

2004

The realization of L2 speech events: a quantitative study of Korean speakers of L2 English with respect to formality and proficiency

Nevin Liddy

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Liddy, Nevin, "The realization of L2 speech events: a quantitative study of Korean speakers of L2 English with respect to formality and proficiency" (2004). *LSU Master's Theses*. 3831.

https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/3831

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

THE REALIZATION OF L2 SPEECH EVENTS:
A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF KOREAN SPEAKERS OF L2 ENGLISH WITH RESPECT
TO FORMALITY AND PROFICIENCY

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Interdepartmental Program in Linguistics

by

Nevin Liddy

B.A., L.S.U., 2001, International Studies

B.A., L.S.U., 2001, Religious Studies

May 2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Arnulfo Ramirez for his patient help and guidance throughout this entire project. I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Hegarty and Dr. Hugh W Buckingham for their support and insights that helped further this study. Margaret Jo Borland has my deep thanks for all of her extremely beneficial assistance in acquiring the data. This is my second opportunity to work with the ELOP for the purpose of acquiring linguistic data, and on both occasions, their help has been invaluable. Finally, I am indebted to all of the Korean volunteers, without whom this study would have been impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 METHOD.....	4
2.1 Participants.....	4
2.2 Research Design.....	4
2.3 Framework for Conversational Analysis.....	9
3 ANALYSIS OF SPEECH EVENTS.....	13
3.1 Beginner Informal Speech Event.....	13
3.2 Beginner Formal Speech Event.....	16
3.3 Intermediate Informal Speech Event.....	18
3.4 Intermediate Formal Speech Event.....	20
3.5 Advanced Informal Speech Event.....	22
3.6 Advanced Formal Speech Event.....	24
3.7 Native Informal Speech Event.....	27
3.8 Native Formal Speech Event.....	29
4 DISCUSSION.....	32
4.1 Comparisons Among Proficiency Groups in the Informal Conversational Scenario.....	33
4.2 Comparisons Among Proficiency Groups in the Formal Conversational Scenario.....	34
4.3 Comparisons Among Conversational Scenario Formality in each Proficiency Group.....	35
5 CONCLUSIONS.....	37
6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	38
7 FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.....	39
REFERENCES.....	41
APPENDIX	
A. DATA FOR THE INFORMAL CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIOS.....	43
B. DATA FOR THE FORMAL CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIOS.....	54
C. CALCULATIONS FOR THE SPEECH ACT REALIZATIONS.....	67
VITA.....	68

ABSTRACT

Guided written conversations were studied from English speakers at four different proficiency levels. They were analyzed according to their speech act realization, speech event realization, and conversation management (as reflected by three levels of speech acts: primary, secondary, and complementary). All four proficiency levels were found to be capable in the formulation of speech acts and events, demonstrating access to certain discourse principles at all levels. Language proficiency was found to effect the way in which a speech event was realized to a greater degree than the level of formality was found to effect the way in which the speech events were realized.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is often used to accomplish tasks, and this is never more evident than to a non-native language learner in the country that uses the target language. Everyday occurrences, such as buying groceries, being polite in conversation, and finding lodging requires requesting, refusing, thanking, etcetera. Of course, using language to accomplish tasks such as these is well documented in voluminous speech act literature. Speech acts are largely recognized as being a universal feature of languages and culture (language) specific.

Acknowledging that, numerous Second Language Acquisition (SLA) studies have also focused on the acquisition of speech acts, pragmatic awareness and pragmatic judgement. These studies have covered various speech acts such as invitations, requests, greetings, refusals, apologies, and compliments (Kasper & Rose, 1999). While the majority of L2 speech act research has focused on the non-native speakers' production, some have covered other approaches such as non-native speaker awareness and judgement (Olshtain & Blum Kulka, 1985; Koike, 1996; and Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998). Although all of these works have provided an excellent tool for the study of interlanguage, our focus here is the production of speech acts by a non-native speaker.

A speech act can be accomplished with a minimal amount of linguistic action. "Hello" is a single linguistic unit, and an expressive speech act. They can also be accomplished through a more wordy endeavor, such as "I would be pleased if you would join me for dinner tonight" as an directive speech act. These speech acts can be looked at as a single linguistic action; the words come together to form a single task (for example a request). In other words, the focus of the non-native speaker production is the speech act itself. Such a focus on a single act linguistic function

can be considered transactional. Our focus here is on a more interactional approach to speech acts.

Speech acts do not occur in a vacuum from other speech acts. For instance, several speech acts can occur consecutively forming what is known as a speech event. A speech event is an important unit of analysis because it provides a context in which to examine the actual “relationship between the speaker and the utterance, on the particular occasion of use” (Brown & Yule, 1983) A simplest case scenario is a request, followed by a refusal (in the form of a statement): *Can I borrow the car tonight, Dad? → I have to go to a meeting tonight...* and so on. This is particularly useful in scenarios that involve indirect methods to accomplish rejections, requests and other face threatening occasions (Brown & Levinson, 1987) This context heavy continuing discourse involving several speech acts is common in the target language of this study, English. This use of context is an aspect of communicative competence (Krashen, 1982) that is developed by L2 learners over time. I believe studying conversational development in discourse will offer insight to the development of interlanguage.

Therefore, this is a quantitative study of interlanguage pragmatics and L2 conversational analysis. Discourse analysis theories were employed to develop a speech event task which would produce data that could be analyzed with conversational analysis methods (Levinson, 1983). I wish to examine how speech events develop as the interlanguage moves from L1 towards L2 (over time, demonstrated by proficiency level). In this work, a speech event is defined as a series of speech acts that occur in natural comprehensible discourse, most often to accomplish a unifying pragmatic goal (Hymes, 1972). For example, if the intent of a speaker’s conversation is to ask a favor, the speaker will often greet, make a statement, make a request, accept, give

thanks, and bid farewell to accomplish her goal. The previous example involved at least six speech acts, all of which are encompassed by the conversation as a whole: the speech event.

I look at two speech events that occur at two different levels of formality (formal and informal), where a shared desire to meet enables a repeated request and refusal adjacency pair to take place until there is a resolution. The data were gathered in order to examine how the four different levels of proficiency handled the conversational issue of formality with respect to primary, secondary, and complementary speech acts. Throughout the process of the study I seek to answer three questions.

- 1) How do the four different proficiency levels affect the realization of an informal speech event?
- 2) How do the four different proficiency levels affect the realization of a formal speech event?
- 3) How does the realization of the informal and formal speech events differ according to proficiency level?

Here are the three questions diagrammatically represented, where the superscripts 'B', 'I', 'A', and 'N', represent Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced and Native proficiency levels respectively, and the subscripts 'i' and 'f' represent informal and formal (the two types of conversational situations) respectively:

- | |
|--|
| 1) $B_i \leftrightarrow I_i \leftrightarrow A_i \leftrightarrow N_i$ |
| 2) $B_f \leftrightarrow I_f \leftrightarrow A_f \leftrightarrow N_f$ |
| 3) $B_i \leftrightarrow B_f$ |
| $I_i \leftrightarrow I_f$ |
| $A_i \leftrightarrow A_f$ |
| $N_i \leftrightarrow N_f$ |

2. METHOD

Here I discuss the participants from whom the data was collected (bearing as many relevant linguistic traits in common as possible), the manner in which the data was collected, and what tools I used to interpret and analyze the data.

