanghai Jiaotong University. Apart from these written interlanguage corpora, a recent spoken corpus was constructed by Cao and Zhang (2009) on interlanguage phonology.

Overall, the development of written Chinese interlanguage corpora is not surprising in that the techniques involved have been quite well established through the investigation of general corpora. However, this also implies that more spoken interlanguage corpora are yet to be compiled. Discussion has been ongoing (e.g., Wang & Li, 2001; Yang, Li, Guo, & Tien, 2006; Zhang, 2005), which helps emphasise the value and significance of the establishment of a spoken interlanguage corpus. Added to this is the importance of Mandarin as a second or foreign language in different parts of the world. The Asian context is a good example. In Japan, the importance and popularity of Chinese is acknowledged and Chinese is taught in some high schools (Gottlieb, 2012; Maher, 1995). Similarly, in Korea, Mandarin has been a popular foreign language (Teng & Yeh, 2001, as cited in Xing, 2006), and there are efforts to construct Chinese interlanguage corpora (such as the one mentioned above). In the certificate course reported on in the present study, Japanese and Korean native speakers formed two of the significant learner groups. All these instances in turn suggest that the development of a Mandarin learner or interlanguage corpus, be it written, spoken, or both written and spoken, is of utmost importance.

**Development of Learner Corpora**

In this section, the features of three of the learner interlanguage corpora mentioned above are presented so as to illustrate the existing development of Mandarin learner corpora.

*The Inter-Media HSK Essay Corpus* (Beijing Language and Culture University, 2003, 2009), constructed by researchers at the BLCU, is based on 11,569 compositions (4.24 million words in total) written by advanced
level students during the HSK examination in the period 1992-2005. Both original scripts produced by the students and error-tagged scripts are open to public access. Errors in the scripts are tagged in terms of five levels: character, punctuation, word, sentence, and paragraph or passage.

Ming and Tao’s (2008) corpus collected written input from Chinese heritage learners whose Mandarin speaking and listening skills were at the advanced level but whose writing abilities varied. One thousand written samples (about 200,000 characters) were encoded in UTF-8, and segmented and tagged by ICTCLAS (Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Lexical Analysis System) in the heritage corpus, and the errors in the samples are tagged according to 10 major categories and 30 subcategories (e.g., verb or verb phrase errors and nominal errors).

Cao and Zhang (2009) devised an interlanguage phonology corpus with reading samples collected from learners of Chinese in an experimental setting. The corpus is composed of six subcorpora (e.g., monosyllabic, disyllabic, sentence, and paragraph). In trying to tag nontarget-like pronunciations, Cao and Zhang addressed the inadequacy of using only IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) symbols. Instead, they used SAMPA2C (a version of the Speech Assessment Methods Phonetic Alphabet) and C2ToBI (a version of the Chinese Tones and Break Indices), which are specifically designed for Mandarin Chinese.

The establishment of the three learner corpora helps show the recent development of learner corpora based on Chinese data. At the same time, they bring out certain problems or challenges in presenting as much information as possible about a given error. For example, Cao and Zhang (2009) acknowledged the need to use different symbols to represent learners’ nontarget-like phonological output. In Ming and Tao’s (2008) heritage corpus, the sentence errors cover a wide range from inappropriate conjunctions to punctuation errors. There is even a very general category labelled multiple errors. This in turn draws our attention to the need to handle learners’ errors with care.

Aim of the Mandarin Interlanguage Corpus Project

In light of the possibility that an error can be subject to more than one judgement or interpretation, especially at the sentence or discourse level, the Mandarin Interlanguage Corpus (MIC) tags the errors at the character level, as explained below. This avoids the situation where errors receive different treatments by the research team and the user, and as a result do not
turn up in the search. At the same time, this also allows room for researchers and teachers to analyse the original data with their own interpretation in terms of their own focus.

With the intention of assembling a collection of written and spoken data from Mandarin learners, the MIC aims to

- Relieve the scarcity of learner corpora of Mandarin;
- Identify and track both written and spoken language patterns from Mandarin learners of different L1s who have reached the post-elementary level or above;
- Facilitate research comparing features among learners of different L1s and possibly different proficiency levels; and
- Enhance the development of teaching and assessment materials for learners of Mandarin.

In what follows, we will explain how data were collected from the learners in the certificate course and processed for the compilation of the database (e.g., tagging). We will then describe the design of the MIC and discuss the challenges in the construction of the database.

**Data Source**

Students from the Mandarin stream of a 2-year *Certificate Course in Chinese Language* offered by the Chinese Language Centre at a tertiary institution in Hong Kong were invited to participate in the corpus project. Both Year 1 and Year 2 students were recruited. They received 15 hours of in-class Mandarin input per week for three semesters in a year and took two final examinations, one at the end of each academic year, which assessed their reading, listening, writing, and speaking competence in Mandarin. Their level is supposed to reach intermediate on the HSK proficiency test upon completion of the course.

All students in the course have L1s other than Chinese. In total, 19 participants from two groups of Year 2 students were recruited within the 1.5-year project period (see Table 1).

As Table 1 shows, the student pool was not balanced as to L1. This is due to a number of reasons. First, the types of student taking the Chinese programme vary from year to year. In the first Year 2 group, there were students with English, Korean, and French as their L1. In the second Year 2 group, there were Japanese and Thai learners. An additional concern was students’ willingness to join the project. Every participant was required to sign a consent form before their course output was recorded and processed for the
Otherwise, their output would not be recorded. Should they request to withdraw during the data collection period (which happened in two of the four oral classes involved), data collection had to cease and the collected data had to be discarded. Lastly, all participants were asked to complete a placement test so that the research team could ensure that their proficiency level had reached post-elementary by the time of data collection. It turned out that all Year 1 students attained very low scores in the placement test and so had to be excluded from the participant pool.

Table 1. First Languages of the Participants of the MIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Two kinds of output were collected during the course and from the end-of-course examination: written and spoken. The written output was in the form of short compositions ranging from 150 to 700 characters, depending on the genre. The spoken output was short presentations (1 to 2 minutes) delivered by the participants in class and during the examination. In both contexts, during the course and in the end-of-course examination, participants were given a topic to write on or talk about (e.g., *A memorable day*). While the topics were fixed by the course instructors, the output was considered to be fairly natural production by the participants because they were free to write or talk about whatever they liked in relation to the given topics.

A placement test, in the form of a fill-in-the-blank exercise and an error correction exercise, was administered to check the proficiency level of the
participants at the outset of data collection. This was to ensure that the project participants’ level of Mandarin had reached at least post-elementary. The items tested were based on what they had studied in Year 1 and what they were learning or would learn in Year 2. The perfect score on the test was 50 and students attaining a score lower than 25 were not included in the database.³

With consent from the participants and after the completion of the placement test, photocopies of their written work were collected and digital recorders were placed in the classroom to record the short presentations. The participants were also requested to fill in a bio-data questionnaire which asked for personal information (e.g., nationality and age) and information relating to their language learning prowess (e.g., first language, other languages they speak, and how long they have learnt Mandarin). This was important in that their nationalities as recorded by the programme teacher did not necessarily predict their L1 (e.g., American nationality with Spanish as L1) or reveal any previous experience or knowledge of the Chinese language (e.g., American nationality with Chinese as the heritage language).⁴

So far, in total, 88 compositions (amounting to 50,000 characters) and 120 hours of recordings (of which 60 hours were observed to be coherent and therefore usable data, a point to be explained later) have been processed from coursework and examinations. The topics of the spoken presentations varied, usually depending on the time of year when they were recorded. For example, near the Chinese New Year, the students were asked to talk about their national festivals or the practices of the Chinese people in their home country. As to the written data, there was a balance between narration or description and exposition. Some sample topics are listed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Topics</th>
<th>Spoken Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wedding</td>
<td>Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>A quarrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My little treasure</td>
<td>Travelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A memorable day</td>
<td>Making a choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The world economy</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to nurture a kid</td>
<td>Role play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News censorship</td>
<td>On vacation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Processing

Based on the discussion about procedures for corpus compilation prof-ferred in McEnery, Xiao, and Tono (2006), and Yang et al. (2006), the current project follows the typical flow of data handling. After photocopies of learners’ compositions and digital audio files were collected, the contextual information about the data (e.g., nationality, age, and the number of languages spoken) collected via the questionnaire was also recorded. A code was assigned to each participant to keep identities anonymous (e.g., F1 to refer to the first Mandarin learner with French as L1). Then the written and spoken raw data were coded in terms of three kinds of textual information: topic, mode (written or spoken), and source (coursework or examination). Each piece of output was thus coded in terms of contextual and textual information (for example, learner 1 with L1 X [X1]—written 1 [W1]—coursework composition 1 [CW1]), which corresponds to the mark-up process later on. For example, the first composition and presentation from the first French native speaker (F1) were labelled as F1CW1 and F1CO1 respectively; the first composition and the second presentation from the second French native speaker were F2CW1 and F2CO2. The number after W or O helps indicate the chronology of the learner output.

Then, the data were transformed into electronic versions: Written data were word-processed and spoken data were transcribed with traditional and simplified Chinese characters and Hanyu Pinyin. The data were then annotated with POS (part-of-speech) tagging, based on a tag set following the national standard in China and the HSK conventions as listed in standard HSK textbooks and references (e.g., Huang & Sun, 2000; Liu, et al., 2002-2005), and some key grammar references on Mandarin Chinese (e.g., Beijing Language and Culture University, 2000; Cheung, Liu, & Shih, 1994; Li & Thompson, 1981; Shao, 2007). Sixteen parts of speech and 40 sub-parts-of-speech were devised, totalling 52 categories (see the Appendix for the complete tag set).

After manual tagging and cross-checking of the data, the tagging was compared with that generated by the word tagging server designed by the CKIP (Chinese Knowledge and Information Processing) group. This server was chosen because it is open to the public for free. While the tag set of the CKIP server is different from that of the MIC, the broad categories (e.g., noun and verb) did help identify any improper tagging in the data. As to be explained later, the MIC administrator page houses a statistical programme to check internal tagging consistency.

In handling the written data, proper names were changed in order not to reveal the identity of the participants. As to the spoken data, the research
team read through every script to select coherent speech produced by each participant. Random utterances, chorus reading, repetition from teachers’ samples, and metalinguistic discussions (e.g., about the usage of verb-object constructions) were excluded.

Regarding the nontarget-like forms (i.e., errors) in the learner output, the issue of whether and how they would be marked as in other existing interlanguage corpora was considered by the research team. In light of the possible subjective nature of correcting learner output and in order not to throw off other teachers’ and researchers’ searches for samples through our own interpretations of the learners’ usage, error analysis was kept at the character level, including replacement of wrongly used or mispronounced characters and addition of missing characters. The character level was regarded as the place bearing the most prominent error type that was worth displaying and studying in the learner output and at the same time a more objective presentation of the learners’ usage.

On the corpus search interface, whenever a nontarget-like character or missing character was found, it was inputted in brackets and placed next to the target character. The same technique was applied to pronunciation. When a character was mispronounced with a nontarget-like sound segment, it was indicated in brackets. Figures 1a and 1b illustrate what the tagging looks like.

![Figure 1a. Sample Error Tag in the MIC (Written)](image_url)

![Figure 1b. Sample Error Tag in the MIC (Spoken)](image_url)
In Figure 1a, the node word is 住 zhù live and there are instances where learners incorrectly used the character 主 zhǔ main for 住. On the interface, it was indicated in brackets and placed next to the node word. In Figure 1b, the character 管 guǎn control was mispronounced with the high falling tone instead of the falling-rising tone. The learner’s mispronounced tone in brackets was placed next to the node word.

In addition to the manual encoding and cross-checking done by the research assistants and researchers, a statistical programme was written to aim at consistency of word tagging across all the data. In the programme, the analysis of the words in one text was checked against that in the database in terms of word token, text token, and the corresponding percentages of each word, as shown in Figure 2a.

For every word in a text under checking, there are five rows with different pieces of tagging information: the word itself and its part of speech (first row), WORD TOKEN (second row), WORD TOKEN RATIO (third row), TEXT TOKEN (fourth row), and TEXT TOKEN RATIO (fifth row). An example is the word 先生 xiānshēng, meaning husband in the context where it appears. In the text under checking (K1CW2), the word 先生 bears the part of speech N (noun), as indicated in the first row [先生 | N]. Under this row, we can
find the match or mismatch between this analysis with the others in the database. *WORD TOKEN* refers to the number of instances of a word in the database at the time of checking (88 tokens of 先生). Next to it is the number of instances of the word with a particular part of speech (88 tokens with the part-of-speech N). Given that 先生 has only one part of speech, the number of *WORD TOKEN* should be the same as that of the part of speech (i.e., 88 for 先生 vs. 88 for the part-of-speech N) or there was a missing tag. The third row shows the corresponding percentages: Given that all 88 tokens of 先生 were tagged N, the percentage is 100%, indicating consistent tagging. The next two rows present the number and percentage of texts where the word appears. At the point of checking, the word 先生 appeared in 34 texts, including the checked one, and all those tokens were labelled with the same part of speech N.

An alert was given to the administrator of the site when one of the following two conditions was found: (1) there was only one instance of a part of speech for a word token, or (2) there was more than one instance of a part of speech for a word token but the percentage was lower than 10%. Figures 2b and 2c help illustrate the two conditions. Condition (1) states that there is only one instance of a particular word tag and this can in turn imply wrong assignment of a part of speech to the word.

![Figure 2b. Consistency Template: Word Token, Text Token, Percentages, and Inconsistency Alert—Condition (1)](image)
As shown in Figure 2b, inconsistent tagging of the verb 坐 zuò sit was noted by the system. Among the 17 tokens, 16 were tagged as TV (i.e., transitive verb, 94%) and one as InV (i.e., intransitive verb, 5%), although all 17 tokens were consistently tagged as the sub-part-of-speech AcV (i.e., action verb). As a result, an alert was issued by the system. The administrators then referred to the text concerned and did subsequent editing for another round of uploading. With cross-checking done, the administrators then pressed the button Suppress warning to avoid confusion in any further cross-checking.

