A Study of Lexicogrammatical and Discourse Strategies for "Suggestion" with the Use of the English Speech Act Corpus

英語スピーチアクト・コーパスによる
「提案・提言(Suggestion)」の語彙・文法・会話ストラテジー分析研究

2008 年 9 月 11 日 13:40-14:10
@ JACET 2008
鈴木　利彦　（早稲田大学）
Email: toshisuz@hotmail.com

1. Purposes of this study

This presentation demonstrates the following:

(1) the effectiveness of English speech act corpora for CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) in teaching 'natural' and 'appropriate' expressions in particular contexts;

(2) lexical features and discourse strategies (i.e. semantic formulae) of the target speech act 'suggestion', performed by English native speakers.

2. Significance of developing "pragmatic competence" (cf. Bachman, 1990)

- The most compelling evidence that instruction in pragmatics is necessary comes from learners whose L2 proficiency is advanced …

- Turning to production, candidates for pedagogic intervention can be sorted in four groups: (1) choice of communicative acts, (2) the strategies by which an act is realized, (3) its content, and (4) its linguistic form.

Kasper, G. (1997)

3. Pragmatics & SLA / TEFL

- Interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993) "a second-generation hybrid of SLA & pragmatics"

- Pragmatics in Language Teaching (Rose & Kasper, 2001):
  (I)n many second and foreign language teaching contexts, curricula and materials developed in recent years include strong pragmatic components or even adopt a pragmatic approach as their organizing principle.

4. **Pragmatics & CLT**

Nunan (1991) defines the principles or features of CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) or "Communicative Approach" as follows:

(1) An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.

(2) The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.

(3) The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the Learning Management process.

(4) An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.

(5) An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

5. **Speech act of "suggestion"**

- 'Suggestion' is an illocutionary speech act, which is supposed to be basically an FEA (face-enhancing act) for the hearer (H) (cf. Kerbat-Orecchioni, 1997: 14), because the speaker (S) undertakes in this speech act to give advice or instructions, offer help, propose etc. for the benefit of H or 'you and I' (inclusive 'we').

- In this sense, 'suggestion' is assumed to belong chiefly to Searle's EXPRESSIVE (cf. 1975:15) and Leech's CONVIVIAL (cf. 1983:104) because of its FEA nature.

- However, if S needs to 'force' H to do something for his/her/our sake, 'suggestion' can get into Searle's (ibid.) category of DIRECTIVE or Leech's (ibid.) COMPETITIVE.

6. **Research background**

Specification of Date and Informants:

- This research was carried out in (1) February-March & (2) September 2007 in Missouri, U.S.A. with 164 undergraduate students of the Southeast Missouri State University.

Procedure of data collection:

- Two types of DCTs (discourse completion tests) and the role-play

- DCT 1 requested one group of informants to write what they really said in the past or would say to perform the target English speech acts.

- DCT 2 requested the other group to write up real or imaginary conversations between S and H.

- Both types asked them to record situations that they remembered or could think of when they perform(ed) the speech acts.

- Besides these studies with questionnaires, some informants volunteered for a role-play for the collection of audio-visual data.

7. Situation

N	Type	Classification	Num	Per
1	N	What to wear	34	24.1%
2	F	Meal	27	19.1%
3	B	Event in near future	16	11.3%
4	M	What to do	15	10.6%
5	C	Friend in trouble	14	9.9%
6	H	Schoolwork	11	7.8%
7	G	Room arrangement	5	3.5%
8	I	Shopping	5	3.5%
9	K	Trouble expected	4	2.8%
10	L	We're in trouble	4	2.8%
11	A	Appearance	2	1.4%
12	D	Future direction	1	0.7%
13	E	Invitation	1	0.7%
14	J	S's request (to solve problem)	1	0.7%
15	O	Workplace request	1	0.7%
		Total	141	

8. Lexical strategies - Wordlist

N	Word	Freq.	%	Texts	N	Word	Freq.	%	Texts
1	YOU	157	6.588334	7	23	WOULD	20	0.839278	6
2	THE	78	3.273185	7	24	MAYBE	19	0.797314	6
3	TO	68	2.853546	7	25	BE	18	0.75535	6
4	I	67	2.811582	7	26	REALLY	18	0.75535	5
5	SHOULD	64	2.68569	7	27	ON	17	0.713386	6
6	IT	56	2.349979	7	28	WITH	16	0.671423	5
7	GO	46	1.93034	7	29	HEY	15	0.629459	5
8	WE	44	1.846412	7	30	HOW	15	0.629459	7
9	THINK	40	1.678556	7	31	CAN	14	0.587495	5
10	YOUR	40	1.678556	7	32	GOOD	14	0.587495	6
11	A	39	1.636593	7	33	HAVE	14	0.587495	6
12	'T	35	1.468737	7	34	DO	13	0.545531	6
13	THAT	31	1.300881	5	35	ONE	13	0.545531	3
14	DON	27	1.133026	7	36	SHIRT	13	0.545531	4