2.1 PARTICIPANTS

The study involved participants at four different levels of English proficiency: beginner, intermediate, advanced, and native. The three non-native groups were participating in an intensive three month English immersion program at Louisiana State University over their 2003-2004 college winter break. The beginner, intermediate and advanced levels of study were distinguished using standardized Michigan A and placement tests, which were administered as part of the placement process in the program. The tests measure listening comprehension, reading, vocabulary and grammar. The native speaker group was comprised of both graduate and undergraduate students at Louisiana State University. All of the subjects (N=12, three at each level) participated on a voluntary basis.

2.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

There are often methodological issues with acquiring speech acts for research purposes. (Brown, 2001; Cohen and Olshtain, 1993) For instance, there is the common problem of acquiring the desired speech acts without sacrificing spontaneity and naturalness of the gathered linguistic material. More explicitly put, if one guides the participant in what you want to hear, the research design may be compromised because the desired linguistic form would not be used by the participant in order to accomplish the speech task in real life. Similarly, if the conversation is left open-ended (providing more language forms actually used by the participant),

one may end up with little or no relevant data at all. Furthermore: nervousness, stress, and other normal human factors may provide a hindered production from the participant not allowing them to display a fuller version of his or her competence in speech. To remedy these and other practical interactional concerns, the participants in this study were asked to complete a guided conversational sequence in writing, called a discourse chain (Spratt, 1985). The design was adapted from a second language pedagogical resource, which proposes that “discourse chains provide an excellent means of practising language within a controlled situational framework, while giving students a considerable degree of choice as to which exponents to use.” (ibid). With a written format, participants were able to monitor their production and more fully express their communicative competence, without the temporal pressures of full speed speech. By knowing the goal of the conversation (as shown in the directions and by each guided turn), the participants are able to provide the required linguistic material, while using it in a natural everyday conversation. In second language classrooms and textbooks, dialogues (small or large) are often used to teach both old and new material. Similarly, dialogues are often run through the mind of L2 speakers before using a second language. Further evidence for this design comes from recent research by Honeycutt (2003). In his book, he discusses the tendency of people to regularly have imagined conversations. He argues that imagining interactional scripts, as the participant is asked to do here, is a common phenomenon.

As for the discourse situations, both a formal and informal scenario were designed based on native speaker conversations that commonly occur in the university setting. The guided informal conversation is shown in Figure 1, below:

Scenario: John and Kevin are friends in the same class in college. They have a big test on Monday. This weekend, they want to study for the test with each other.

Directions: Please write out the conversation between the two friends, following the outline below.

<u>John</u>	<u>Kevin</u>
1) Greet Kevin. <u> <i>Hello Kevin, how's it going?</i> </u> _____ _____	
	2) Acknowledge John's greeting. _____ _____ _____
3) Invite him to study on Friday. _____ _____ _____	
	4) Refuse politely. _____ _____ _____
5) Invite him to study on Saturday. _____ _____ _____	
	6) Accept his invitation. _____ _____ _____
	Suggest a time and place to study. _____ _____ _____
7) Refuse politely. _____ _____ _____	
	8) Suggest a different time and place. _____ _____ _____

Fig. 1: Studying Together for the Test

(Fig. Cont'd Next Page.)

9) Accept.

10) Acknowledge his agreement.

11) End the conversation.

This conversation is between two persons of equal status (both students) with an acknowledged familiarity (friendship, as noted in the scenario and directions). Furthermore, the proposed meeting is mutually desired and beneficial to both parties in the conversation, which allows the discourse to continue despite the initial refusals in both exchanges (to be discussed below).

The same participants were also asked to complete a formal conversation scenario (at a later date), as given in Figure 2, below:

Scenario: A student (John) goes to the professor’s office to ask some questions about a recent homework assignment. The professor (Dr. Smith) is busy today, but can meet tomorrow.

Directions: Please write out the conversation between the teacher and the student, following the outline below.

John

1) Greet the professor.
Hello Mr. Smith, do you have
a moment?

Dr. Smith

2) Greet John.

Fig. 2: Meeting with the Teacher

(Fig. Cont’d Next Page.)

3) Tell the professor that you (John) need help with your homework.

4) Ask the professor if he can meet with you today.

5) Accept.

Suggest a time.

7) Tell the professor that you can't meet at that time.

9) Accept.

5) Tell John that you are busy today.

6) Suggest meeting tomorrow.

6) Tell John that you can't meet at that time.

Suggest a time.

8) Suggest a different time.

(Fig. Cont'd Next Page.)

10) Say goodbye.

11) Say goodbye.

At the formal level, the conversation is between two persons of unequal status, a teacher and a student. In this scenario, the impetus to continue the conversation after the initial refusals in the dialogue is a matter of need for the student, and a matter of professionalism for the teacher.

2.3 FRAMEWORK FOR CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS

To analyze the realization of individual speech acts, I used combination of Stenstrom's (1994) and Ramirez's (2004) framework of primary, secondary, and complementary speech acts to analyze the speech acts within the conversation. The primary speech acts were classified into four speech act classes based on classifications suggested by Searle (1979) and Bach & Harnish (1979). These four classes include assertives, commissives, expressives (acknowledgments), and directives. Examples of the speech acts found in the data are listed below, in Figure 3:

Primary Acts--*can realize moves on their own*

Assertives

- Accept: agrees to a <request>, <suggest>, etc.
- Acknowledge: signals receipt of information
- Agree: signals agreement with what was just said
- Alerts: calls the addressee's attention
- Answer: responds to a <question>/<request>
- Inform: provides information
- Reject: disagrees to a <request>, <suggest>, etc
- Suggest: puts forward an idea or a plan

Commissives

- Promise: commits to a future action

Directives

- Invite: asks if somebody 'would like to do X'

Fig. 3: Speech Act Framework

(Fig. Cont'd Next Page.)

Question:	asks for information, clarification
Request:	asks somebody to do something
<u>Expressives:</u>	
Apology:	expresses regret
Farewell:	bids farewell using a verbal formula
Greeting:	greet somebody, usually with a verbal formula
Opine:	gives one's personal opinion
React:	expresses attitude and strong feelings
Thanks:	expresses gratitude
Secondary Acts -- <i>accompany and sometimes replace primary acts</i>	
Emphasizer:	underlines what was said in the primary act
Expand:	gives complementary information
Metacomment:	comments on current talk
Clue:	gives a hint; gives preliminary complementary information
Justify:	defends what was said
Preface:	introduces a primary act
Complementary Acts -- <i>accompany but rarely replace primary acts</i>	
Filler	fills a gap in the discourse
Link:	connects sentences using conjunctions
Staller:	plays for time
Starter:	helps getting started
Uptakes:	accepts what was said and leads on (ah, no, oh, well, yes)
Appealer:	invites feedback

For the realization of the speech event, I used a conversational framework based on Sinclair and Coulthard's 1975 account of classroom interaction. The above conversation can be coded for analysis based on the hierarchical framework proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (ibid.). When one adapts the constructs of Exchanges (topics within the conversation), Moves (each speaker's contribution to the topic/ their intention in speaking), and Acts (the actualization of the moves), the informal guided dialogue looks like Figure 4, below:

I: Transaction: Studying Together For The Test

A: Exchange 1--Ritual greeting sequence

J: Greet Kevin.
 K: Acknowledge John's greeting.