As a supplement to Condition (1), Condition (2) handles situations where there is more than one instance of the tag but the percentage is low. In Figure 2c, the word token 多 duō many in the text under checking was among the 18 instances in the database with the part of speech Other particle [OtherPt] (as in 十多个大的蜢 shíduōgè dàde měng about 10 big locusts). Even though there was more than one instance of 多 bearing the part of speech Other particle (18 instances), the percentage of the tag OtherPt was low (4%). Consequently, an alert was issued by the system and cross-checking ensued.

Database Structure of the MIC

In constructing the MIC, PHP (Hypertext Preprocessor) and MYSQL were adopted for several reasons. First, they are free of charge, which is important considering the funding and other resources available. More importantly, they can be run on every platform and provide good support to the UTF8 encoding which accommodates both Traditional and Simplified Chinese characters. Last, they are quick and light on server resource usage.
Components of the MIC Site

The MIC is made up of the two standard components of any corpus resource: the corpus and statistics. In addition to these two components, a Learners’ Corner is also available for the student participants in the project. The content of the pages can be displayed in three different modes: English, traditional Chinese, and simplified Chinese.

Corpus Search Interface

The corpus search interface consists of two corpora: spoken and written. Once a user clicks on the spoken or written corpus, he or she will go into the search interface of that particular database. The search interface is designed in a user-friendly manner, with five key search options phrased in nontechnical terms: *Keyword*, *Source*, *Word category*, *First language*, and *Topic*. A user can key in any of the five options in searching for tokens in the database (see Figure 3).

![Written Corpus Search Interface](image)

Figure 3. Search Interface of the MIC Site

Alternatively, the user can combine two or more search options so as to execute a more specific search (e.g., how action verbs [word category] are used by learners with French as the first language [first language]). Once a search is keyed in, the system will generate the output (see Figure 4).
In addition to the node word in the centre and the concordance lines, the user can refer to the original text from which the node word is taken by clicking on the View Original Text button next to a particular line (see Figure 5). The full text is made available to users so as to facilitate further independent and undistorted analysis of the word under examination in the context where it was used.

Figure 5. Sample Output Interface of the MIC (Original Text)

Statistics

On the statistics interface, the user can search for the frequency of a keyword in either the spoken or written corpus (see Figure 6). Three kinds of statistics about the word under search are given on the page: the different parts of speech assigned to the word, the WORD TOKEN (and ratio) and the TEXT TOKEN (and ratio). In the example in Figure 6 of the character 想 xiăng, we can see the number of instances when it was used as a transitive verb (29 instances, 67.4%), with its sub-category psyche verb (20 instances, 46.5%) or optative verb (9 instances, 20.9%) below it, or as part of a word (e.g., in the noun 想法 xiăngfǎ thought).
As a way to encourage students to submit their work to the project, a Learners’ Corner was constructed on this site. Unlike the corpus search interface, which is open to the public, this is a place reserved for student participants and they need to log in to get access to the exercises on Mandarin and the corresponding answers. Besides some general exercises with different types of questions, there are some questions on the specific open parts of speech (e.g., verbs and nouns) and some questions that target different first languages. So far, 100 exercises have been uploaded to the site.

Preliminary Observations

In the course of tagging the data, some preliminary observations as to the features of the learners’ Chinese were made:

1. Learners, in general, tended to overuse the aspectual marker 了 and underuse the aspectual marker 过.
2. Classifier-language speakers and non-classifier-language speakers differed in their use of some specific classifiers, although they used the general classifier 个 most of the time.
3. There were traces of first language (L1) influence in L2 Chinese word order, as in the position of the modifier of a place name: Native Chinese: 我的家乡在美利坚南布的North Carolina Charlotte.
English: My hometown is Charlotte, North Carolina in southern America (i.e., USA).
Some of these features have been and are being examined in more detail in Tsang (2012a, 2012b).

Challenges

In the compilation of the MIC, several challenges deserve some discussion in this report. These challenges are mainly related to data processing at the encoding level and at the technical level.

Annotation-Related Challenges

The first challenge concerns the ambiguity of the parts of speech of some words. Such ambiguity arises largely because of two difficulties. The first relates to the lack of a specific tag in the existing HSK conventions and the nature of the word as discussed in the literature. For example, 還是 háishì still is labelled as an adverb in the HSK system. However there is no mention of what kind of adverb it is, and different subcategories have been suggested in the existing key literature on Mandarin grammar (e.g., scope adverb or mood adverb). The other difficulty is associated with the usage of a word in the context. Take 沒有 méiyǒu not yet as an example. It can be one lexical unit functioning as a negative adverb as in (1) or two lexical units as a negative adverb plus an existential verb as in (2):

(1) 我沒有打瞌睡 （沒有 méiyǒu as an adverb）
    wǒ méiyǒu dăkēshuì
    I not yet fall asleep
    “I haven’t fallen asleep yet.”
(2) 我身上沒有錢 （没有 méiyǒu as an adverb plus a noun）
    wǒ shēnshang méi yŏu qián
    I body on no money
    “I have no money with me.”

To arrive at a correct tag for tokens such as 還是 háishì still, the research team looked at all the contexts collected in the first 3 months and decided on one sub-part-of-speech of the word to be used consistently for future analyses. As to the second difficulty (i.e., as exemplified by 沒有 méiyǒu not
yet), each context in which the word appeared was carefully examined and cross-checked to find out which pattern the word fell into.

One more challenge was about marking participants’ output at different periods of the course in terms of the corresponding level of Mandarin. As stated earlier, the student participants were asked to complete a placement test, which helped to identify their level of Mandarin at the outset of data collection. Besides this indicator of their Mandarin proficiency, the end-of-course examination was taken as another available indicator. While the examination output could be clearly marked with the participants’ levels of Mandarin, the output produced as coursework has yet to be marked in terms of participants’ proficiency. As a makeshift solution, all the data are currently marked with the time when the participants produced the work and the number in the code (e.g., CW1 earlier than CW2).

**Technical Challenges**

As well as the annotation-related issues, the research team needs to handle two challenges in the technical realm. First, the team is actively exploring the best way to upload actual sound files to the database site, taking into account the need for the anonymity of the participants in the audio clips, an economical budget, the size of the clips, and the availability of space on the server. The other technical challenge concerns the two conditions for the consistency check function. A statistical programme is deemed necessary to show the reliable thresholds which can further enhance the checking of tag consistency across a bulk of data.

**Conclusion**

With the intention to overcome the above challenges, the MIC project hopes to contribute to the learning of Mandarin Chinese as a foreign language from both theoretical and pedagogical perspectives. Theoretically speaking, the learner corpus can serve as a small-scale database that facilitates and stimulates research on both corpus linguistics and different fields of applied linguistics. Pedagogically, the database is expected to enhance the learning and teaching of Mandarin as a foreign language.

Regarding the area of corpus linguistics, the inclusion of both written and spoken output will shed light on the development of two-mode corpora, as well as that of spoken learner corpora and learner corpora in general, especially in terms of the nature of learners’ output and the compilation process or technology concerned. The database can also contribute to different fields
of applied linguistics, with its systematic and detailed database of Mandarin language output from learners of different L1s. In particular, the availability of both written and spoken data in the database can help investigation or comparison of learners’ output in terms of different parameters, such as L1s, levels of proficiency, language patterns (especially those contrasting Mandarin and L1s of different learners), genres, contexts (e.g., in-course vs. examination), and modes of output (written vs. spoken).

Pedagogically, students should find the Learners’ Corner particularly useful. They can choose to work on some general exercises applicable to learners of any first language or some exercises targeted at different types of Chinese learners (e.g., Japanese learners of Chinese in Japan or Mainland China). Meanwhile, language teachers and course or textbook developers of Chinese as a second or foreign language will be provided with a resource where they can examine learners’ Mandarin in a systematic and focused context. Drawing on information from the database, they will be in a better position to plan curricula and design teaching and assessment materials. This in turn will help explore further the role of corpora in language teaching.

Finally, it is intended that the MIC will serve as a preliminary database leading to a bigger resource with more variables covered, especially in terms of the number of language samples and participants with different L1s.

Notes

1. The authors would like to express their gratitude to one of the reviewers for information about the BLCU Chinese Interlanguage Corpus, the Modern Interlanguage Chinese Corpus, and some corpora which are currently under construction.

2. This kind of occurrence leads to potential difficulties in attaining corpus balance in different areas such as proficiency levels or observations for each language point. One possible solution to this problem is that the data be analysed in terms of proportions rather than absolute frequencies. Meanwhile, it is intended that more resources will be generated and learners be recruited in the future to arrive at a bigger and more balanced pool of learners’ data.

3. At the time of submission of this report, the lowest score on the placement test was 29 and the highest 43.
4. Data from Chinese heritage learners were not included in the database because their exposure to the target language is different from that of other learners of Chinese.

5. Each word in a text was given a number as the identifier, which is stated in the left column (e.g., 3 for the word 先生 husband).

6. In reading the numbers under the column TEXT TOKEN, it should be noted that a word can appear more than once in a text with different parts of speech, for example, 想 as an optative verb and as a noun, in two different parts in one text. Therefore, the text token at the top of the column is not the sum of the specific text tokens beneath it.
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Appendix

MIC Tag Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>形容詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Qualifying adjective</td>
<td>性質形容詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Descriptive adjective</td>
<td>狀態形容詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td>Non-predicate adjective</td>
<td>非謂語形容詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>副詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAdv</td>
<td>Degree adverb</td>
<td>程度副詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScAdv</td>
<td>Scope adverb</td>
<td>範圍副詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAdv</td>
<td>Time adverb</td>
<td>時間副詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegAdv</td>
<td>Negative adverb</td>
<td>否定副詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MdAdv</td>
<td>Mood adverb</td>
<td>語氣副詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>連詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Idiomatic expression</td>
<td>習慣用語</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Interjection</td>
<td>歎詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Measure word</td>
<td>量詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Classifier</td>
<td>個體量詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>Unit measure word</td>
<td>度量詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>Verbal measure word</td>
<td>動量詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>名詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Direction noun</td>
<td>方位詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Place noun</td>
<td>處所詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Time noun</td>
<td>時間詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td>數詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaNu</td>
<td>Cardinal number</td>
<td>系數詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeNu</td>
<td>Decimal number</td>
<td>位數詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrNu</td>
<td>Ordinal number</td>
<td>序數詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ono</td>
<td>Onomatopoeia</td>
<td>象聲詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>代詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerPr</td>
<td>Personal pronoun</td>
<td>人稱代詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DemPr</td>
<td>Demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>指示代詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPr</td>
<td>Question pronoun</td>
<td>疑問代詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pref</td>
<td>Prefix</td>
<td>詞頭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>介詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>Particle</td>
<td>助詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsPt</td>
<td>Aspect particle</td>
<td>動態助詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StPt</td>
<td>Structural particle</td>
<td>結構助詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPt</td>
<td>Modal particle</td>
<td>語氣助詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OtherPt</td>
<td>Other particle</td>
<td>其他助詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPt</td>
<td>Sentence final particle</td>
<td>句末語氣詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSF Pt</td>
<td>Declarative SF Pt</td>
<td>陳述句末語氣詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntSF Pt</td>
<td>Interrogative SF Pt</td>
<td>疑問句末語氣詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImSF Pt</td>
<td>Imperative SF Pt</td>
<td>祈使句末語氣詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExSF Pt</td>
<td>Exclamatory SF Pt</td>
<td>感嘆句末語氣詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suf</td>
<td>Suffix</td>
<td>詞尾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Transitive verb</td>
<td>及物動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InV</td>
<td>Intransitive verb</td>
<td>不及物動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcV</td>
<td>Action verb</td>
<td>動作動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExV</td>
<td>Existential verb</td>
<td>存在動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DirV</td>
<td>Directional verb</td>
<td>趨向動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CauV</td>
<td>Causative verb</td>
<td>使令動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyV</td>
<td>Psyche verb</td>
<td>心理動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CopV</td>
<td>Copula verb</td>
<td>判斷動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpV</td>
<td>Optative verb</td>
<td>能態動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Verb plus complement</td>
<td>動補式動詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td>Verb plus object</td>
<td>動賓式動詞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
中学校英語教科書のジャンル・テキストタイプ分析

A Genre/Text-Type Analysis of Junior High School English Textbooks
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2012年から実施される中学校学習指導要領（文部科学省, 2008）によれば、まとまりのある英語に焦点をあてて指導することが明記されている。まとまりのある英語とは、「一つのテーマに沿って話されたものや内容に一貫性のあるものなどを示している。例えば、スピーチや機内アナウンス、天気予報などが挙げられる。」(p. 12) と説明されている。そこで、平成18年度版中学校英語教科書にどのようなまとまりのある英語が扱われているのかを調べた。分析の結果、比較的多様なジャンル・テキストタイプが用いられていることがわかった。また、社会的行為や目的が明確でない基本的なジャンル・テキストタイプも見られた。頻度の高いジャンル・テキストタイプは、会話、スピーチ、自己紹介、放送、散文、電子メール、手紙、ウェブサイトであった。6社の教科書すべてで扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプは少なかった。これらの分析結果に基づき、教育的示唆を行った。
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The purpose of this study is to obtain information about EFL teaching materials used in Japanese junior high schools by analyzing textbooks in terms of genre/text types, one aspect of discourse organization. This study was motivated by the growing recognition of the importance of teaching discourse organization. For example, the new Course of Study (Monbukagakusho, i.e., the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, 2008) is now emphasizing discourse organization. Furthermore, Grabe and Stoller (2002) suggested that it is necessary to teach discourse organization because of inherent differences in L1 and L2 reading processes and reading situations. They also pointed out that features of discourse organization and social expectations in a particular genre may differ among cultures and thus argued that raising L2 learners’ awareness about discourse organization is important. Moreover, in light of these points, it is clear that an analysis of textbooks used as the main materials for EFL education in junior high schools will be beneficial for junior high school EFL teachers. As far as we know, no previous studies have analyzed such textbooks in terms of genre/text types.

In this study, we posited two research questions as follows: (a) What types of genre/text types are utilized in junior high school EFL textbooks? and (b) How often does each genre/text type appear? We analyzed 18 government-authorized EFL textbooks (six titles, each consisting of three books for three grades).