15	'S	25	1.049098	6		37	THERE	13	0.545531	5
16	ABOUT	22	0.923206	6		38	WHAT	13	0.545531	4
17	AND	22	0.923206	7		39	BETTER	12	0.503567	5
18	IN	22	0.923206	7		40	OF	12	0.503567	4
19	IS	22	0.923206	5		41	OUT	12	0.503567	5
20	WEAR	22	0.923206	6		42	TONIGHT	12	0.503567	3
21	ARE	21	0.881242	6		43	WHY	12	0.503567	7
22	GET	20	0.839278	7						

9. [Selected] Lexical & grammatical strategies (collocations/chunks/structure)

SHOULD

1) Maybe you **should** get your homework done before you play videogames.
2) Maybe you **should** take a nap
3) You **should** probably slow down.
4) Maybe you **should** stop seeing him if you think it's not working out.
5) You **should** go over there and check it out!

DON('T)

1) Why **don't** we go to Bella Italia for dinner?
2) Dustin, why **don't** you go work on your homework so you can get your grade up in that class.
3) Hey, why **don't** we go see a movie?
4) Why **don't** we go play basketball at the gym?
5) Hey, Stephanie, why **don't** we go get pizza Saturday night?

ABOUT

1) How **about** we get some food?
2) How **about** this weekend we can go to the movies, since it was just released,
3) How **about** bowling?
4) How **about** chocolate?
5) How **about** we go to Logan's restaurant?

WOULD

1) I **would** pick the Red bus route because it has the most convenient route.
2) I **would** wear the belt with it.
3) I **would** really suggest taking a minor in History.
4) May be it **would** be a better idea to take your pills with water.
5) **Would** you like me to get you some Diana?

REALLY

1) I think it would be a **really** good idea for you to go to college.

2) There's a **really** great restaurant in town with great burgers, if you want to go.

3) Jen, you should **really** take a shower sometimes.

4) I **really** think it would look good.

5) Texas Roadhouse was **really** good last time ate there.

10. **Conversation/Discourse strategies – strategy classification**

No	Type	Classification	Freq	Perc 1	Perc 2
1	H	head act (Declarative)	76	20.3%	25.0%
2	A	addressing (voc/intj/etc)	70	18.7%	
3	C	follow-up act (giving reason)	41	11.0%	13.5%
4	O	head act (Interrogative)	37	9.9%	12.2%
5	Q	preparatory act (explanation of problem)	23	6.1%	7.6%
6	I	head act (Hypothetical + Declarative)	21	5.6%	6.9%
7	V	preparatory act (S's preference)	19	5.1%	6.3%
8	E	follow-up act (indication of good result)	14	3.7%	4.6%
9	T	preparatory act (presenting topic)	13	3.5%	4.3%
10	L	head act (Imperative 1)	12	3.2%	3.9%
11	D	follow-up act (indication of bad result)	7	1.9%	2.3%
12	K	head act (IFID)	7	1.9%	2.3%
13	M	head act (Imperative 2)	7	1.9%	2.3%
14	U	preparatory act (question)	7	1.9%	2.3%
15	F	follow-up act (query on h's opinion)	6	1.6%	2.0%
16	J	head act (Hypothetical + Interrogative)	4	1.1%	1.3%
17	G	follow-up act (recommendation)	3	0.8%	1.0%
18	B	follow-up act (another suggestion)	2	0.5%	0.7%
19	P	preparatory act (attention getter)	2	0.5%	0.7%
20	N	head act (Imperative 3)	1	0.3%	0.3%
21	R	preparatory act (mitigation)	1	0.3%	0.3%
22	S	preparatory act (offer of help)	1	0.3%	0.3%
		Total 1	374		
		Total 2	304		

11. Semantic formulas (Combination of discourse strategies)

N	Combination	Freq.		N	Combination	Freq.
1	H	20		15	AEO	2
2	CH	12		16	AHQ	2
3	ACH	6		17	AHT	2
4	AH	5		18	AIT	2
5	AO	5		19	AQ	2
6	CO	5		20	CV	2
7	O	5		21	EH	2
8	ACI	3		22	GH	2
9	AJ	3		23	HU	2
10	AV	3		24	HV	2
11	HQ	3		25	I	2
12	IQ	3		26	IO	2
13	K	3		27	MO	2
14	ADL	2				

12. Conclusion & future directions

·   The results of the data analysis above are to contribute to the production of ELT materials pursuing CLT.

·   Both instructors and learners can study lexical, grammatical and discourse strategies of the U.S. university undergraduates as a model of the target language.

·   The analysis of 'responses' (positive, negative and others) and that of prosody and kinesics will provide more information on the actual use of this speech act. (in progress)

References

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved [2006/07/23] from the World Wide Web: http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (eds.) (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1997). "A multilevel approach in the study of talk-in-interaction". *Pragmatics* 7(1): 1-20.

Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Nunan, D. (1991). "Communicative task and the language curriculum". *TESOL Quarterly* 25.

Rose, K. & G. Kasper (2001). "Pragmatics in language teaching". In Rose, K. & G. Kasper (eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.