B: Exchange 2--Invitation Sequence

J: Invite him to study on Friday.
 K: Refuse politely.

Fig. 4: Depiction of Informal Scenario

(Fig. Cont'd Next Page.)

J: Invite him to study on Saturday.
K: Accept his invitation.

C: Exchange 3-Meeting Time Sequence

K: Suggest a time and place to study.
J: Refuse politely.

K: Suggest a different time and place.
J: Accept.
K: Acknowledge his agreement.

D: Exchange 4-Closing

J: End the conversation.

Furthermore, the two main exchanges, 2 and 3, can be further broken down into to sets of moves. Each exchange can be broken down into two moves. Exchange 2 begins with a invitation/refusal adjacency pair, followed by a invitation/acceptance adjacency pair. Exchange 3 begins with a suggestion/refusal and is followed by a suggestion/acceptance adjacency pair (followed by an acknowledgment).

The formal conversation can also be depicted according to Sinclair and Coulthard (ibid), as shown below:

I: Transaction: Meeting with the Teacher

A: Exchange 1-Ritual greeting sequence

J: Greet the professor.
D: Greet John.

B: Exchange 2-Statement of problem

J: Tell the professor that you (John)
need help with your homework.

C:Exchange 3-Setting up a meeting

Fig. 5: Depiction of Formal Scenario

(Fig. Cont'd Next Page.)

J: Ask the professor if he can meet
with you today.
D: Tell John that you are busy today.

D: Suggest meeting tomorrow.
J: Accept.

D: Exchange 4–Meeting Time Sequence

J: Suggest a time.
D: Tell John that you can't meet at that time.

D: Suggest a time.
J: Tell the professor that you can't
meet at that time.

D: Suggest a different time.
J: Accept.

E: Exchange 5–Closing

D: Say goodbye.
J: Say goodbye.

In this conversation, Exchange 3 begins with a request/refusal adjacency pair, followed by a suggest/accept pair. Exchange 4 contains two suggest/refusal adjacency pairs, and suggest/accept adjacency.

3. ANALYSIS OF SPEECH EVENTS

The three L2 English learners at the three different proficiency levels and the three native speakers produced two conversational scenarios involving both the informal and formal discourse scenarios. Using the framework above, each *conversational scenario* is coded for the *act number, category, speech act class, and act type*. The notion of *speech event* consists of the entire conversation. The *act number* is simply the enumeration of the acts within the speech event. The term *category* is used to distinguish between primary, secondary, and complementary acts; denoted as 1,2 and 3 respectively, below. The *speech act class* is the designation based on Searle's and Bach & Harnish's speech act taxonomies.

For the informal task, there is a minimum of 11 speech acts required by the structure of the conversation. Likewise, the formal task has a minimum of 14 speech acts required to complete the dialogue.

The results of the three non-native speaker groups (beginner, intermediate, advanced) are presented first, followed by the native speaker group. As stated directly above, the data were analyzed according to the number and manner of the speech acts found in the data. Furthermore, each speech act was examined for grammaticality. The number of grammatical and ungrammatical realizations were tabulated and reported for each participant. In reporting the data below, the "<>" brackets will be used to denote errors. The data produced are presented below below:

3.1 BEGINNER INFORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three non-native speakers of English at the beginner level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which

it was analyzed, below:

Table 3.1 Beginner Informal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Studying Together For The Test

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J:	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
Hello Kevin, how's it going?				
K: Hi! John.	1	Greeting	1	Expressive

B: Exchange 2–Invitation Sequence

J: I want to invite to you to study on Friday.	2	Invite	1	Assertive
K: I'm sorry. I can't go there.	3 4	Preface Reject	2 1	Expressive Assertive

J: Really? I want to invite to you to study on Saturday	5 6	Uptake Invite	3 1	Discourse Assertive
K: Ok. I can go there.	7 8	Accept Expand	1 2	Assertive Assertive

C: Exchange 3-Meeting Time Sequence

K: What do you think about 5 P.M and in dormitory?	9	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: Oh I am sorry. I busy.	10 11 12	Uptake Preface Reject	3 2 1	Discourse Expressive Assertive

K: I think about 7 PM and in UNION?	13	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: That's ok. Don't late!	14 15	Accept Request	1 1	Assertive Directive
K: Thank you! Good!	16 17	Thanks React	1 1	Expressive Expressive

D: Exchange 4–Closing

J: Thank, see you later.	18 19	Thanks Farewell	1 1	Expressive Expressive
-----------------------------	----------	--------------------	--------	--------------------------

The beginner group produced the lowest average amount of speech acts (mean=17.67,

range 16-19) for the informal task. The “primary” speech acts carried a clear majority accounting for 43 of the overall 53 speech acts produced by the beginners (mean=14.33, range 14-15). All of the beginners produced at least one “secondary” act (mean=2.33, range 1-3) and had an average of one complementary act (range 1-2). The inventory of all of the acts produced in the informal scenario by the beginner level is given below: All together, the beginners produced 13 different kinds of speech acts in the primary class.

Primary–43 total

Assertives:

Reject (5), Accept (6), Suggest (5), Acknowledge (1), Answer (1).

Directives:

Invite (5), Request (2), Question (2).

Commissives:

Promise (2).

Expressives:

Greeting (6), Thanks (2), React (1), Farewell (4), Apology (1)

Secondary–7 total

Preface (5), Expand (1), Emphasizer (1).

Complementary–3 total

Uptake (3)

Overall, the majority of the acts realized moves on their own. This is not surprising at the beginning levels, because most of their dialogue is composed of a rudimentary set of stock phrases. Along with the mass of primary acts, we have a few scattered secondary acts, and few complementary acts.

The grammatical accuracy of this group was found to be 77.34%, with an average of 4 grammatically ill-formed utterances per speech event and a range of 3-5 mistakes per speech event. The conversations were handled mainly using formulaic speech patterns, and the errors were mostly comprised of an omitted copula. (“I <am> busy”)

3.2 BEGINNER FORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three non-native speakers of English at the beginner level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.2 Beginner Formal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Meeting with the Teacher

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
D: Yes. I do.	1	Answer	1	Assertive

B: Exchange 2–Statement of problem

J: Do you need to help your homework?	2	Question	1	Directive
---------------------------------------	---	----------	---	-----------

C: Exchange 3–Setting up a meeting

J: Today, Do you have a time?	3	Question	1	Directive
D: No, I don't I have appointment	4 5	Reject Justify	1 2	Assertive Assertive

D: Can I meet you tomorrow?	6	Request	1	Directive
J: It's OK.	7	Accept	1	Assertive

D: Exchange 4–Meeting Time Sequence

J: What time do you meet at 12pm?	8	Suggest	1	Assertive
D: No, I do I'm going to eat the lunch with my friend	9 10	Reject Justify	1 2	Assertive Assertive

D: What time do you meet at 2 o'clock?	11	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: Sorry John I have a another meeting that time.	12 13	Preface Reject	2 1	Expressive Assertive

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

D: What time do you meet at 5 o'clock	14	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: It's OK	15	Accept	1	Assertive

E: Exchange 5-Closing

D: See you later.	16	Farewell	1	Expressive
J: Goodbye John	17	Farewell	1	Expressive

For the formal task, the beginner level once again produced the fewest overall conversational acts (mean 21.67, range 17-26) There was increase of the minimum required speech acts required for the formal event (14, as opposed to the 11 required for the informal act). As expected, the average number of speech acts produced by the beginner group also increased (mean 21.67, range 17-26). The inventory of all of the acts produced in the formal scenario by the beginner level is given below:

Primary-49 total

Assertives:

Inform (2), Answer (3), Reject (9), Suggest (11), Accept (6), Agree (1)

Directives:

Request (3), Question (3)

Expressives

Thanks (2), Farewell (9)

Secondary-11 total

Preface (8), Justify (2), Expand (1)

Complementary-5 total

Link (1), Uptake (4)

With ten different types of primary acts, the trend of a wide majority of acts being primary continues here, similar to the beginner's productions on the informal acts. On the other hand, there is a slight decrease in the proportion of primary acts with a resultant slight increase in the amount of secondary and complementary speech acts (proportionately) .