To analyze the textbooks, we proceeded as follows:

1. We made a basic list of genre/text types based on previous studies.
2. We each coded two textbooks independently.
3. We made a list of genre/text types through actual coding of those textbooks.
4. We each coded one book using that list of genre/text types. Our agreement reached 97.6%.
5. One or the other of us coded all the other books.
6. We discussed the codes and made final decisions about coding.

The results show that a variety of genre/text types was used in the textbooks, including both more basic genre/text types that have less clear communicative purposes or do not show clear social behaviors, and also genre/text types that can easily and definitely be regarded as a genre. Among the genre/text types, certain types such as conversations, speeches, self-introductions, and broadcasting were frequently used for the oral modes of communication whereas stories, emails, letters, and websites were the more frequent types for the written modes of communication. The range of genre/text types was not very different among the textbooks, but the specific types covered were.

On the basis of the findings, we discuss the pedagogical implications. First, taking into consideration that both more basic genre/text types as well as genre/text types with clearer communicative functions were identified, teachers can arrange the texts from basic to more complex genre/text types throughout the 3 years of EFL instruction in junior high school. Second, because the specific genre/text types
covered were different among textbooks, teachers need to know which genre/text types appear in the textbooks they use. If necessary, then, teachers can create additional materials to supplement the textbooks when teaching a certain genre/text type. Lastly, teachers must be careful about the terms for describing genre/text types because those used in the textbooks themselves are very often ambiguous.

本研究の目的は、ジャンル・テキストタイプの点から中学校英語教科書を分析し、教材に関する情報を得ることによって、教材の特徴を踏まえながらどのように指導するべきかという教育的示唆を得ることである。平成24（2012）年に完全実施される中学校学習指導要領（文部科学省，2008）では、内容等の改善点の1つとして、「『聞くこと』においては、『まとまりのある英語を聞いて、概要や要点を適切に聞き取ること』を追加した」（p.4）ことが挙げられている。「まとまりのある英語」とは、「一つのテーマに沿って話されたものや内容に一貫性のあるものなどを示している」（p.12）とし、例として、スピーチや機内アナウンス、天気予報などを挙げている。この例示は、ジャンル・テキストタイプを提示したものと理解できる。他にも、スピーチ、手紙、読み物、ポスター、図表、伝言、メモ、といった例を示している。そこで、どのようなジャンル・テキストタイプが英語教科書に出現しているのかを分析することは、教師にとって示唆に富む資料が得られると考え、本研究を計画した。

ジャンル・テキストタイプ

Grabe and Stoller (2002) によれば、談話構造（discourse organization）は“larger units of texts, how they are organised and how they can be recognised”（p.80）と定義されており、ジャンル（genre）、書き手の意図（writers’ intention）、情報の流れ（flow of information）、テキスト構造（text structure）、情報の種類（types of information）を反映する談話の特徴であると説明されている（p.259）。本研究では、談話構造の1つ側面であるジャンルに焦点を当てる。

ジャンルはどのように定義されるのだろうか。Grabe and Stoller (2002) は、“Means for organising formal aspects of a text to reflect specific functional intentions of a group, discipline or culture”（p.259）と定義しており、Swales (1990) は、“A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes”（p.58）と定義している。これらの定義によれば、ジャンルはある特定のコミュニケーション上の目的（communicative purpose）を反映したテキストの構成方法として捉えることができる。また、社会的な行為や出来事としても捉えられる。

一方で、ジャンルを定義することは曖昧で難しいという指摘がある（松木，2003，p.251）。また、Askehave and Swales (2001) や Swales (2004) は、コミュニケーション上の目的が最初から存在しているのではなく、その社会的行為を分析することによって、明確になることもあることを指摘し、コミュニケーション上の目的を、ジャンルを特定する要因とする考え方を修正している。すなわち、ジャンルを捉えるとき、コミュニケーション上の目的、社会的行為、テキストの構成方法などの点から、複眼的に分析する必要があることを示している。
ジャンルと類似した表現にテキストタイプという用語がある。本研究では、Grabe and Stoller (2002) の上記の定義に従いながらも、「ジャンル」と単独で表記せず、「ジャンル・テキストタイプ」という言い方を採用する。第一に、“genre/text type”という表現を用いて、テキストタイプとジャンルの違いを明示せずに、テキストの変数（text variables）の一つとして捉えている Alderson (2000, p. 39)のような研究者がいるからである。Aldersonは、テキストタイプの定義を示していないが、テキストタイプとして説明文（expository texts）と物語文（narrative texts）を例示している（p. 63）。また、Alderson はジャンルの定義を提示していないが、テキストタイプ研究の発展として Swales (1990) のジャンル分析研究にふれている（p. 63）。ここでは、テキストタイプの一部としてジャンルが扱われていると捉えられる。第二に、ESPのジャンル分析の研究領域（e.g., Askehave & Swales, 2001; Swales, 1990; 寺内, 2010）では、次のようにジャンルをかなり厳密に定義しており、単独で「ジャンル」という言い方を用いると、ジャンル分析におけるジャンルとの混同を招くと恐れたからである。

学問的背景や職業など固有のニーズを持つことにより同質性が認められ、その専門領域において学問上・職業上の目的を果たす集団である（プロフェッショナル・ディスコース・コミュニティでは、「講演」、「学術論文」、「スピーチ」、「宣伝」などさまざまな種類のコミュニケーションのイベントが行われている（…）。このコミュニケーションの各イベントのことを「ジャンル」という。そして、こうした目的をもった一連の発話であるテクストをジャンルによって識別する方法をジャンル分析という。 (寺内, 2010, pp. 6-7)

ESPのジャンル分析によるジャンルは限定的に定義されている。例えば、Swales (1990) は、“Rather, it [ordinary conversation] is a pre-generic "form of life," a basis from which more specific types of interaction have presumably either evolved or broken away” (p. 59) と述べ、ESP のジャンル分析では、会話 (conversations) や語り (narratives) はジャンルではなく、前ジャンル (pre-genres) を構成すると指摘している。中学校の英語教科書では、ESP のジャンル分析で定義されているジャンルが出現する前に、基本的なやりとりである前ジャンルが多く出現するだろうと予測された。そこで、本研究ではジャンル・テキストタイプという用語を用いて、ジャンルという概念（すなわち、ある特定のコミュニケーション上の目的を反映したテキストの構成方法や、社会的な行為や出来事）だけでなく、前ジャンル（すなわち、ジャンルを構成する以前の基本的なやりとり）の考え方も含むものとする。

中学校学習指導要領とジャンル・テキストタイプの指導

中学校学習指導要領を振り返ってみると、まとまりのある英語に言及しているのは平成20（2008）年公示・平成24（2012）年度実施の中学校学習指導要領（文部科学省, 2008）が初めてではない。平成元（1989）年公示・平成5（1993）年度実施の中学校学習指導要領（文部省, 1989）では、「数個の文」という言い方で「いくつかの文が互いに補い合って、あるまとまった内容を表すもの」（p. 15）を指したり、「初歩的な英語の文章」という言い方で「文がいくつか集まってできる文章」（p. 23）に言及したりしている。さらに、次に引用のように、「題材の形式」（p. 31）という言い方で、本研究で焦点をあてるジャンル・テキストタイプの概念と関連のある概念を表している。
第2学年では、題材も日常生活に関するもの、風俗習慣、物語、地理、歴史などと変化に富んだものになる。また、題材の形式も、説明文、対話文、物語、劇、詩、手紙などと幅広くなってくるであろう。（下線筆者、文部省、1989年、p.31）

平成10（1998）年告示・平成14（2002）年度実施の中学校学習指導要領（文部省、1999）では、多くのジャンル・テキストタイプに言及している。読むことの言語活動として「物語や説明文などのあらすじや大切な部分を読み取ること」（p.19）が挙げられ、物語や説明文を「文章としてある程度の長さをもち、まとまった内容を伝えようとするもの」（p.19）と解説している。その上で、次に示すように、物語や説明文など、それぞれの特徴に応じて、読み取るべき内容が異なることを指摘している。

例えば、物語では、どんな登場人物がいるのか、主人公は誰か、話がどのように展開していくのかなど、大まかな流れをつかみながら読み取ったり、説明文では、特に中心となる事柄など大切な部分をとらえて的確に読み取ることがある。（下線筆者、文部省、1999、p.19）

他にも「書かれた内容を考えながら黙読したり、その内容が表現されるように音読すること」（p.18）という言語活動に関しては、「まとまりのある説明文、意見文、感想文、対話文、物語」（p.19）や「対話文やスキット」（p.19）に応じて音声化することを指摘している。また、「伝言や手紙などから書き手の意向を理解し、適切に応じること」（p.20）という言語活動の中心では、「伝言」と「手紙」というジャンル・テキストタイプが挙げられており、伝言は「特に形式にはとらわれず自分の意向を語句や文、あるいは簡潔な文章でまとめたもの」（p.20）であるとし、手紙は「一定の形式にしたがい自分の意向を伝えるように書いたもの」（p.20）と解説されている。さらに、書くことの言語活動として「聞いただけで読みだした場合についてメモをとり、感想や意見などを書いたりすること」（p.21）や「伝え手に自分の意向が正しく伝わるように書くこと」（p.22）というように、メモ、伝言、手紙などのジャンル・テキストタイプに言及されている。また、この平成10（1998）年告示・平成14（2002）年度実施の中学校学習指導要領（文部省、1999）では、言語が使用される場面や働きが初めて取り上げられており、例えば、挨拶、自己紹介、電話での応答、買い物、道案内、旅行、食事などが挙げられている（p.26）。

先に述べたように、平成20（2008）年公示・平成24（2012）年度実施の中学校学習指導要領（文部科学省、2008）は、さらに多くのジャンル・テキストタイプ（例、スピーチ、機内アナウンス、天気予報、手紙、読売物、ポスター、図表、伝言、メモ）に言及している。また、言語が使用される場面や働きについても触れている。

まとめると、中学校学習指導要領によれば、1990年代には「まとまりのある英語」を扱った言語活動を行うことが示されており、2000年代に入り言語使用の場面や働きに重点が置かれるのに応じてジャンル・テキストタイプに応じた言語活動を行うよう示されるようになった。2010年代に入り、さらにその指針が明確になったと言える。

ジャンル・テキストタイプの指導の意義

ジャンル・テキストタイプなどの談話構造を指導することの必要性は、さまざまな観点から主張されている。例えば、読解プロセスの点から、Grabe and Stoller（2002）は、次のように考えている。読解プロセスは、下位処理（語彙アクセス、統語解析、命題の形成、作業記憶の活性化）と上位処理（理解のテキストモデル、解釈の状況モデ
ル、背景知識の使用と推測、実行制御の処理）に分けられる。このうち、理解のテクス
ストモデルは“the coordination of ideas from a text that represent the main points and
supporting ideas to form a meaning representation of the text” (p. 25) であると述べ、
テクストに基づいてまとまりのある内容を理解することであるとしている。一方、解釈
の状況モデル（situation model of reader interpretation）については“… the reader will
begin to interpret the information from the text in terms of his or her own goals, feelings
and background expectations”（p. 27）と述べ、読む目的、感情、期待に応じ
てテクストを解釈することとしている。Grabe and Stoller は、理解の二重性（the duality
of understanding）として、異なるジャンルは異なる読み方（テクストモデルと状況モデ
ルのバランス）を必要とすると指摘する。例えば、詩や小説は解釈の状況モデルの比
重が大きくなるのに対して、新聞や研究論文ではテクストモデルの比重が大きくなる。
すなわち、ジャンル・テクストタイプに関する知識を持っていることは、適切な読
解を行うために必要であるといえる。

また、Grabe and Stoller (2002) は、L1とL2リーディングの相違点も指摘している。情
報の提示の方法や主張の仕方などの談話構造の知識やジャンルに関する期待に関
して、L2学習者はあまり知らないこともあるとしている（pp. 43-44）。また、L1の場合、
教室外でさまざまなテクストタイプに触れる機会があるのに対して、L2の場合、限
られていることが指摘されている（p. 57）。さらに、談話やテクストの構成方法には、文
化的・社会的嗜好性があるとしている（p. 60）。これでは、L1とL2の違いから、Grabe and
Stoller は、ジャンル・テクストタイプに関する意識を高めていくことが必要であろうと
主張している。

中学校英語教科書分析の概観

本節では、中学校英語教科書の分析を行った先行研究について整理する。この教
科書分析研究の概観により、さまざまな観点から教科書分析が行われてきたにもか
かわらず、ジャンル・テクストタイプに注目した教科書分析研究が欠如していることを
示す。

教科書を語彙のレベルから分析し特徴を示したものに、杉沼（1977）、伊東・山田
（1992）、山田・伊東（1992）、松尾（2003）などがある。語彙関連としては語彙と文型の
観点からアメリカの幼児のコミックと教科書を比較した中西（1992）やLexical Relation
に関して青谷（1992, 1993a, 1993b）によって行われている。

文法の観点からは、名詞句に焦点を当てた児玉（1992, 1993）、言語材料に焦点を
当てた小川（1994）、文法操作の移動に焦点を当てた大野（1995）や未来表現に焦点
を当てた荒井（2001）がある。

談話の観点を取り入れた分析に、根岸（1990）、深沢（1992）、古家（1987）、廣地（1993）、
山森・藤田・武知・秦・伊東（2003）、江重（2008）、Iizima（2011）があ
る。これらの研究の多くは、会話を分析対象とし、概して会話が自然でないことを指
摘している。根岸（1990）は、会話中で見られる判断（または評価）を下す時の談話分
析を行っている。深沢（1992）は、会話における Yes/No Question の応答にのみ限
定し、その応答を6種類に分けて分析している。古家（1987）は、発言権の付与（turn-
allocation）の観点から分析している。また、廣地・長安（1993）は、談話の構成、その
構成要素の文の機能、話題、話し手の国籍から会話を分析している。さらに、山森・