The grammatical accuracy of this group was found to be 73.12%, with an average of 5.33

grammatically ill-formed utterances per speech event and a range of 4-8 mistakes per speech event. Examples of grammatical errors are: the omitting of the copula (“I will <be> busy”) and inclusion of unnecessary determiners (“I have a < > another meeting”).

3.3 INTERMEDIATE INFORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three non-native speakers of English at the intermediate level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.3 Intermediate Informal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Studying Together For The Test

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
K: I'm Fine. and you?	1	Greeting	1	Expressive
	2	Greeting	1	Expressive

B: Exchange 2–Invitation Sequence

J: fine. Can you study with me on Friday?	3	Greeting	1	Directive
	4	Request	1	Expressive
K: I'm sorry I have to do something	5	Preface	2	Expressive
	6	Reject	1	Assertive

J: How about on saturday	7	Suggest	1	Assertive
K: OK. I hope so.	8	Accept	1	Assertive
	9	Emphasizer	2	Expressive

C: Exchange 3-Meeting Time Sequence

K: How about at 7.00 PM in my room?	10	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: No, thanks. It's so late and your room is so far in here. Can you pick up me?	11	Reject	1	Assertive
	12	Justify	2	Assertive
	13	Link	3	Discourse
	14	Justify	2	Assertive
	15	Request	1	Directive

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

K: Sorry. I don't have a car. Then, can you meet at 5.00 PM in the library.	16	Preface	2	Expressive Assertive Discourse Directive
	17	Reject	1	
	18	Uptake	3	
	19	Request	1	
J: That's all rights. Good	20	Accept	1	Assertive Assertive
	21	Emphasizer	2	
K: I see.	22	Acknowledge	1	Assertive

D: Exchange 4–Closing

J: See you then.	23	Farewell	1	Expressive
------------------	----	----------	---	------------

Overall, the total number of speech acts produced was greater than that of the beginner's group. (Mean=23.33, range 20-27). The average number of primary, secondary, and complementary acts also increased compared to the beginners. The primary category was once again the most evident (mean=15.66, range 14-18), and produced 13 different types of speech acts. The secondary category produced more acts (mean=5, range 4-6) than both of the beginner's productions. The complementary conversational acts also played a larger role (mean=2.67, range 2-4). The inventory of all of the acts produced in the informal scenario by the intermediate level is given below:

Primary–47 total

Assertives:

Reject (7), Suggest (9), Accept (8), Acknowledge (2), Inform (1),
React (1).

Directives:

Invite (2), Request (4), Question (1).

Commissives:

Promise (1).

Expressives:

Greeting (7), Farewell (3), Thanks (1).

Secondary–15 total

Justify (5), Preface (5), Emphasizer (4), Expand (1)

Complementary–8 total

Uptake (4), Link (3), Staller (1)

At the intermediate level we observe an increase in the use of secondary and complementary conversational acts at the informal level, at the proportional expense of primary acts. Whereas at the beginner level the conversation tended to be mostly handled with the primary category, the intermediate level group begins to approximate the native speaker group with the increased use of secondary and complementary acts..

The grammatical accuracy of this group was found to be 85.28%, with an average of 3.33 grammatically ill-formed utterances per speech event and a range of 3-4 mistakes per speech event. The conversations consisted mainly of formulaic speech patterns intermixed with creative elements. Examples of common errors are use of improper prepositions (“... your room is so far in <from> here”) and incorrect usage of determiners (“Because of <the> test”).

3.4 INTERMEDIATE FORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three non-native speakers of English at the intermediate level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.4 Intermediate Formal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Meeting with the Teacher

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
D: No. I don't. I have some plan.	1	Reject	1	Assertive
	2	Justify	2	Assertive

B: Exchange 2–Statement of problem

J: Professor. I have some question	3	Inform	1	Assertive
------------------------------------	---	--------	---	-----------

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

C:Exchange 3–Setting up a meeting

J: Do you have a moment today?	4	Question	1	Directive
D: Sorry, I am busy	5	Preface	2	Expressive Assertive
	6	Reject	1	
D: How about tomorrow?	7	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: That sounds good.	8	Accept	1	Assertive

D: Exchange 4–Meeting Time Sequence

J: How about at 7 P.M tomorrow?	9	Suggest	1	Assertive
D: Oh. I'm sorry It is so late I'll pick my son	10	Uptake	3	Discourse Expressive Assertive Assertive
	11	Preface	2	
	12	Reject	1	
	13	Justify	2	
D: Do you want to meet at 5 P.M?	14	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: I'm sorry I have a part time work at that time.	15	Preface	2	Expressive Assertive
	16	Reject	1	
D: How about 3 PM?	17	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: That all right.	18	Accept	1	Assertive

E: Exchange 5–Closing

D: O.K. See you then	19	Uptake	3	Discourse Expressive
	20	Farewell	1	
J: Me too see you ther	21	Uptake	3	Discourse Expressive
	22	Farewell	1	

The formal event produced roughly the same average number of acts (mean=23, range 17-30) as the informal event. The majority of acts produced were primary (mean=16.33, range 14-20). However, both the secondary (mean=4.67, range 2-7) and complementary acts (mean= 2, range 0-3) were less in evidence in the formal scenario. There were 11 different primary speech acts overall. The inventory of all of the acts produced in the formal scenario by the intermediate level is given below:

Primary–49 total

Assertives:

Inform (2), Suggest (13), Agree (1), Reject (10), Accept (6), React (1),
Answer (1)

Directives:

Request (3), Question (2).

Expressives:

Greeting (3), Farewell (7).

Secondary–14 total

Preface (8), Justify (2), Expand (2), Emphasizer (2).

Complementary–6 total

Uptake (6)

The formal speech event was marked by a high level of primary act usage, not too far removed by the proportion of primary acts used by the beginner levels. These results differ in the comparison of the beginner and intermediate informal conversations scenarios, which substantially increased its use of both secondary and complementary acts.

The grammatical accuracy of this group was found to be 75.65%, with an average of 5.67 grammatically ill-formed utterances per speech event and a range of 3-9 mistakes per speech event. The conversations here were also mainly handled using formulaic speech patterns intermixed with personalized affixation. Grammatical problems were found mainly in the use of prepositions (“I can’t meet <at> that time”).

3.5 ADVANCED INFORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three non-native speakers of English at the Advanced level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.5 Advanced Informal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Studying Together For The Test

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

(Table Cont’d Next Page.)

J:	Hello Kevin, how's it going?	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
K:	I'm good.	1	Greeting	1	Expressive
	and you?	2	Greeting	1	Expressive

B: Exchange 2–Invitation Sequence

J:	Hey.	3	Alert	1	Assertive
	do you have any plan?	4	Question	1	Directive
	Could you study on Friday with me	5	Request	1	Directive
K:	I'm sorry.	6	Preface	2	Expressive
	I have no time to go there.	7	Reject	1	Assertive
	I wish, I could	8	Emphasizer	2	Expressive

J:	Let me see!	9	Staller	3	Directive
	Could you come on saturday?	10	Request	1	Directive
K:	Of couse!	11	Answer	1	Assertive
	I have no plan on Saturday	12	Expand	2	Assertive

C: Exchange 3-Meeting Time Sequence

K:	How about my house.	13	Suggest	1	Assertive
J:	I'm sorry.	14	Preface	2	Expressive
	I can't go there.	15	Reject	1	Assertive

K:	How about your house.	16	Suggest	1	Assertive
J:	that sounds good.	17	Accept	1	Assertive
	I'll be at house.	18	Promise	1	Commissive
K:	OK.	19	Acknowledge	1	Assertive
	Good.	20	Emphasizer	2	Assertive
	see you on saturday	21	Promise	1	Commissive

D: Exchange 4–Closing

J:	OK.	22	Uptake	3	Discourse
	See you later	23	Farewell	1	Expressive

The advanced students production of the informal speech event produced a slight increase in total acts (mean=24.67, range 23-27). Both the primary and secondary acts were produced in amounts similar to the intermediate level. The production of primary speech acts (mean=15.33, range 15-16) was spread across 13 different types of acts. Secondary acts (mean=5, range 4-6)

and complementary acts (mean=4.33, range 2-6) played a substantial part in the conversation.

The inventory of all of the acts produced in the informal scenario by the advanced level is given below:

Primary—46 total

Assertives:

Answer (2), Reject (6), Suggest (9), Accept (4), Acknowledge (2),
Alert (2).

Directives:

Question (4), Invitation (1), Request (3).

Commissives:

Promise (4).

Expressives:

Greeting (6), Farewell (3), Opine (1).

Secondary—15 total

Preface (8), Emphasizer (4), Justify (1), Expand (1)

Complementary

Staller (4), Appealer (1), Uptake (6), Link (1), Starter (1)

These data presents a continuing trend of the informal speech acts: the increase of both overall conversational acts, and the increased use of complementary acts.

The grammatical accuracy of this group was found to be 85.16%, with an average of 3.67 grammatically ill-formed utterances per speech event and a range of 3-4 mistakes per speech event. The conversations were more idiosyncratic in execution, yet consisted of similar errors in determiners (“I’ll be at <the> house”) and prepositions (“I’ve studied by <from> them”), along with errors in verb choice (“We are going to see <meet> at your house”)

3.6 ADVANCED FORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three non-native speakers of English at the advanced level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.6 Advanced Formal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Meeting with the Teacher

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
D: OK!	1	Uptake	3	Discourse
Sure	2	Answer	1	Assertive
What can I do for you?	3	Question	1	Directive

B: Exchange 2–Statement of problem

J: I have some question about homework	4	Inform	1	Assertive
--	---	--------	---	-----------

C:Exchange 3–Setting up a meeting

J: Do you have free time today?	5	Question	1	Directive
D: Let me check my schedul	6	Staller	3	Directive
Oh!	7	Uptake	3	Discourse
I'm sorry.	8	Preface	2	Expressive
Today. I'm so busy	9	Reject	1	Assertive

D: Why don't you meet tomorrow?	10	Suggest	1	Assertive
J: Sure I will	11	Accept	1	Assertive

D: Exchange 4–Meeting Time Sequence

J: What time do you want to meet?	12	Question	1	Assertive
I want to meet at 3:00 pm	13	Suggest	1	Assertive
D: Sorry.	14	Preface	2	Expressive
I will have class	15	Reject	1	Assertive

D: I will finish 4:00 pm	16	Inform	1	Assertive
How about 4:00	17	Suggest	1	Assertive

J: I'm sorry	18	Preface	2	Expressive
I also have a class at 4:00 pm	19	Reject	1	Assertive

D: OK.	20	Uptake	3	Discourse
I'll have free time at 7:00 pm	21	Suggest	1	Assertive
so do you want?	22	Appealer	3	Directive

J: of course!	24	Accept	1	Assertive
Thank you so much.	25	Thanks	1	Expressive
You're really a good professor	26	Opine	1	Expressive

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

E: Exchange 5–Closing

D: Ok. See you tommorrow	27 28	Uptake Farewell	3 1	Discourse Expressive
J: see you tommorrow	29	Farewell	1	Expressive

At the advanced level, the formal scenario produced more acts (mean=27, range 23-31) than both its advanced informal counterpart and the intermediate formal counterpart. The total average number of primary acts (mean=18, range 17-19) Secondary acts played a varying role (mean=4, range 2-7). Complementary acts (mean=5, range 3-6) occurred more often than in the advanced informal event, and a had much greater role than in the intermediate formal event. The primary acts were realized using 12 different types. The inventory of all of the acts produced in the formal scenario by the advanced level is given below:

Primary–54 total

Assertives:

Reject (9), Answer (3), Inform (4), Suggest (13), Accept (6).

Directives:

Invite (1), Question (5), Request (2).

Commissives:

Promise (2)

Expressives:

Thanks (3), Farewell (5), Opine (1)

Secondary– 12 total

Preface (8), Emphasizer (1), Expand (3), Metacomment (1).

Complementary–15 total

Staller (3), Uptake (6), Appealer (1), Link (3), Filler (2).

Like the informal event produced across proficiency levels, the non-native productions of the formal events also showed some patterns. The development of both the formal and informal events showed patterns of increased amounts of both total conversational act output and complementary act output, while the domination of primary acts receded as proficiency increased.

The grammatical accuracy of this group was found to be 86.71%, with an average of 3.67 grammatically ill-formed utterances per speech event and a range of 3-5 mistakes per speech event. The conversations were also more idiosyncratic than the previous intermediate and beginner levels, showing a lesser reliance on formulaic expressions to execute speech events. Grammatical problems occurred with infinitives (“so do you want <to meet>”), prepositions (“See me <at>11:30”), and lexical choices (“How <what> do you think about...”)