これらの概観によれば、さまざまな観点で教科書分析がなされてきたが、ジャンル・テキストタイプに焦点をあてて教科書分析を行った研究は見られないことが示される。

研究課題

中学校学習指導要領が示す通り、ジャンル・テキストタイプの扱いがより明確に指示されるようになっている。また、ジャンル・テキストタイプの指導の重要性について指摘されている。しかし、さまざまな観点から中学校英語教科書の分析は行われているが、筆者らの知る限り、ジャンル・テキストタイプの点から教科書分析をしたものがない。教科書のジャンル・テキストタイプ分析を行うことは、英語教育の教材論の点から重要であると考える。また、どのような教材が使用されているかを把握することによって、多くの教育的示唆を得ることができると考える。

そこで、本研究では、次の2つの研究課題を設定し、教科書分析を行うことにした。

1. どんな種類のジャンル・テキストタイプが用いられているか。
2. それぞれのジャンル・テキストタイプはどの程度出現するか。
方法
分析対象及び分析単位

平成18年度版中学校外国語科用文部科学省検定済教科書6種類をすべて分析対象とした（表1参照）。6種類の教科書は、1学年から3学年まで3冊から成る。したがって、合計18冊の教科書を分析した。これらの教科書は、平成18年度から平成23年度まで使用されているものである。

表1. 分析をした教科書の一覧

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>出版社</th>
<th>教科書名</th>
<th>略記</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Columbus 21 English Course</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Crown English Series (New Edition)</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Horizon English Course</td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>One World English Course</td>
<td>OW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sunshine English Course</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total English</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

本研究では、原則的に頁単位で分析を行った。1つのつながった文章であっても、頁にまたがっている場合、それぞれの頁ごとに分析した。したがって、物語など、複数の頁（例えば、4頁）にまたがって掲載されている場合、4頁単位として分析した。また、1頁に2つの異なるテキストが掲載されている場合には、主たるテキストについて分析した。

本研究において頁を分析単位としたことは恣意的な選択であり、今後その単位をどのように設定するのが良いかという議論は必要であると考えられる。本研究では、以下の利点を考慮し、頁を分析単位とした。第一に、高い再現性（replicability）である。他の研究者が同様の分析をするとき、頁を単位とすることによって比較的客観的に分析単位を特定できると考えた。第二に、教科書の頁が教育上重要な単位であると考えられる。指導時間と頁は関連していることが多いと想定される。例えば、物語4頁の場合、手紙1頁のテキストより、より多くの授業時間があてられることが推測できる。頁数を分析単位とすることによって、指導における重要性の大小を示唆として得ることができると考えた。しかしながら、頁を単位とした分析の場合、注意を要することもある。上記のように複数頁にまたがるテキストの場合、得られる数字は大きくなるため、ジャンル・テキストタイプの種類の頻度を考察する際には留意する必要がある。例えば、手紙と物語の頻度がともに4であった場合でも、手紙の場合1頁ごとにテキストが提示されており、4種類の手紙が特定されていることを示している一方で、物語の場合、1つの物語が4頁にまたがっていることを示しており、単純に比較できないだろう。本研究では、頁を分析単位としながらも、考察の際には、この留意点を踏まえることにする。

各教科書の主たるレッスンを分析対象とした。付録や歌などは分析から除外した。その他、スピーキング活動・コミュニケーション活動だけの頁、日本語だけの頁や写真だけの頁、単語だけの頁、文法などのまとめや練習の頁などは分析外とした。これらの頁を分析対象外にした主な理由は、ジャンル・テキストタイプをコード化するための一部曲（2012）を参照。
必要な情報が得られなかったためである。例えば、コミュニケーション活動は、中学校英語において重要な言語活動であるが、その活動の中で使用される言語は実際のやりとりの記録がないと分析できない。最終的に、分析対象とした頁数は、表2の通りである。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>教科書・学年</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1学年</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2学年</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3学年</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>合計</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**分析方法**

本研究では、次のように分析を進めた。

1. 本研究のジャンル・テキストタイプのコードを作成するために、まず、ジャンル・テキストタイプのコードの候補となりうるものから先行研究の中から抜き出して、基礎リスト（付録Aを参照）を作成した。

2. 基礎リストに基づき、2社の教科書を、筆者2名がそれぞれコード化した。その際、基礎リストにないコードを作成したり、分類を細かくしたり、あるいは合成したりなどの修正を加えた。

3. 2のコード化の後、各自修正を加えたコードについて協議し、ジャンル・テキストタイプのコードのリストを作成した。その際、音声コミュニケーションと文字コミュニケーションを分けた。

4. コード化の練習のために、筆者らが、3のリストに基づいて、ある教科書1社の1つの学年について、それぞれコード化した。その後で、コードの定義を整理・修正した。各コードの内容については、「新明解国語辞典（第三版）」（金田一・見坊・金田一・柴田・山田, 1981）、『広辞苑（第五版）』（新村, 1998）の国語辞典を参照し、概念整理を行った。具体的には、各国語辞典で与えられている定義を比較し、共通部分を抜き出したり、定義の文言を合成したりすることによって整理した。最終的なコードとその内容については、付録B、付録C、付録Dを参照されたい。

5. 続いて、ある教科書の1つの学年のコード化を個別に行い、一致度を計算した。その結果、85頁中83頁の一致が見られた。一致度は、97.6%であった。不一致箇所については、議論の上、最終決定をした。

6. その他の教科書のコード化を、筆者のうちの一人が行った。

7. 別の筆者が6のコード化を確認した。意見が分かれる部分については、2人が協議して最終決定を行った。
したがって、コードについては、(a) 先行研究を参考にした基礎リスト（1の段階）、
(b) 2人の筆者によってそれぞれ修正された基礎リスト（2の段階）、(c) 筆者の協議の
上、まとめられたジャンル・テキストタイプのコードのリスト（3の段階）、(d) コードの
定義の明確化（4の段階）を経て、最終的なコードのリストが作成された。コード化に
ついては、(e) 基礎リストを修正するためのコード化（2の段階）、(f) ジャンル・テキス
トタイプのコードのリストに基づいたコード化の練習（4の段階）、(g) コード者一致度
(intercoder reliability) を確認するためのコード化（5の段階）、(h) 最終的なコード化（6
の段階）を行ったことになる。このうち、(e) で行ったコード化は、改めて (h) において
分析し直している。

結果と考察

ジャンル・テキストタイプの種類

表3から表5は、それぞれ音声コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプのコード、
文字コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプのコード、モードが不明のジャン
ル・テキストタイプのコードを示している。音声コミュニケーションのコードは26種類（「そ
の他」を含める）、文字コミュニケーションのコードは21種類（「その他」を含める）であっ
た。先行研究（付録Aを参照）で例として挙げられているジャンル・テキストタイプをほぼ
包括しているものと言える。先行研究で挙げられている学術論文（academic journals）、
要旨（abstracts）、推薦書（letters of recommendation）などは、中学校の教科書では見られ
なかった。これは、母語であっても、中学生にとって身近なジャンル・テキストタイプとは
考えることができないためであると思われる。

表3. 音声コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプのコード

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>会話</td>
<td>対話</td>
<td>預_インタビュー</td>
<td>預_インタビュー</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3人以上</td>
<td>インタビュー</td>
<td>インタビュー</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>電話</td>
<td>ビデオ</td>
<td>放送</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>議論</td>
<td></td>
<td>質疑応答</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>レストラン</td>
<td></td>
<td>預_ナレーション</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>買物</td>
<td>ショッピングセンター</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>洋服屋</td>
<td>实況放送</td>
<td>テレビ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時計屋</td>
<td>放送</td>
<td>ニュース</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お土産屋</td>
<td></td>
<td>ラジオ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ハンバーガーショップ</td>
<td></td>
<td>コマーシャル</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>バザー</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コード</td>
<td>下位コード</td>
<td>コード</td>
<td>下位コード</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>入国審査</td>
<td></td>
<td>天気予報</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>校内放送</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>機内放送</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>搭乗案内・機内放送</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_案内</td>
<td></td>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案内</td>
<td></td>
<td>散文</td>
<td>物語</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td></td>
<td>ゲーム</td>
<td>クイズ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td></td>
<td>指示</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td></td>
<td>手品の手順</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td></td>
<td>その他</td>
<td>電話の伝言</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td></td>
<td>占い</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不明</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

表4. 文字コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプのコード

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td></td>
<td>手紙</td>
<td>状況の報告</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td></td>
<td>ファックス</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td></td>
<td>お礼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td></td>
<td>返信</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_要約</td>
<td></td>
<td>メッセージ</td>
<td>メッセージ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>原稿</td>
<td>寄せ書き</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>ポスター</td>
<td>Pre_案内</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>メモ</td>
<td>記事のためのメモ</td>
<td>お知らせ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>発表のためのメモ</td>
<td>勧説</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

不明
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>日記</td>
<td>日記</td>
<td>レシピ</td>
<td>教科書</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>旅行記</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>各種図書</td>
<td>ガイドブック</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新聞</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>調味料</td>
<td>テレビガイド</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>投書</td>
<td>論説</td>
<td>雑誌</td>
<td>人物事典</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>論説</td>
<td>広告</td>
<td>新聞</td>
<td>パンフレット</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>電子メール</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>状況の報告</td>
<td>電子メール</td>
<td>伝記</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>詩</td>
<td>日記文学</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>お詫び</td>
<td>韻文</td>
<td>ノンフィクション</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>依頼</td>
<td>謝文</td>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>問い合わせ</td>
<td>謝文</td>
<td>俳句</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>問い合わせと返信</td>
<td>謝文</td>
<td>苦情と助言</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>返信</td>
<td>その他</td>
<td>相談と助言</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>カード</td>
<td>依頼</td>
<td>アンケート項目</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>はがき</td>
<td>その他</td>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案内状</td>
<td>話す</td>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小さい紙</td>
<td>話す</td>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

表5. モードが不明のジャンル・テキストタイプのコード

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>Pre_ナレーション</td>
<td>スピーチ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>散文</td>
<td>あらすじ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td>解説</td>
<td>小説</td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td>不明</td>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

入国審査でのやりとりや問い合わせの手紙など、社会的行為や目的が明確なコードが見られた一方で、「会話」、「Pre_報告」、「Pre_解説」、「Pre_インタビュー」、「Pre_案内」、「Pre_ナレーション」など、社会的行為や目的が明確でないコードも多く見られた。このことから、Swales (1990, p. 59) が会話と答えをジャンルではなく基本的なやりとりである前ジャンルであるとする指摘を受けて、本研究では前ジャンルを含むジャンル・テキストタイプの点から分析を行ったことの妥当性を示している。
おいて、英語という教科を学ぶのは中学校に入学してからであることを考えると、明確な社会的行為や目的のある言語使用の前に、基本的で基礎的な言語使用が多くみられるのは当然のことであると考えられる。インタビューを例にとる。「Pre_インタビュー」は、「取材のためやビデオ撮影・放送のためではなく、ただ単に調査をするために聞きあうこと」であり、多くの場合、クラスメイトと質問し合って、情報を得る言語使用を示している。一方、「インタビュー」とは、「記者が取材のために行う面会やその記事のことを指す。」「インタビュー」は、「Pre_インタビュー」が前提となる。つまり、調査をするために聞きあうことができなければ、取材のために質問することはできないであろう。同様に、「会話」は、入国審査、レストランや買い物のやりとり、議論の基本となる。つまり、中学校教科書では、基本的なジャンル/テキストタイプと、複雑なジャンル/テキストタイプの両方が観察されたといえる。

また、表3から表5によれば、音声コミュニケーションに特有なジャンル/テキストタイプ（会話、議論、レストランや買い物、入国審査、授業、インタビュー、質疑応答、ナレーション、実況放送や放送など）、文字コミュニケーションに特有なジャンル/テキストタイプ（メモ、日記、新聞、ウェブサイト、電子メール、カード、手紙、ポスター、各種図書、散文や論文など）、音声コミュニケーションにも文字コミュニケーションにも共通してみられるジャンル/テキストタイプ（報告、解説、自己紹介、案内など）に分類できる。このような分類できる理由としては、音声コミュニケーションと文字コミュニケーションの特徴を挙げることができる。音声コミュニケーションのテキストは、産物（product）として残るものではない。そのために、テキストを社会的行為として現れたものとして捉えが求める。一方、文字コミュニケーションのテキストは、産物として残る。そのため、産物として存在しているテキストの種類（テキストの媒介）の点からテキストを捉えることができる。両方に見られたジャンル/テキストタイプは、行為の目的に基づくコードが主である。

しかしながら、音声コミュニケーションと文字コミュニケーションの特徴は、見かけほど明確でないことを指摘する必要がある。むしろ、社会生活の中でジャンル/テキストタイプを切り取ることが難しいということを、分析を通じて筆者らは感じている。例えば、研究者が学会にて口頭発表を行ったとする。そのテキストのジャンル/テキストタイプは、「学会発表（すること）」となる。もし書かれた論文をそのまま読み上げているならば、産物としての論文が残るため、「研究論文」というジャンル/テキストタイプとコード化できる。さらに、研究したことの成果を他人に知らせるので、口頭発表であっても、書かれた論文を読み上げている場合でも、研究成果の「報告」という行為の目的として切り取ることができると。

さらに、教科書に書かれているジャンル/テキストタイプの種類の区分が恣意的であり、同じ区分であってもさまざまな意味合いで用いられていることを指摘したい。ジャンル/テキストタイプの分析にあたっては、テキストだけでなく、付随するリード文（多くの場合、状況説明をした日本語文）、イラスト、前後のテキストを参考にした。その際、テキストのリード文で書かれている用語をそのまま受け止めてコード化できないことが多く見られた。例えば、リード文では「スピーチをします」と書かれているが、「何人かの前で自分の考えを述べる」という「スピーチ」ではなく、課題として行った調査の結果の「報告」や、単なる経験の報告（「Pre_報告」とコード化されるもの）などにコード化されることがあった。他にも、「紹介」という表現は、「人と人との間にたってとりもちをすること」という意味で使われておらず、「自己紹介」、「Pre_紹介」、「報告」、「Pre_報告」
などにコード化される内容を示していた。また、リード文における「説明」という用語は、「専門家がよくわかるように物事を分析して説明すること」である「解説」や、「何人かの前で自分の考えを述べること」である「スピーチ」や、ゲームとして行われる「クイズ」や、「与えられた任務が明確に提示されていないが、何かしらの経験について述べていること」である「Pre_報告」や、「学校などで、学問や技術などを教え授けること」という「授業」などにコード化される内容を示していた。このように、1つのジャンル・テキストタイプがさまざまな意味合いで用いられていることが指摘できる。教科書によって示されたジャンル・テキストタイプがどのような内容を示すのかを考える必要性が示唆される。

ジャンル・テキストタイプの頻度

表6から表8は、教科書ごとのジャンル・テキストタイプの頻度を示している。音声コミュニケーション（表6参照）において、最も頻度が高かったジャンル・テキストタイプは会話（502頁）であった。続いて、スピーチ（43頁）、自己紹介（32頁）と放送（32頁）であった。一方、頻度の低かったジャンル・テキストタイプは、レストランのやりとり（1頁）、議論（2頁）、案内（2頁）であった。

文字コミュニケーション（表7参照）において、最も頻度が高かったジャンル・テキストタイプは散文（140頁）であった。他のコードと比べて極度に大きい数値となったのは、頁ごとの分析を行ったためであると考えられる。すなわち、例えば4頁程度にまったがっている場合、1つの物語であっても、4頁分の頻度として数えたため、大きい値になったと考えられる。続いて頻度の高かったジャンル・テキストタイプは、電子メール（15頁），手紙（12頁），ウェブサイト（12頁）であった。一方、頻度の低かったジャンル・テキストタイプは、レシピ（1頁），メモ（2頁），ポスター（3頁）であった。

表6. 音声コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプの頻度

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>会話</td>
<td>対話</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3人以上</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>電話</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>議論</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>レストラン</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>買物</td>
<td>ショッピングセンター</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>洋服屋</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時計屋</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お土産屋</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ハンバーガーショップ</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>入国審査</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>紹介</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コード</td>
<td>下位コード</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>OW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>計</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_案内</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案内</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_インタビュー</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>インタビュー</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>放送</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>質疑応答</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ナレーション</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実況放送</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>放送</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>テレビ</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ラジオ</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コマーシャル</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大気予報</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>校内放送</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>機内放送</td>
<td>V7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>搭乗案内・機内放送</td>
<td>V8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>散文</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ゲーム</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>指示</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>手品の手順</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>その他</td>
<td>Z1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>電話の伝言</td>
<td>Z2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>その他</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

表7. 文字コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプの頻度

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_要約</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コード</td>
<td>下位コード</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>OW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>計</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>メモ</td>
<td>記事のためのメモ</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>発表のためのメモ</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日記</td>
<td>日記</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>旅行記</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新聞</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>投書</td>
<td>J2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>論説</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>広告</td>
<td>J4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ウェブサイト</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>解説</td>
<td>K2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>紹介文</td>
<td>K3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>K4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>投書</td>
<td>K5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>電子メール</td>
<td>状況の報告</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お礼</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>依頼</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>問い合わせ</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>問い合わせと返信</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>返信</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>カード</td>
<td>はがき</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>案内状</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>小さい紙</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>手紙</td>
<td>状況の報告</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ファックス</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お礼</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>返信</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>メッセージ</td>
<td>メッセージ</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>寄せ書き</td>
<td>O2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポスター</td>
<td>Pre_案内</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お知らせ</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>勧誘</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>レシピ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コード</td>
<td>下位コード</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>OW</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>計</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>各種図書</td>
<td>教科書</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>パワーポイント</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>テレビガイド</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>雑誌</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>人物事典</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>パンフレット</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>散文</td>
<td>物語</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>脚本</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>伝記</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>日記文学</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ノンフィクション</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>韻文</td>
<td>詩</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>俳句</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>その他</td>
<td>苦情と助言</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>相談と助言</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>アンケート</td>
<td>U3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>項目</td>
<td>U4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>地図</td>
<td>U4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

表8. モードが不明の場合のジャンル・テキストタイプの頻度

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ナレーション</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>散文</td>
<td>あらすじ</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>小話</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
これらの表によれば、どの教科書でも扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプは、音声コミュニケーションについては、5種類（会話、Pre_紹介、自己紹介、紹介、ゲーム）しかなかった。文字コミュニケーションについては、3種類（電子メール、散文、頌文）だけであった。別の言い方をすると、教科書によって、扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプが異なることを示唆する。

しかしながら、教科書ごとに扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプの幅はあまり差がなかった。表9は、教科書ごとのコード数（下位コードも含む）を示している。音声コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプについては、Sunshine の19種類から、New Crownの29種類まで幅が見られたが、統計的に有意な違いではなかった（χ²(5) = 2.65, p = .377）。文字コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプは、ほとんどの教科書が12種類から18種類であったのに対して、New Horizon は39種類と極端な違いが見られた。その違いは統計的に有意であった（χ²(5) = 28.40, p < .001）。ラインの名義水準を用いた多重比較（有意水準5%）の結果、大きい順番に臨界比は 3.64 (p < .001, New Horizon - Sunshine), 3.47 (p < .001, New Horizon - Total English), 3.30 (p = .001, New Horizon - New Crown), 3.13 (p = .002, New Horizon - One World), 2.65 (p = .008, New Horizon - Columbus) であり、New Horizon と他の5社との間だけに有意な差が見られた。文字コミュニケーションにおけるNew Horizonを除けば、どの教科書においても、扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプの幅に違いはなかったといえよう。

表9. 教科書ごとのコード数

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>モード</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>TE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>音声コミュニケーション</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文字コミュニケーション</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

まとめ

第一の研究課題「どんな種類のジャンル・テキストタイプが用いられているか」に関しては、音声コミュニケーションにおいても文字コミュニケーションにおいても比較的多様なジャンル・テキストタイプが用いられていることがわかった。また、社会の行為や目的が明確なジャンル・テキストタイプだけでなく、Swales (1990) が前ジャンルと呼んだようなジャンル・テキストタイプも見られた。

第二の研究課題「それぞれのジャンル・テキストタイプはどの程度出現するか」に関しては、頒度の高いジャンル・テキストタイプとして、会話、スピーチ、自己紹介、放送や、散文、電子メール、手紙、ウェブサイトであった。6社の教科書すべてで扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプは少なかった。一方で、各教科書で扱われているジャンル・テキストタイプの幅は、文字コミュニケーションにおける1社の教科書を除けば、それほどの違いは見られなかった。
教育的示唆

本研究の結果から次の教育的示唆が得られる。第一に、基礎・基本となるジャンル・テキストタイプと、社会的行為や目的が明確なジャンル・テキストタイプとの関連をより強く意識することである。「会話」は、その先に、議論、レストランや買い物、入国審査におけるやりとりに発展するようになる。「Pre_インタビュー」は、「インタビュー」や「質疑応答」につながっている。使用する教科書の中で、どのようなジャンル・テキストタイプが使われているかを把握することによって、3年間を通して、教師はより基本的なものから複雑なものへと、テキストの関連を意識しながら、指導することができる。例えば、次に挙げたテキスト1は1年生のテキストである。久美は、ボールとの学びについて話しているが、与えられた任務や課題について話しているわけではないので、「Pre_報告」とコード化されている。

テキスト1 (New Crown, Book 1, Lesson 8, p. 78)
久美とボールはそれぞれのことばを楽しく学び合っています。
I study English. So I can speak it a little. Paul studies Japanese. So he can speak it a little.
I teach Japanese to Paul. He teaches English to me. We help each other.

この後、2年生では、Lesson 7で次のような「報告」のテキストが扱われている。

テキスト2 (New Crown, Book 2, Lesson 7, p. 65)
ボールと久美が研究の成果をいっしょに発表します。
Kumi: Paul and I studied about heat islands and green roofs.
Paul: We learned that plants cool buildings. Look at this.
The surface of a regular roof is over 50 degrees.
It’s as hot as sand on a summer beach.
Kumi: A green roof is better than a regular roof.
The green roof is only 30 degrees.
Growing plants on roofs may be the best way to fight heat islands.
Paul/Kumi: Thank you.

また、3年生の Lesson 7では、久美が一枚の写真を基に「ハゲワシと少女」について報告している。

テキスト3 (New Crown, Book 3, Lesson 7, p. 62)
久美は図書館で借りた写真集中の1枚の写真に衝撃を受けました。その報告を聞いてみましょう。
Sudan is a large country in northeast Africa. It is a country with great promise. But it also has great problems.

In 1993 the people of Sudan suffered from war and hunger. Few people knew about this. Kevin Carter went there to work as a photographer. He wanted the world to see the problems of Sudan.

3つのテキストを比べたとき、テキスト2が、過去形を用いながら、Paul and I studied about ～や We learned that ～というように行った任務について話したり、その結果を報告したりしていることから、「報告」いうジャンル・テキストタイプを指導するのに適したテキストであると考えられる。一方、テキスト3は、報告内容についての英文は書かれているが、I found a picture in the book. This picture was shocking. So I studied about the picture. I learned that one photographer tried to do something for people in hunger. I am going to talk about him. というような表現はない。そこで、「久美になったつもりで、久美が調べた内容を報告しよう」という活動を与え、適切に報告する練習を行うことができる。まとめると、3年間を通したとき、「報告」というジャンル・テキストタイプについて、次のような目標設定が可能であろう。

1学年から2学年・・・現在形や過去形を用いて経験を述べることができる。
2学年のLesson 7・・・与えられた課題や、その課題の遂行状況や結果を述べることができる。
3学年・・・情况に応じて、適切に報告することができる。

第二に、教科書によって扱われるジャンル・テキストタイプの種類が異なる。教師は、使用する教科書にどのようなジャンル・テキストタイプが用いられているかを把握し、必要に応じて投げ込み教材などを利用することも考えたい。また、ジャンル・テキストタイプによっては、かなり頻繁に出現するものとそうでないものがある。かなり頻繁に出現するジャンル・テキストタイプについては、1年から3年間にかけて生徒の触れる機会が多くなる。そのため、テキストを用いながら当該のジャンル・テキストタイプの指導を3年間に亘る計画的に行うことが可能となる。一方、あまり出現しないジャンル・テキストタイプの場合、該当のテキスト以外のところではそのジャンル・テキストタイプを生徒に触れさせることができなくなる。指導するタイミングを逃さないようにすべきである。

例えば、次のテキスト4は、レストランにおける話のやりとりである。

テキスト4 (Columbus 21, Book 2, Skit Time, At the Restaurant, p. 40)
① A: Shall I bring the menu?
   B: Yes, please.
② A: Can I take your order?
   B: I’ll have spaghetti and salad.
③ A: Would you like something to drink?
B: Uh, I’ll have coffee.
④ A: Anything else?
B: No, that’s all. Thanks.

「レストラン」というジャンル・テキストタイプは、他のレストランや他の学年では扱われていない。したがって、このテキストを扱う時に、「レストラン」における話のやりとりを指導する単元を構成することが重要になる。

第三に、言語使用の場面設定にあたっては、ジャンル・テキストタイプを意識し、用語を用いていくことが重要である。教師自身が、「スピーチとは何か」「紹介とは何か」「報告とは何か」と問いかけていくことが必要である。教科書のリード文に「スピーチ」と書かれていても、詳細に分析していくと、「ある任の遂行状況や結果について述べること」という「報告」のジャンル・テキストタイプである場合もある。そのような場合には、スピーチに焦点をあてるのはなく、「報告」に焦点を当てないと、教科書のテキストは、適切なモデルとして機能しなくなる恐れがあるだろう。

おわりに

本研究では、平成18年度版の中学校英語教科書ジャンル・テキストタイプの点から分析し、その結果に基づいて教育的示唆を示してきた。今後は、平成24年度から使用される中学校英語教科書を分析する必要がある。また、それぞれのジャンル・テキストタイプに応じた指導方法やタスクなども追求することも必要である。本研究は話構造の1つの側面であるジャンル・テキストタイプに焦点をあてて教育的に有益な資料を提示したと筆者ら方は考えている。

注

1. 1頁に複数テキストが見られる場合、本研究では、重複コーディングをするのでではなく、協議の上、主たるテキストを決め、そのテキストをコード化した。主な理由として、重複コーディングによる結果の解釈の困難さを避けたこと、このような頁数が各教科書の各学年について0〜3という少ない頻度であったことが挙げられる。複数テキストの頁の分析方法については今後検討が必要であろう。

2. 会話といっても、下位コードとして、「対話」「3人以上（の会話）」「電話」等にコード化され、さらにそれぞれの頻度は教科書によって異なることが表6よりわかる。特に、対話と3人以上の会話に見られる違いは、教科書制作に関する方針（例えば、ペア活動のしやすさを考慮して、対話活動を多く示すことにしていた、など）にも影響されると考えられ、教育的に考察する価値があると思われる。しかし、教科書制作方針なども含めて考察することは本研究の範囲を超えているため、本稿では触れないと、この点に関する査読者の指摘に感謝する。

3. New Horizonが、文字コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプにおいて他の教科書と違いを見せたのは、注2と同様に、教科書制作に関する方針が影響した可能性がある。また、文字コミュニケーションのジャンル・テキストタイプの
種類が多く見られたこととNew Horizon の分析対象が6種類の教科書の中で最も分析対象とした頁数が多かったこと（表2）に関連があるかもしれない。これらの点は興味深いが、教科書ごとの違いを示すことが本研究の目的ではないため、今回は触れない。この点に関する査読者の指摘に感謝する。
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付録A
ジャンル・テキストタイプの基礎リスト