3.7 NATIVE INFORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three native speakers of English is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.7 Native Informal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Studying Together For The Test

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J:	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
Hello Kevin, how's it going?				
K: Hey John. It's going OK	1	Greeting	1	Expressive
	2	Greeting	1	Expressive

B: Exchange 2–Invitation Sequence

J: You want to get together and study Friday?	3	Invite	1	Directive
K: I can't. I have plans.	4	Reject	1	Assertive
	5	Justify	2	Assertive

J: Alright, Saturday then?	6	Uptake	3	Discourse
	7	Suggest	1	Assertive
K: Saturday's good.	8	Accept	1	Assertive

C: Exchange 3-Meeting Time Sequence

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

K:	How about 7 PM at my apartment	9	Suggest	1	Assertive
J:	Nah. Date with my girlfriend at 8.	10 11	Reject Justify	1 2	Assertive Assertive

K:	How about 4 at the Union	12	Suggest	1	Assertive
J:	Sounds good.	13	Accept	1	Assertive
K:	Great. See ya then	14 15	Uptake Promise	3 1	Discourse Commissive

D: Exchange 4–Closing

J:	OK. Later.	16 17	Uptake Farewell	3 1	Discourse Expressive
----	---------------	----------	--------------------	--------	-------------------------

For the informal speech event at the native level the total production of speech acts (mean=18.33, range 15-23) falls between the beginner and intermediate levels. The production of primary acts (mean=12.67, range 10-16) is the lowest of any of the proficiency levels, whereas the complementary acts (mean=3, range 1-5) are closest to the intermediate and advanced levels. The secondary acts (mean=2.67, range 2-4) were identical to that of the intermediate level. The primary acts were produced over 11 different types. The inventory of all of the acts produced in the informal scenario by the native level is given below:

Primary–38 total

Assertives:

Alert (2), Reject (5), Suggest (7), Accept (4), Answer (3).

Directives:

Invite (3), Question (2).

Commissives:

Promise (3).

Expressives:

Greeting (5), React (1), Farewell (3).

Secondary–8 total

Preface (2), Metacomment (1), Justify (2), Emphasizer (2), Expand (1).

Complementary–9 total

Appealer (1), Uptake (7), Starter (1).

The complementary acts played a more important role (proportionately) in the native proficiency level than in any other proficiency level during the production of the informal speech event. The number of comparative primary acts is still high, however, meaning that secondary acts were more reduced than in any other proficiency level.

3.8 NATIVE FORMAL SPEECH EVENT

An example of a conversational scenario produced by one of the three native speakers of English at the native level is shown below. It is presented in the manner in which it was analyzed:

Table 3.8 Native Formal Speech Event

I: Transaction: Meeting with the Teacher

A: Exchange 1–Ritual greeting sequence

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?	Act #	Act Type	Category	Speech Act Class
D: Yes John what's on your mind?	1	Answer	1	Assertive
	2	Question	1	Directive

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

B: Exchange 2–Statement of problem

J: Well, I'm having some questions about this week's assignment.	3	Uptake	3	Discourse
	4	Inform	1	Assertive

C: Exchange 3–Setting up a meeting

J: Can I talk to you today?	5	Request	1	Directive
D: John I'm busy right now unfortunately	6	Reject	1	Assertive
	7	Expand	2	Expressive
D: Can you stop by tomorrow at all?	8	Request	1	Directive
J: yeah	9	Accept	1	Assertive

D: Exchange 4–Meeting Time Sequence

(Table Cont'd Next Page.)

J: How's 3:00?	10	Suggest	1	Assertive
D: Oooh, I have a meeting then	11 12	Staller Reject	3 1	Discourse Assertive
D: But I'm free at 11:00	13 14	Link Suggest	3 1	Discourse Assertive
J: I'm in class until 12:00	15	Suggest	1	Assertive
D: Well how about 12:15?	16 17	Uptake Suggest	3 1	Discourse Assertive
J: Yeah, that's great	18 19	Accept Emphasize	1 2	Assertive Assertive
E: Exchange 5-Closing				
D: Ok john see you then	20 21	Uptake Farewell	3 1	Discourse Expressive
J: Thanks Dr. Smith See you tomorrow	22 23	Thanks Farewell	1 1	Expressive Expressive

The native speakers produced a good amount total acts (mean=23.67, range 22-26) comparable to the intermediate group in the formal scenario. Also similar to the formal intermediate group was the production of primary acts (mean=16.67, range 16-18), utilizing nine different types of acts. The secondary acts (mean=2.33, range 1-4) were produced the least. The native group produced amounts of complementary acts (mean=4.67, range 4-5) comparable to the formal advanced group. The inventory of all of the acts produced in the informal scenario by the native level is given below:

Primary-50 total

Assertives:

Answer (3), Inform (3), Reject (9), Suggest (8), Accept (5).

Directives:

Question (5), Request (6).

Expressives:

Farewell (6), Thanks (5).

Secondary-7 total

Expand (1), Emphasizer (2), Justify (1), Preface (3).

Complementary–14 total

Uptake (7), Link (4), Staller (2), Filler (1).

Like its informal counterpart, the formal advanced group produced a significant amount of complementary acts at the cost of secondary acts. Primary acts remained the substantial majority.

4. DISCUSSION

Grammatical accuracy is shown to be affected by proficiency level, as seen in Table 4.1:

Table 4.1: Comparison of Grammaticality Accuracy with Respect to Formality Level and Proficiency Level

<u>Beginner</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>	<u>Advanced</u>
<i>Informal</i> 77.34%	<i>Informal</i> 85.28%	<i>Informal</i> 85.16%
<i>Formal</i> 73.12%	<i>Formal</i> 75.65%	<i>Formal</i> 86.71%

The grammatical accuracy can be accounted for by trends of language use at each level. In both the formal and informal events, the beginner group tended to use a small set of formulaic utterances, with a significant degree of grammatical accuracy (e.g. “Would you like to study with me this Friday?” for the first invitation, then an identical utterance for the next). Likewise, for both the formal and informal speech events the intermediate groups still showed a propensity to use formulaic speech, yet combined them (e.g. “Can you study with me on Friday” for the first utterance followed by “How about on Saturday?” for the next) with other stock sentences within the same utterance. At the informal level, there is a significant increase in grammatical accuracy that can be accounted for by the increased proficiency level. In the formal conversational scenario, this increased accuracy is negligible. The intermediate group recognized the increased formality and responded with a greater number of utterances and an increased complexity of utterances. Finally, both the native and advanced English speakers used more individual utterances for both the formal and informal events. The advanced group showed a tendency to use more complex, wordy utterances to accomplish tasks than either of the other two groups (e.g. “What time will you <be> free at <on> that day? How about 5PM?” rather than “How about

5:00” as was more commonly used by beginners and intermediates). The similarity of the advanced group’s grammatical accuracy between the formal and informal scenarios can be explained by attributing the advanced group with a greater general L2 competence, regardless of formality (perhaps acquired through increased exposure to both conversational scenarios in life and study)

In spite of the small sample size, there are some clear patterns, such as the increasing amount of speech acts produced (given by the mean of the total speech acts at each level) as the proficiency level rises. In both the formal and informal events the amount of total acts of the non-native speakers exceeded those of native speakers’. As shown in the native speaker conversations, the performance of native speakers may resemble the advanced, intermediate or even beginner groups.