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>モード</th>
<th>ジャンル・テキストタイプの例</th>
<th>出典</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>音声</td>
<td>スピーチ、機内アナウンス、天気予報</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>講演、スピーチ、会話</td>
<td>寺内 (2010, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>講義</td>
<td>寺内 (2010, p. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>筆記</td>
<td>昔話、伝記、紀行文</td>
<td>橋内 (1995, p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>地誌</td>
<td>橋内 (1995, p. 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>伝記</td>
<td>橋内 (1995, p. 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>料理の作り方、機器の使い方、実験の方法、道順などを教える場合</td>
<td>橋内 (1995, p. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>レシピー</td>
<td>橋内 (1995, p. 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>道順の教え方</td>
<td>橋内 (1995, p. 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a poem, a technical manual</td>
<td>G&amp;S (2002, p. 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newspaper stories, biographies, abstracts, reports, memos, editorials</td>
<td>G&amp;S (2002, p. 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>手紙や読み物教材</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ボスターや図表</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>物語や説明文</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>伝言や手紙などの文章</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>伝言や手紙、メモ</td>
<td>文部科学省 (2008, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>学術論文、手紙、通知、宣伝</td>
<td>寺内 (2010, p. 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注. G&S = Grabe & Stoller
付録B
音声コミュニケーションのコードとその内容

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>サブコード</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>内容</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>会話 (Pre-Genre)</td>
<td>対話</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>日常生活における2人の話のやりとり。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3人以上</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>日常生活における3人以上の話のやりとり。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>電話</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>電話における話のやりとり。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>話のやりとり。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>議論</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>互いに自分の意見を述べ合い、論じあうこと。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>レストラン</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>レストランにおいて料理を選び、食事をし、会計をすること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>買物</td>
<td>ショッピングセンター</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>商品を選び、支払い、物品等を持ち帰ること。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>洋服屋</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>時計屋</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お土産屋</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ハンバーガーショップ</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>バザー</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>入国審査</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>入国審査における話のやりとり。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>実際に人と人との間にたって仲立ちをしているわけではないが、第三者について情報を伝えているもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>自分の名前・身分・経歴・趣味などを自身で言い知らせること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>紹介</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>人と人との間にたってとりもちをすること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_案内</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>実際に連れて歩いているわけではないが、知らない場所などを導く意図がある話のやりとり。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案内</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>その場所を知らない人などを導いて連れて歩くこと。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>与えられた任務が明確に提示されていないが、何かしらの経験について述べていること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>ある任務の遂行の情況や結果について述べること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>専門家が話しているかどうか明解でないが、何らかの事物に関して説明していること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>専門家がよくわかるように物事を分析して説明すること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>学校などで、学問・技芸などを教え授けること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_インタビュー</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>取材のためやビデオ撮影・放送のためではなく、ただ単に調査をするために聞きあうこと。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>インタビュー</td>
<td>インタビュー Q1</td>
<td>記者が取材のために行う面会やその記事。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ビデオ</td>
<td>ビデオ Q2</td>
<td>取材のために行った面会をビデオ撮影したもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>放送</td>
<td>放送 Q3</td>
<td>取材のために行った面会を放送しているもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>質疑応答</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>質問とそれに対する回答・答弁。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ナレーション</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>映画やテレビではないが、絵などを述べてあるもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ナレーション</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>映画やテレビ、ビデオなどで画面外の語り手が説明を加えること、またその説明。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実況放送</td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>実際の状況を、その場から直接放送すること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>放送</td>
<td>テレビ V1</td>
<td>テレビでの放送。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ニュース V2</td>
<td>テレビやラジオで放送されるニュース。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ラジオ V3</td>
<td>ラジオでの放送。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>コマーシャル V4</td>
<td>テレビやラジオで放送されるコマーシャル。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>天気予報 V5</td>
<td>テレビやラジオで放送される天気予報。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>校内放送 V6</td>
<td>学校内での放送。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>機内放送 V7</td>
<td>飛行機などの乗り物内での放送。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>搭乗案内・機内放送 V8</td>
<td>空港での放送。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>何人かの前で自分の考えを述べること。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>散文</td>
<td>物語 X1</td>
<td>散文「音数に制限がなく、韻も踏まず自由に書き記した文章。」物語「作者の見聞または想像を基礎とし、人物・事件について叙述した散文の文学作品。」</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ゲーム</td>
<td>クイズ Y1</td>
<td>ゲームのための話のやりとり。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>指示 Y2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>手品の手順 Y3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>その他</td>
<td>電話の伝言 Z1</td>
<td>電話で、人に頼んで伝えてもらうこと。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>占い Z2</td>
<td>占い。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不明</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

付録C
文字コミュニケーションのコードとその内容

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>内容</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>与えられた任務が明確に提示されていないが、何かしらの経験について述べられたもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>ある任務の遂行の情況や結果について述べられたもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>専門家が話しているかどうか明解でないが、何らかの事物に関しての説明。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>項目</td>
<td>内容</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>専門家がよくわかるように物事を分析して説明したもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_要約</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>なんのために要約されたかは不明だが、話・文章の重要な点を短くまとめたもの。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>原稿</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>何人かの前で自分の考えを述べるために書かれたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自己紹介</td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>自分の名前・身分・経歴・趣味などを自身で言い表せるために書かれたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>メモ</td>
<td>記事のためのメモ</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>忘れないように簡単に書きとめた記録。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>発表のためのメモ</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日記</td>
<td></td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>日々の出来事や感想などの記録で、私的で個人的なもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>旅行記</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>旅行中の見聞や感想を記した文章。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新聞</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>新聞や雑誌に載る事実を書き記したもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>投書</td>
<td>J2</td>
<td>新聞や公共の機関に送られた意見・苦情・希望などを書いたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>論説</td>
<td>J3</td>
<td>時事的な問題について自分の意見を述べた文章。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>広告</td>
<td>J4</td>
<td>新聞・雑誌などに掲載されたり、折り込まれたりされる商業宣伝のこと。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ウェブサイト</td>
<td>記事</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>ウェブサイトで公開される事実を書き記したもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>解説</td>
<td>K2</td>
<td>ウェブサイトで公開される、専門家による説明。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>紹介文</td>
<td>K3</td>
<td>ウェブサイトで公開される、何らかの人や物を知らしめるための文章。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>K4</td>
<td>ウェブサイトで公開される、ある任務の情況や結果について書かれたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>投書</td>
<td>K5</td>
<td>ウェブサイトで公開される、意見・苦情・希望などを書いたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>電子メール</td>
<td>状況の報告</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>状況を報告するための電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>ある任務の遂行の情況や結果について述べるための電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お礼</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>お礼を述べるための電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>依頼</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>依頼をするための電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>問い合せ</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>問い合わせをするための電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>問い合わせと返信</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>問い合わせをするための電子メールと返事の電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>返信</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>返事の電子メール。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>カード</td>
<td>はがき</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>はがきに書かれたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>案内状</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>催し物や場所などに招待したり導いたりするための小型の紙に書かれたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>小さい紙</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>小型の四角い紙に書かれたメッセージ。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>手紙</td>
<td>状況の報告</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>状況を報告するための手紙。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ファックス</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>ファックスで送られた文章。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お礼</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>お礼を述べるための手紙。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>返信</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>返事の手紙。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>メッセージ</td>
<td>メッセージ</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>伝えたい内容を短いことばで表したもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>寄せ書き</td>
<td>O2</td>
<td>2人以上の人があなたを伝えたい内容を短いことばで表したものを、一枚の紙に書いたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ポスター</td>
<td>Pre_案内</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>広告または宣伝のために掲示する大型のビラや貼り紙。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>お知らせ</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>勧誘</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>レシピ</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>料理の材料や調理法を記したものの</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>各種図書</td>
<td>教科書</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>学校などで学習用教材として使用される図書。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ガイドブック</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>手引書、指南書、旅行案内書のこと。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>テレビガイド</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>テレビの番組について書かれた小冊子のこと。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>雑誌</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>一定の期間をおいて次々に刊行される冊子。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>人物事典</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>様々な人物について説明した本。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>パンフレット</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>小冊子のこと。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>散文</td>
<td>物語</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>散文「音数に制限がなく、韻も踏まず自由に書き記した文章。」物語「作者の見聞または想像を基礎とし、人物・事件について叙述した散文の文学作品。」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>脚本</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>演劇・映画・放送劇などのセリフ・歌詞・動作・舞台装置などを記したもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>伝記</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>ある個人の一生の事跡を述べた記録や、一人の人物に焦点をあてて記述したもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>日記文学</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>日記の形式をとった文学作品。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ノンフィクション</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>記録文学・紀行文・体験記など、作り話・小説でないものの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>韻文</td>
<td>詩</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>韻文「言語や文字の配列や音数に一定の規律のあるもの」</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>俳句</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### その他

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>苦情と助言</td>
<td>U1 苦情と助言。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相談と助言</td>
<td>U2 相談と助言。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>アンケート項目</td>
<td>U3 アンケート項目。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>地図</td>
<td>U4 地表の諸物体・現象を、一定の約束に従って縮尺し、記号・文字を用いて平面上に表現した図。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不明</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 付録D

**モードが不明の場合のコードとその内容**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>コード</th>
<th>下位コード</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>内容</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Pre_紹介</td>
<td>実際に人と人との間にたって仲立ちをしているわけではないが、第三者について情報を伝えているもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Pre_報告</td>
<td>与えられた任務が明確に提示されていないが、何かしらの経験について述べられたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報告</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>報告</td>
<td>ある任務の遂行の情況や結果について述べられたもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Pre_解説</td>
<td>専門家が話しているかどうか明解でないが、何らかの事物に関しての説明。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>解説</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>解説</td>
<td>専門家がよくわかるように物事を分析して説明したもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>授業</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>授業</td>
<td>学校などで、学問・技芸などを教え授けること。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre_ナレーション</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Pre_ナレーション</td>
<td>映画やテレビではないが、絵などについて述べているもの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>スピーチ</td>
<td>何人かの前で自分の考えを述べること、また、書かれたものの。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>散文</td>
<td>あらすじ</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>あらすじ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小話</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>小話</td>
<td>聞き手を笑わせる、ちょっとした話。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不明</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>不明</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In contrast to the cognitivist foundations of much of the SLA research that goes on in Japan, Simon-Maeda’s theorising is based soundly on the notion that language use and language learning (being and becoming a speaker of Japanese) cannot be understood apart from social activity. Since engaging in any discourse involves entering into a community of practice, language learning involves developing new linguistic identities and becoming part of new societal discourses. The book is an autoethnographic narrative of her 35 years’ experience as an American living in Japan and the process of identity reconstruction which that has entailed. It’s a fascinating book both as a scholarly look at the nature of language learning and as a documentation of the human experience of living across two or more cultures.

The book is divided into two parts: an overview of the theory underlying autoethnography, with a narrative inquiry approach to understanding language learning; and a longer section discussing Simon-Maeda’s actual experiences in a variety of settings from family to work. As she points out, though, the nature of this kind of qualitative research is such that the telling of the story is neither strictly chronological nor wholly separated from the theoretical discussion. This makes the book both easier and more difficult to get to grips with than would be, say, an experiment-based text. Whereas an experimental study can be grasped by a judicious skimming of the main sections and a quick survey of the conclusions, this book requires a somewhat deeper reading. On the other hand, it is easy to read in the same way
as a good novel where the story, whether chronologically organized or not, carries the reader along and acts at various points as a hook for the writer's comments and analysis.

This is a brave book. Simon-Maeda is not afraid to describe situations that characterise her in what some might consider an unflattering light. Like many immigrants, particularly from English-speaking or Western European cultures, she is aware that despite considerable time living in Japan she retains significant L2 dysfluencies which compromise her efforts to become “a legitimate member of mainstream Japanese society” (p. 32), and this is perhaps one of the key themes of the book. Although for a foreign-born adult becoming a member of a society is not easy anywhere, Japanese society is widely seen as particularly difficult to enter into. In addition to the social barriers, some deliberately erected and some unconsciously so, that separate Japanese from non-Japanese, the *kanji* (Chinese character)-based writing system presents a substantial linguistic challenge to all but the most determined.

Simon-Maeda does a good job of delineating both types and of giving body to the picture by showing how these barriers take on different forms according to one's non-Japanese identity. For instance, immigrants from other East Asian cultures have experiences quite different from those of immigrants from Western cultures. Westerners, regardless of their actual linguistic and cultural assimilation, are often seen as irremediably outsiders, with correspondingly low expectations of adjusting to Japanese social mores. Immigrants from neighbouring countries, on the other hand, are more likely to feel that expectations of them are impractically high, and that they are often seen as having a duty to assimilate, while in fact even their best efforts to do so are condemned to failure.

Some of the experiences that exemplify the existence of barriers could easily be mistaken for kindnesses, but Simon-Maeda points out that even these come with a sense of discomfort. For instance, when she receives excessive praise for her Japanese abilities, even after having exchanged only the most banal of greetings, an example of what have recently been called “microaggressions,” (Arudo, 2012), she realises that the perlocutionary effect is to position her on the periphery of society rather than as an ordinary member.

This is not to say that the book is in any way a complaint about Japanese society. Simon-Maeda’s specific experience is based in Japan, but the core concern of the book is not Japanese culture per se, but crossing cultures in general. The intent is clearly to document the complexity of the process
of entering into another culture, forging new linguistic and socio-linguistic identities, and becoming part of and in turn becoming co-creator of an array of discourse communities. In the world of language learning and teaching where test scores are often given great prominence, this is a highly worthwhile project. Simon-Maeda herself notes her own experience of taking and passing the top level of one of the Japanese language tests, but this is buried in a larger discussion of the complexity of the notion of proficiency.

In Simon-Maeda’s sense, proficiency is tied up ineluctably with the various communities of practice that make up her social environment. Proficiency as a member of the kindergarten and school mothers’ group is different from proficiency as a university professor. Proficiency as a woman in Japan is quite different from what it would entail as a man. And of course there are communities of practice within communities of practice. So being a professor in the community of faculty meetings entails different skills and ways of interacting from being a professor in the community of the classroom.

In short, this book is a timely and valuable contribution to understanding the essentially social characteristic of learning a language and becoming a participant in a language community.

Reference


Reviewed by
Scott Gardner
Okayama University

Few of us can remember the first meaningful word or phrase we ever uttered. Yet as adults, largely without ever being explicitly instructed, most of us possess a fully developed understanding of how to make language. Perhaps the same could be said for our experience with making puns or getting jokes.
When it comes to talking about how language works, though, we may be at a loss for words. Students of elementary linguistics at university can have difficulty making connections between the decontextualized jargon given them in class and the linguistic acts they have been performing almost unconsciously for most of their lives. So says the back cover of *Understanding Language Through Humor*. The goal of this book is to help linguistics students grasp one pervading human system, language, by cranking it through another, humor. By illustrating linguistic concepts with jokes, Dubinsky and Holcomb believe that students, in getting the jokes, will likely also get the concepts in question.

This book is intended to be a supplement to an introductory course in linguistics; “this is not a textbook per se” (p. 3). While it seems to target university students in the United States, as a supplemental text it offers challenging and rewarding material for advanced EFL learners interested in getting at culture through language study. For the most part the book is organized in order of increasing linguistic complexity, starting with manipulation at the phonemic or phonological level (*Keep your hens off me!* and moving up to the discourse level (*A priest, a rabbi, and a minister walk into a bar. The bartender says, “Is this some kind of joke?”*). The final chapters are variations on previously covered material, albeit from slightly different perspectives such as language variation, cross-cultural communication, and language prescriptivism.

Early on there is much that should be familiar to EFL instructors, in both content and jokes. To illustrate phoneme and grapheme arbitrariness, a classic joke outlining the steps of English spelling reform appears, in which the “reformed” language at the end of the joke is almost unreadable. Phono- logical phenomena like puns, spoonerisms, and mondegreens (humorously misheard song lyrics) are also treated. The book’s analysis at these fundamental linguistic levels may seem a bit drawn out to instructors, but it is thorough, adequately covering what may be the most universal and easy to understand forms of linguistic humor.

Once Dubinsky and Holcomb move up to “conversational principles” and the “structure of discourse,” their discussion becomes particularly beneficial for those who wish to use this text in an EFL setting. The authors use many examples from *Seinfeld* and other popular American comedy programs to demonstrate the ways in which conversational style, pragmatic intent, and shared culture can enhance the humor of the things people say. It is in these chapters, also, that the authors delve into taboo topics and the cultural
boundaries of humor. A skilled and patient EFL teacher can possibly use these chapters to help students define the near-mythical “American joke.”

However, the book’s narrow sampling of humor limits its effectiveness. There are many references to American figures of limited global import such as politicians and radio personalities. The majority of cartoons used as material, such as Far Side, Dilbert, B.C., and Peanuts, originate in the USA. In many cases the joke mechanisms are language-oriented enough for readers anywhere to capture how the humor works (and if they don’t, a detailed exegesis typically follows). But nearly as often there are sociocultural referents underlying the jokes as much as the language does. For instance, when a phonemic ambiguity joke refers to the “Independent’s/Independence Day” of an obscure American politician who had severed ties with his party back in 2001 (p. 33), one has to wonder why a more generic example couldn’t have been used.

While this book may be charting new territory with its dedicated goal of mixing linguistics study with humor, it is not necessarily the first to step in that direction. Blake’s Playing With Words (2007), for example, is not a linguistics primer as Dubinsky and Holcomb’s text is, but some of its chapters on lexicon, puns, grammar, and context manage to demonstrate linguistic fundamentals with humor in much the same way, with what seems to be a far more diverse set of resources. Another recent example is Structural Ambiguity in English (Oaks, 2010). This is also far from being a primer, but it is an extensive catalogue of humorous usage of certain types of grammatical ambiguity. It demonstrates the vast pool of material available to illustrate how one narrow linguistic phenomenon can be turned to humorous ends. In comparison with the resources compiled in these works, Dubinsky and Holcomb’s sampling seems somewhat thin.

This thinness becomes more apparent in the final few chapters, which begin to sound redundant. For example, while a chapter on first language acquisition may seem fitting (Kids say the darndest things), it is handled in a way that renders much of it indistinguishable from other chapters. Comics such as Family Circus and Calvin and Hobbes, which create humor from young people’s unusual language use, are already well represented elsewhere in the book, and the grammar explanations in the chapter seem similar to those glossed over earlier under structural ambiguity. It all could have been said in one chapter or the other, not stretched over both.

Understanding Language Through Humor fulfills its proposed goal of supplementing a course on linguistics with humorous examples. However,
it seems to have picked a narrower audience than it needed to. The lack of diversity and general appeal in its examples gives it a somewhat repetitive and parochial feel. However, for students of (American) English, this book provides more than enough material to make language learning fun and to blend it well with the study of popular culture.
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“Come here till I talk to you” would not pass a test of grammatical accuracy, but to an Irish person would sound utterly natural. Similarly, the naturalized use of long vowels in words such as *school* [skuːwl] and *main* [meɪːjən] would probably horrify received-pronunciation purists, yet would pass unnoticed in a conversation between two Dublin people. The traditional emphasis in ELT on *Standard English* has implied that examples like the above are instances of “imperfect” English, and are often treated by teachers, if at all, as mere examples of dialect. However, Hughes, Trudgill, and Watt (2005) have estimated that even in England itself, only about 5% of the population speak standard English. Concentrating on this variety of English means that learners are in essence studying a minority language. As a result, there has been a growing recognition of the importance of World Englishes and the necessity for both EFL teachers and students to be exposed to, and have an understanding of, nonstandard varieties of English.

Irish English (IrE) has a special place within World Englishes, not only for being the first example of colonial English, but also because of its subsequent influence on other varieties of English around the world. Amador-Moreno’s
excellent book on the historical development and contemporary use of IrE shows how current examples of nonstandard varieties of English such as Singlish and Nigerian Pidgin have, in fact, a linguistic precedent stretching back over 800 years.

The book is divided into nine chapters that cover the main linguistic and sociolinguistic features of IrE. Each chapter begins with a brief preview of the main topics to be covered and ends with a summary along with comprehensive suggestions for further reading. In addition, there are reader activities proposed throughout each chapter along with suggested explanations. A particularly helpful aspect of the book is the use of online resources, essential for understanding the distinct phonetic features of IrE. A complete list of bibliographical references and an index is provided at the end of the book, though the latter tends more towards names than categories.

Chapter 1 begins with a general introductory overview of IrE, helpfully distinguishing it from similar terms like Hiberno-English and Anglo-Irish. Given that much of IrE is concerned with matters of pronunciation, the chapter also includes clear definitions of such important concepts as dialect, accent, and variety.

The second chapter provides a necessarily abridged account of the history of English in Ireland since its initial introduction with the arrival of Anglo-Normans in the mid-12th century. As Amador-Moreno makes clear, any account of the development of English in Ireland must also be an account of the decline of Gaelic as the vernacular Irish language. In this respect, the plantations of the 15th and 16th centuries marked a distinct turning point. Subsequent closer political control by England, a series of devastating famines, and mass emigration accelerated the decline of Irish (Gaelic) and the ascendancy of English. Conversely, the migration of a large number of by then predominantly English-speaking Irish to British colonies had a distinct influence on the varieties of English spoken there. Traces of the linguistic influence of IrE can be found in the contemporary English spoken in parts of Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Caribbean.

The next three chapters are concerned with the linguistic features of IrE, respectively grammar, vocabulary, and sounds. Although Amador-Moreno does provide plentiful and useful examples of each of these features, there is an unstated presupposition that the reader has both a basic understanding of the Irish (Gaelic) language and a grounding in linguistics. For instance, in Chapter 3 we have an explanation of how will is often used instead of shall in contexts where the speaker is showing hospitality (Will I get you
Amador-Moreno makes the plausible case that such a feature is derived from the Irish *An bhfuil tú* which is also used in the context of offering, but few readers who are not familiar with Irish, perhaps, would realize that *will* and *bhfuil* sound the same. Similarly, in her discussion of the combination of the preposition *in* with the pronoun *it* (*Let’s open the bottle, for the day that’s in it*), she explains how this feature “is a direct translation of the Irish synthetic form *ann* (i.e., the Irish preposition *i* + the third person masculine singular of the pronoun)” (p. 46). This is correct, but readers without a working knowledge of the Irish language are liable to feel a bit lost in these sections.

In Chapter 6, the book examines fictional representations of IrE—in novels, plays, films, television drama, stand-up comedy, and advertising. This is a lot of ground to cover and Amador-Moreno tries admirably, her discussion encompassing everything from Elizabethan drama to television adverts for beer. Inevitably, there are omissions and perhaps a little too much foregrounding of favorites. Thus repeated mention is made of the somewhat obscure early 20th-century Donegal writer Patrick MacGill, yet no space is found for either Samuel Beckett or Flann O’Brien. Similarly, in her treatment of cinema she highlights the use of IrE in the film *Small Engine Repair*, yet almost perversely ignores more notable (and known) examples such as *My Left Foot* or *Angela’s Ashes*.

The following chapter is a wonderfully stimulating examination of discourse pragmatics in IrE. What may be of particular interest to readers based in Japan is that IrE shares with the Japanese language an ingrained avoidance of directness. This is a form of politeness, a discourse strategy that serves to maintain the self-esteem of the speaker and listener, ensuring that communication proceeds harmoniously. A good example of this is the widespread use of understatement amongst Irish people. Thus, the common response by an Irish person to the greeting *How are you?* is not *I’m fine*, but something more self-effacing along the lines of *Not too bad, Not the worst,* or *Can’t complain*. Conversely, where IrE differs noticeably from Japanese discourse pragmatics is in its complete lack of any social class markers akin to *keigo*. Despite, or perhaps because of, a long history of English colonial rule, Ireland never developed a formal social class system. The result is that people tend to relate to each other as equals in a rather familiar way without implying any lack of respect in their language choices. This absence of overt linguistic markers can be disconcerting for Japanese learners of English studying in Ireland, where they may struggle to acquire the more subtle pragmatic competence required to display politeness or deference in IrE.
Chapter 8 deals with the usefulness of corpora for the study of IrE and suggests a number of methods and resources researchers can draw upon in compiling or analyzing a concordance of words or grammatical structures specific to IrE. Such corpora could then be used to compare and contrast various linguistic features with other varieties of English. Appending the chapter is a useful list of existing online corpora of IrE, which can be easily accessed by the interested reader.

The final chapter is also the shortest, only seven pages long, which is a pity as its focus—the implications of IrE for teaching EFL—warrants a fuller discussion. As students from my own institute can testify, foreign learners of English who visit or study in Ireland are often taken aback at the initially alarming difference between what they have studied in the classroom and the pronunciation, grammatical constructions, vocabulary, and pragmatic features of the English they encounter in Ireland. There is an increasing recognition of the different varieties of English but awareness alone is not enough; also required is a corresponding pedagogical change in how English is taught, particularly in compulsory formal education, where the emphasis still remains on standard English. Such a change could usefully introduce students to texts, both aural and written, in nonstandard English and help develop their awareness of linguistic and pragmatic differences along with the associated cultural factors that influence such varieties.

Amador-Moreno’s book is an accomplished introduction to the oldest example of what Hickey (2004) calls “transported” English. It is written in a clear and engaging style, and for the most part achieves the often difficult balance between introductory clarity and expository depth. I would particularly recommend it as a supplementary reader for any course concerned with the study of World Englishes. Finally, the book is also, in its quiet, understated way, a welcome plea for linguistic and cultural diversity: for maintaining and encouraging the range of dialects, vocabularies, grammars, discourses, and all the other linguistic ingredients that enable the rich variety of Englishes around the world to grow and flourish.
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The last few years have seen a burgeoning of influential multidisciplinary works that deal with the changing linguistic ecology of Japan (e.g., Heinrich & Galan, 2011; Seargeant, 2011; Willis & Murphy-Shigematsu, 2008). Exploring the interplay between globalization, migration, and ethnicity, contributions such as these have highlighted a dismantling of the modernist myth of Japan as a monolingual, monocultural nation-state and have offered more accurate accounts of Japan’s contemporary linguistic and ethnic landscape. Gottlieb’s *Language Policy in Japan: The Challenge of Change* should quite rightly be seen as an original, skillfully crafted addition to this emerging body of literature.

Chapter 1, entitled “Language Policy, Planning, and Ideology,” effectively sets out the central arguments of the book. Gottlieb posits that the ramifications of two significant changes to Japanese society over the last three decades—1) migration-induced multilingualism and 2) electronically mediated changes to the literary practices of Japanese—have thrown up particular challenges for Japan’s language policymakers. Gottlieb argues that an erroneous but “strongly entrenched and overarching language ideology . . . [retaining] a lingering belief that Japan is monolingual” (p. 6) has called for two very different responses to these challenges. She maintains that while language policy designed to address the growing language needs of migrants has been slow, fragmented, localized, and bottom up, language policy dealing with changing practices brought about by increased computer use and the proliferation of cell phones has been unified and decisive—a top down, centrally-planned, coordinated response at the national level.

The second chapter, “The Needs of Language Migrants,” canvasses the complexities associated with meeting the linguistic needs of migrants from a variety of contexts. Gottlieb first outlines some of the difficulties faced by migrant children and children of migrants in their attempts to integrate into the Japanese public school system, as well as the social consequences that frequently result in instances where these attempts are unsuccessful. She
also takes up some of the issues faced by adult migrants who want to learn Japanese and contextualizes the role of the volunteer language instructors assisting them. In particular, issues faced by non-Japanese spouses of Japanese citizens, foreign nurses, and daycare workers, as well as foreign defendants caught in the Japanese judicial system are examined. In summarizing the progress that has been made in recent years, this informative chapter concludes with the following caveat: “While language planning which takes into account the needs of migrant children in Japanese schools and of their parents outside them makes perfect sense to those children and their families, it must also make sense to the Japanese mainstream” (p. 62).

Chapter 3, “Foreign Languages Other than English in Education and the Community,” argues that, far from being “foreign,” several languages spoken in Japan need to be more fully recognized as community languages, that is, languages that “are used by citizens within a polity” (p. 68; see also Clyne, 1991). Such a view is contrasted with the pervasive three-tiered conceptualization of languages that permeates language policy in Japan: “the national language, English as an international language, and other ‘foreign’ languages, which . . . [are] sidelined in the school system” (p. 68).