4.1 COMPARISONS AMONG PROFICIENCY GROUPS IN THE INFORMAL CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIO

In the informal event, the non-native speakers productions change respective to their proficiency level. The following results occurred ($\pm .06$, due to rounding to the second decimal place) as shown in Table 4.2:

Table 4.2: The Use of Speech Acts in the Realization of Speech Events at the Informal Level According to Proficiency

Proficiency Level/ Formality	Speech Acts			Total
	Primary	Secondary	Complementary	
<u>Beginning</u>				
Informal	81.10%	13.19%	5.66%	99.95%
<u>Intermediate</u>				
Informal	67.17%	21.43%	11.44%	100.04%
<u>Advanced</u>				
Informal	62.14%	20.27%	17.55%	99.96%
<u>Native</u>				
Informal	69.12%	14.57%	16.37%	100.06%

As proficiency level increases, the proportion of primary acts decrease, and the complementary

acts increase. The secondary acts seem to first increase and decrease as proficiency improves. The biggest decrease in primary acts (-13.93%) occurs between the beginner and intermediate levels. At the same time, there is also a great increase in secondary acts (+8.24%) , along with a decent increase in complementary acts (+5.78%). The jump from intermediate to advanced led to a smaller increase in primary acts(-5.03%), and a continued increase in complementary acts (+6.11%) Compared to the advanced non-native speakers, the native speakers favored more primary acts (+6.98%) and slightly less, yet comparable complementary acts (-1.18%).

4.2 COMPARISONS AMONG PROFICIENCY GROUPS IN THE FORMAL CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIO

The formal event follows the same patterns as the informal event. The following results occurred (± 0.06 , due to rounding to the second decimal place) as shown in Table 4.3:

Table 4.3: The Use of Speech Acts in the Realization of Speech Events at the Formal Level According to Proficiency

Proficiency Level/ Formality	Speech Acts			Total
	Primary	Secondary	Complementary	
<u>Beginning</u>				
Formal	75.36%	16.94%	7.71%	100.01%
<u>Intermediate</u>				
Formal	71.00%	20.30%	8.70%	100.00%
<u>Advanced</u>				
Formal	66.67%	14.81%	18.52%	100.00%
<u>Native</u>				
Formal	70.43%	9.84%	19.73%	100.00%

For the non-native speakers, there is a steady decreasing of primary acts, and an increase of complementary acts as proficiency level increases. Once again, the secondary category seems to soak up the slack of the changes of the primary and complementary changes, by first increasing then decreasing. From the beginning to intermediate, primary acts decrease (-4.36%), and then decrease again from intermediate to advanced (-4.37). At the same time, complementary acts increase from beginning to intermediate (+.99) and intermediate to advanced (+9.82%). Also

similarly to the informal level, the native speaker group increases its primary acts from the advanced level (+3.76). However, the native speakers actually increase their complementary acts from the advanced level (+1.21), while remaining close enough to be comparable.

4.3. COMPARISONS AMONG CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIO FORMALITY WITHIN EACH PROFICIENCY GROUP

The following results occurred ($\pm .06$, due to rounding to the second decimal place) as shown in Table 4.4:

Table 4.4: The Comparison of the Use of Speech Acts in the Realization of Formal and Informal Speech Events According to Proficiency

Proficiency Level/ Formality	Speech Acts			Total
	Primary	Secondary	Complementary	
<u>Beginning</u>				
Informal	81.10%	13.19%	5.66%	99.95%
Formal	75.36%	16.94%	7.71%	100.01%
<u>Intermediate</u>				
Informal	67.17%	21.43%	11.44%	100.04%
Formal	71.00%	20.30%	8.70%	100.00%
<u>Advanced</u>				
Informal	62.14%	20.27%	17.55%	99.96%
Formal	66.67%	14.81%	18.52%	100.00%
<u>Native</u>				
Informal	69.12%	14.57%	16.37%	100.06%
Formal	70.43%	9.84%	19.73%	100.00%

When comparing the beginner informal to formal speech events, primary acts decreased (-5.74%), secondary acts increased (+3.75%), and complementary acts increased (+2.05%).

When comparing the intermediate informal to formal speech events, primary acts increased (+3.83%), secondary acts decreased (-1.13%), and complementary acts decreased (-2.74%).

When comparing the advanced informal to formal speech events, primary acts increased (+4.53%), secondary acts decreased (-5.46%), and complementary acts increased (+.97%). When comparing the native informal to formal speech events, primary acts increased (+1.31%), secondary acts decreased (-4.73%), and complementary acts increased (+3.36%). The only

pattern that can be discerned here is by comparing the pattern of increases and decreases directly to the native speaker pattern, as shown in Table 4.5 below:

Table 4.5: Average Change of Speech Act Composition in a Speech Event from Informal to Formal-*

<u>Beginner</u>	Primary (decrease) –	+ <different>	<u>Native</u>
	Secondary (increase) +	– <different>	
	Complementary (increase)+	+ <same>	
<u>Intermediate</u>	Primary (increase) +	+ <same>	<u>Native</u>
	Secondary (decrease) –	– <same>	
	Complementary (decrease) –	+ <different>	
<u>Advanced</u>	Primary (increase) +	+ <same>	<u>Native</u>
	Secondary (decrease) –	– <same>	
	Complementary (Increase) +	+ <same>	

Arranged in this manner, as proficiency increases, the non-native speakers seem to come closer to native habits in dealing with situations of increased formality.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study focused on two variables affecting the realization of conversational scenarios. The first factor was language proficiency: the participants were at four different proficiency levels of English. The second was an extra-linguistic factor; a distinction between personas of unequal status which influenced the level of formality.

The distinction of language proficiency levels was found to have a more overt effect on the realization of conversational scenarios. In both the formal and informal events, the proportion of primary, secondary, and complementary acts progressed in a predictable pattern of increase and decrease.

The non-linguistic influence which focused on the formality of the scenarios had a less tangible effect the language production among non-native speakers. The distinctions reflected by the proportional composition of primary, secondary, and complementary acts between the formal and informal scenario did not produce any measurable differences due to the level of formality.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

First and foremost, there were too few participants at each of the three non-native proficiency levels (N=3). This study was done with what was available, yet the range for some of the speech act productions (for example the range for the Intermediate Formal Scenario yielded between 17 and 30 speech acts). More participants would have perhaps yielded more stable data.

Secondly, this study deals only with native speakers of one language. Speakers with different native languages might have produced different results. Furthermore, the linguistic trends of Korean (the native language of the participants) is not known to the author. Perhaps there is an unseen cultural connection between the increased use of complementary acts and the decreased use of primary speech acts (as proficiency) increases that is not examined here.

Third, this study only dealt with one type of speech event. In this speech event a meeting is being arranged through repeated suggestions, refusals, and final acceptances. The face threatening potential in these situations is obvious and may account for the distribution of primary, secondary, and complementary acts in the discourse. Faced with these questions, there are several areas of speech event actualization that may be further examined.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

It goes without saying that it would be beneficial to do this study with a greater number of participants. Further studies with greater numbers would go far in substantiating the data provided here. In addition several other factors need to be examined here: native language, other scenarios (with respect to participants, context, and formality, etc...), and differing speech events.

Native language has long been discussed as playing a role in second language acquisition. This study would be benefitted by corresponding studies from different language backgrounds. The native language here, Korean, may actualize suggesting and requesting speech acts in a more indirect way than Spanish speakers, or vice versa, based on transfer from native language. Therefore, the role of native language needs to be further examined. A thorough knowledge of the native (Korean) language's patterns was not known here, so a cultural comparison could not be made.

These scenarios dealt with suggestions, requests, and (initial) rejections, all of which are potentially face threatening. The possibly delicate nature of this scenario is likely to have influenced the productions of the participants. It is entirely possible that a scenario with different speech act components is likely to produce a different composition (and therefore composition pattern) of primary, secondary, and complementary speech acts. These studies need to be done to compare whether the patterns observed here are a trend of L2 production in general as proficiency increases, or a trend in L2 production with respect to face threatening speech events.