“Technology and Language Policy Change” is the title of Chapter 4. Here, Gottlieb describes the common belief that the use of kanji is in a state of decline, something that is often attributed to the expanded use of television and other media diffused online and through cell phones. Gottlieb convincingly argues that while there are indeed noticeable orthographic changes to the way Japanese is being written online—such as the so-called gyarumoji “writing conventions used by a particular subculture of rebellious young women known as kogaru” (p. 109) providing perhaps the most illustrative example—such language play should not be interpreted as evidence of language midare (disorder/decline), but rather as a manifestation of “a confident mastery of the accepted literary conventions . . . [permitting] expertly playful departures from such norms rather than any attempt to replace them” (p. 114). The chapter also provides a detailed account of the processes that led to the creation of the 2010 Revised List of Kanji for General Use (Kaitei Jōyō Kanji Hyō).

Chapter 5, “National Language Policy and an Internationalising Community,” effectively draws the main arguments of the book together. Gottlieb’s realistic summation of the state of language policy reform in Japan paints a somewhat bleak, though not altogether pessimistic, picture. Change, she argues, is often slow and tortuous, but it is coming nonetheless. Such a situation, she writes:
reflects the fact that Japan, only now beginning to acknowledge that foreign workers have become part of the permanent landscape, has not yet done the language policy work necessary to deal with multilingualism in its communities by providing adequate opportunities to study the host country’s language as a nationally sponsored and well integrated enterprise. Policies or discussion documents which mention language training have been orientated to the labour market and to the smooth running of local communities on an ad hoc basis and lack a general overview of national needs in this area. (p. 133)

The book concludes by summarizing the challenge of change facing language policymakers in Japan: “The dominant narrative in this process may be summed up as one of hovering between loss and gain: loss of the comfort of homogeneity as assumed shared heritage balanced against the economic and cultural gain from the presence of foreign residents in local communities” (p. 162).

Language Policy in Japan is an informative, accessible account of the fluid challenges facing language policymakers in Japan. It will be of interest to a wide range of scholars—most notably from the fields of applied linguistics and Japanese studies. It could conceivably also be introduced as a graduate text, both in Japan and elsewhere, and as such is highly recommended.
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In recent years, motivation has been actively researched, with studies focusing on Japanese contexts becoming more increasingly available in journal articles and conference presentations. *Teaching and Researching Motivation* is a resource for teachers and researchers who seek a solid foundation of knowledge about motivation and motivation studies. After having postulated the process-oriented motivation theory 20 years ago, in this second edition, coauthored with Ushioda, Dörnyei proclaims a shift in perspectives on motivation. This expanded view combines the learner’s ideal vision of the self and the surrounding social context, and identifies these as crucial factors that scaffold or affect learner motivation. The book consists of four sections in which are discussed motivation in psychology, motivation for learning a foreign language, strategies and approaches to enhance motivation, and methods and types of research in motivation. Throughout these sections, the authors review past literature in depth, thereby formulating a set of guiding principles to be applied by the readers. As such, the book serves as a comprehensive guide for inquiry and research into the current sociodynamic perspectives underpinning motivation.

Section 1 consists of four chapters. Chapter 1 begins with a brief introduction to commonly agreed concepts of motivation and then proposes a paradigm shift toward the current sociodynamic perspectives, thereby directing readers beyond the past linear models. In Chapter 2 the authors look at motivation within general learning theories in psychology and present prominent motivation theories comprehensively, starting from expectancy value theories, goal theories, and self-determination theories. Finally, the discussion reaches the point of social contexts that influence motivation, which is a key concept proposed in the later chapters.

In Chapter 3 motivation in relation to second language learning is discussed. The authors describe four distinct stages in the history of motivation theory: the *social psychological* period, the *cognitive-situated* period, the *process-oriented* period, and the current *sociodynamic perspective*. In the so-
cial psychological period, Gardner’s *integrative orientation* and *instrumental orientation* played a prominent role. Then in the cognitive-situated period, motivation theories were expanded by combining perspectives from learners, the learning context, and language, within which key enquiries included self-determination theory, autonomy theory, and task motivation theory. In the process-oriented period, motivation was conceptualized as a dynamically changing process, which involved time sequence and learner experience; here inquiry expanded across phases from initiating action to postactional, and the focus moved to the changes in learner motivation during the course of learning. Thus, the authors highlight the need for qualitative research to examine reflectively the inner changes in learner motivation, thereby avoiding a view of motivation based on cause-effect linear models that simply predict learning outcomes from entry levels of motivation. The chapter closes with a discussion of the diminishing role of integrative motivation, shortly touching on the English as a lingua franca movement around the world.

In Chapter 4 the authors elaborate further on the current sociodynamic perspectives: Ushioda’s person-in-context relational view and Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System. Both emphasize the crucial role of the surrounding social context in constructing learning experience and the learner’s ideal future self. Also considered are learner motivation with the components of the complex dynamic system, which involves motivation, cognition, and emotion. The system is further broken down into *interest*, *motivational flow*, *motivational task processing*, and *future self-guides*, all of which are crucial to generate enjoyment of learning and active engagement toward the goal of learning.

In Section 2, Chapters 5 to 7, motivation in second language learning contexts is discussed. Chapter 5 illuminates motivational strategies with step-by-step motivational practices, namely task procedures, goal settings, and the creation of learner-relevant materials. Although the authors propose a wide range of approaches, they conclude that the best motivation-sensitive approach is one in which the teacher communicates with learners personally and helps them find their own goals by presenting appropriate tasks in a cozy atmosphere.

In Chapter 6 demotivating influences are looked at. The authors generalize from past investigative studies that, not surprisingly, one of the most demotivating factors is brought on by immediate interactions with teachers. The authors conclude that whether students encounter disorganized instruction, inappropriate materials, or even dissatisfaction with progress, they perceive demotivating factors to be attributable to teachers. In Chapter
The authors look at protecting teacher motivation and propose necessary measures, which include protecting teacher autonomy from educational constraints, developing sufficient self-efficacy, and offering career advancement paths. They touch upon the relationship between teacher motivation and student motivation, as well as teacher enthusiasm and student enthusiasm, and discuss how these relationships may function reciprocally in ongoing interactions and impact further on motivation.

In Sections 3 and 4, Chapters 8 through 11, methods and designs for researching motivation along with useful resources are described. Chapter 8 provides general directions for motivation study and explains the main research methods, namely quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research, along with the strengths and weaknesses of each. In Chapter 9 the authors discuss types of research design with samples of past research methods, whose results, we find, have positive correlation with the aforementioned discussions about the complex dynamic system. Finally, the authors emphasize the need for multiple focuses, including “(a) focus on ‘attractors,’ (b) focus on context, (c) focus on change rather than variables, and (d) focus on qualitative system modeling” (p. 246), which are recurrently stated themes throughout the sections. Chapters 10 and 11 offer resources and sample questions used for questionnaires and surveys.

The authors state that researching motivation can be a challenging task. Because of its abstract, unobservable “mental processes,” it is neither linear nor is it a cause and effect phenomenon. Rather, motivation should be seen as multiple dimensions of constructs and dynamically changing systems over time. Despite the complexity of the constructs of motivation, the book elaborates on each facet comprehensively, weaves them together, and guides readers with a helpful map for researching the abstract concepts. One limitation might be a lack of research that can be generalized to predict common trajectories of “mental processes” in the authors’ complex dynamic system and this new paradigm. However, all in all, the book would serve as a good textbook for graduate students to establish fundamental knowledge on motivation. In addition, as I seek to adopt the components of the complex dynamic system when planning my own lessons, I would say that the book is helpful not only for protecting student motivation but also for avoiding demotivating influences for learners and teachers alike.

Reviewed by
Alan Thompson
Nagoya University of Commerce and Business

Writing of the move in social sciences away from theories of structural determination and towards the situation-first approaches of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, Heritage (2001) notes that “talk-in-interaction . . . is the fundamental resource through which the business of all societies is managed, their cultures are transmitted, the identities of their participants are affirmed, and their social structures are reproduced” (p. 47). Intercultural Interactions in Business and Management is likewise inclined—if we widen the notion of talk to all forms of transient communication (websites, brochures, etc.)—and focused on situated acts of communication. Thus, there are refreshingly few statistics of worldwide trends in aggregate and few categorisations of the world into circles or dichotomies; the focus is on the situations.

The collection of papers is drawn from a 2010 conference of the European Society for the Study of English, with the objective “not to emphasize contrasts, . . . [but to] promote mutual understanding, arising from awareness about different norms of communication” (p. 14). Further, the focus is on the specific and timely: In the Foreword, Francesca Bargiela-Chiappini calls for more studies that are situated in present-day workspaces, with a preferable emphasis on East Asia, around which the business world has recently been “re-centring” (p. 9). It is also stated in the foreword and introduction and on the back cover that the role of English as a lingua franca (ELF) is a main concern of the book.

The book is divided into two parts, the first dealing with (one-way) written genres and the second with interactions (mostly spoken, but including email). The opening paper by Rita Salvi functions as a survey of the literature and is an exception to the interaction-focus of the volume as a whole. The chapter is helpful in referencing many of the frameworks and definitions that have informed studies for the past decades, but it does not successfully tie them together to show how they contribute to an integrated understanding of intercultural professional communication. Salvi then appends to this an exploration of the genre of the chart in business communication.
Following are a series of rigorous studies, using corpus-based and multimodal methodologies, describing the genres and discursive practices of company brochures and websites. The contributions by Winnie Cheng and Judith Turnbull investigate the word frequencies, common collocations, and semantic patterning of company promotional material (engineering company brochures and the Unilever regional websites, respectively). Turnbull adds to this an examination of the most frequent words in context and a multimodal analysis of how the composition of the website contributes to its message. Daniela Cesiri provides a keyword analysis, followed by design and content analyses, of Nestlé and Kraft websites. Next, Cristina Gatti, with a corpus of 25 company websites in the Baltic region, focuses her analysis on “culturally-entrenched representational modalities,” drawing on the framework of Halliday’s (1985) functional grammar, and finding that even among cultures that are commonly understood as a cultural monolith, there are differences in the typical process types used to encode and represent events and relations.

The findings of these studies seem reliable but are often uninteresting: of engineering brochures, “the distinctive phraseological patterns of business and professional English . . . convey meanings that are specific to both the discipline and the communicative patterns of the genre, which are different to general English” (p. 68). Or, when they hold interest, it is often in relation to something that is not quite the stated focus of the volume: the variation in corporate message for different local settings (e.g., the Nigerian Unilever website having a unique concern with employee relations, which may indicate something about Unilever in Nigeria but not about the use of English in intercultural interactions), or the citation of culturally-filtered semiotic resources (i.e., grammar) in Gatti’s study.

Olga Denti and Michela Giordano, in their contribution, approach the topic at the higher level of the activity, investigating the intercultural issues involved in the modes of communication that online dispute resolution systems (in the UK, Ireland, and India) impose on users. Their findings confirm that dimensions of difference such as time orientation and power distance play a role, but they also note that the differences are not as astounding as expected, with the features of two sides of a dichotomy (e.g., high-context vs. low-context) intermingling.

The chapters in the first half of the book, concentrating on the written mode and presenting in most cases instances of one-way communication, create the impression that the senders of messages are able to maintain control over content, genre, and discursive practices, with any interactive feedback being
remote, indirect, and weak in effect. However, as the focus switches to spoken interactions in the second half, local practices are seen to have more power. Shanta Nair-Venugopal makes this point explicitly, observing that trainers in a Malaysian company “reproduce and replicate the language structures that trainees produce” (p. 168), downshifting in register and mixing language in order to facilitate the training session, and in so doing subvert the stated language policies that assert, unrealistically, that English is the working language. Janet Bowker, also in the Malaysian context, employing an ethnographic and conversation analysis (CA) approach, found that foreign expert consultants and their audiences, even though they attempted to express solidarity and deference in their use of hedges and use or non-use of pronouns, were at odds due to the mismatch in their perceptions of social distance and relative power inherent in the situation. Thus, this became another site of contestation, with the bald on-record statements of the Malaysian audience forcing the experts to retreat. On the other hand, another study in the CA framework, by Vittoria Grassi, demonstrates that a high level of collaborative interaction-management was brought about in an Australian workplace by diminishing power differences by similar means (hedging, casual discourse particles, and humour), reinforcing the idea that politeness strategies are only partially effective, and that background perceptions of relative power and privilege are a greater determining factor in achieving collaboration.

Cast amid these cases involving power differentials, Hiromasa Tanaka’s contribution, examining the discourse strategies of a Japanese businesswoman and her Indian partners, reveals several strategies that facilitate relatively power-neutral intercultural ELF communication. In his data, these strategies include, along with much conscious repetition, a tolerance for white lies and even a concession in a negotiation. Tanaka interprets the concession as having a motivation similar to Firth’s (1996) let-it [the miscommunication]-pass strategy—“to avoid difficult discussion that might be too much burden for participants with limited linguistic resources” (p. 224)—a broad interpretation that bleakly suggests that much intercultural communication might falter in a fog of incompetence.

Franca Poppi follows with a study of corporate email communication, from Japan and China to Italy, which shows mixed adoption of local versus global practices in the greetings, closings, and requesting moves in the messages. Finally, Vanessa Leonardi and Irina Khoutyz explore the link between business discourse and language teaching, focusing on contrastive small talk practices and strategies for successful engagement in this important stage of the business interaction.
The papers in this volume are most promising in the initial pages where the theoretical framework is expounded and the research questions are posed. But, as every investigator of interactions in authentic settings knows, one cannot ensure that the data collected will supply answers to one’s questions, and that is also a source of disappointment here. At least one study including data which turned out not to be an appropriate example of the phenomenon under investigation. Other studies also failed to yield the intended discoveries, yet this is instructive in several cases, including Nair-Venugopal’s paper, which encourages the suspicion that the prevalence of English as a worldwide workplace language is overstated. And at times, the interpretations are a stretch, such as when two instances of charts published in different years are used to infer a trend in the use of charts in business communication.

Overall, while the studies in the book do not lead to many groundbreaking insights, they do succeed in confirming and documenting many features of intercultural business communication practice, and in disconfirming a few commonly held assumptions. Personally, I found the studies useful mostly in suggesting new avenues of analysis for my own research, and of intrinsic interest purely because they grapple with instances of real, situated business communication, which was what the collection set out to do.
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