Finally, there is the need to study a variety of conversational scenarios. Speech act categorization developed out of the observation that people often do things with speech. It was then further expanded that speech acts may occur in a direct or indirect manner; in other words

that a form may always not fit a conversational category (for example, a suggestion may take the form of a statement). The design of the scenarios in this study developed out of two observed phenomena. The first is the observation that a group of speech acts may occur with the intent of accomplishing one goal (reads=act). Secondly, that although people may not remember the exact execution of utterances in a conversation, they often remember the gist of the conversation. Regarding these two aspects of speaker perspective, it would prove useful to develop a taxonomy and system of analysis of conversational scenarios as a whole, similar to those currently in place used to study speech acts.

REFERENCE

- Bach, Kent and Robert M. Harnish.(1979) Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press,
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). "Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic vs. grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning." *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 233-259.
- Brown, James Dean (2001) "Pragmatics tests: Different purposes, different tests" in Pragmatics in Language Teaching (edited by Rose, Kenneth R. and Kasper, Gabriele, in 2001) pp. 301-325
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983) Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press, NY
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen, (1987). Politeness. Some universals in language use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Andrew D. and Elite Olshtain (1993). 'The Production of Speech Acts by EFL Learners', *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (1), Spring pp. 33-56.
- Coulthard, Malcolm (1977). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Longman, London and New York
- Honeycutt, James M. M. (2002) "Imagined Interactions: Daydreaming about Communication" Hampton Press, Incorporated
- Hymes, Dell. (1972) "On Communicative Competence" in J. B Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.) 1972 Sociolinguistics Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Kasper, Gabriele, and Kenneth R. Rose. (1999). "Pragmatics and SLA." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* Vol. 19. Eds. W Grabe et. Al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 149-169.
- Koike, Dale. (1996) "Transfer of Pragmatic Competence and Suggestions in Spanish Foreign Language Learning." Speech Acts across Cultures. Ed. S. M. Gass and J. Neu. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 257-281
- Krashen, Stephen (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon
- Levinson, S C (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press
- Olshtain, E., Blum-Kulka, S. (1984), "Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech

act realization patterns” (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5, 3, 196-215.

Ramirez, Arnulfo, (2004) “Conversational Discourse Across Spanish Proficiency Levels” *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*. Special Issue on “Discourse Analysis” Vol 43, *in press*

Searle, John R. (1979) “The Classification of Illocutionary Acts.” *Language in Society* 1979: 137-151

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1975). Towards an Analysis of Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spratt, Mary (1985) “Discourse Chains” in At the Chalkface (Edited by Matthews, Alan, Mary Spratt and Les Dangerfield) London: Edward Arnold Publishers

Stenstrom, Anna-Brita (1994). An Introduction to Spoken Interaction Longman, London and New York

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1992). “Towards an analysis of discourse”. In Coulthard, M.(Ed) 1992. Advances in spoken discourse analysis. 1-34. London: Routledge.

APPENDIX A: DATA FOR THE INFORMAL CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIOS

B1

"Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin,
how's it going?

K: Hi! John.

J: I want to invite to you to study on Friday.

K: I'm sorry.
I can't go there.

J: Really?
I want to invite to you to study on Saturday

K: Ok.
I can go there.

K: What do you think about 5 P.M and in dormitory?

J: Oh
I am sorry.
I busy.

K: I think about 7 PM and in UNION?

J: That's ok.
Don't late!

K: Thank you!
Good!

J: Thank,
see you later.

B2

"Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: so so.
And you?

J: I'm fine!
Do you come to my house study on Friday?

K: I'm sorry.
I have promise on Friday.

J: How about you on Saturday?

K: Saturday is good.
I see.

K: How about 10 o'clock?

J: Sorry!
I don't have time in the morning.

K: How about 3 o'clock?

J: It's good.
OK!

K: OK!
See you later

J: Good bye

B3 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: fine.
and you?

J: Would you like to study with me this Friday?

K: I'm sorry.

then. I busy

J: Would you like to study with me this Saturday?

K: OK.

See you then

K: When do you like meet?

J: I'm sorry

K: Where do you like meet?

J: Your home.

Don't late

K: OK.

See you there

J: Good-bye

II "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: Fine,

Feel so good.

How about you?

J: Fine.

Would you go together to library on Friday?

K: I'm sorry.

I can't.

I will be busy on Friday.

J: Then,

How about Saturday?

K: That's sounds great.

K: I want to meet in Union, at 7:00.

J: I can't go
that's too late.
and too far.

K: Then,
How about. In Prescott at 5:00

J: That is OK

K: That's sounds good.

J: See you then.

I2 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: I'm Fine.
and you?

J: fine.
Can you study with me on Friday?

K: I'm sorry
I have to do something

J: How about on Saturday

K: OK.
I hope so.

K: How about at 7.00 PM in my room.?

J: No, thanks.
It's so late
and your room is so far in here.
Can you pick up me?

K: Sorry.
I don't have a car.
Then,
can you meet at 5.00 PM in the library.
J: That's all rights.
Good
K: I see.

J: See you then.

I3 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?
K: Doing great.
What happened?

J: I would like to study with you on Friday.
Can you do it?
K: I'm sorry.
I have a appointment.

J: That's all right
How about you on Saturday?
K: That sounds good!
Because of test on Monday,
I want to study

K: Let me see~
Do you meet at noon in my dormitory?
J: Sorry.
I will have lunch with my family.
How about after lunch?

K: It's ok.
And then...
Let's meet at 2:00 in my dormitory

J: good.
good.
good
Thank you.

K: You're welcome.
Let's meet that time.

J: Good-bye

A1 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?
K: I'm fine.
Where have you been?

J: I've been from library.
How have you prepared for coming test?
If you don't mind,
would you like to study with me in my house, on Friday?

K: I'm sorry.
I'm going to be out of campus.
How about another day except Friday?

J: Um.
I think that we'd better meet on Saturday.
Because I need some time to reorganize what I've studied by them.
Let's meet on Saturday.

K: OK.
No problem

K: What time will you free at that day?

How about around 5 PM?
J: Um.
I prefer in the morning.

K: Let me see
would you meet me at 9 in front of highland cafe?
J: That's good.
K: We are going to meet at 9 PM in front of highland café.
Right?

J: No problem.
See you then.

A2 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?
K: I'm good.
and you?

J: Hey.
do you have any plan?
Could you study on Friday with me
K: I'm sorry.
I have no time to go there.
I wish, I could

J: Let me see!
Could you come on saturday?
K: Of course!
I have no plan on Saturday

K: How about my house.
J: I'm sorry.
I can't go there.

K: How about your house.

J: that sounds good.
I'll be at house.

K: OK.
Good.
see you on saturday

J: OK.
See you later

A3 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: Good...
And you?

J: Do you have a plan this Friday...
If not,
why don't we study together?

K: Oh...
I'm so sorry
I am supposed to go out for dinner.

J: Sounds good to you...
What about Saturday?

K: All right. This Saturday...

K: Saturday afternoon 4:30 and my house.
It's ok?

J: Sorry.
I have an appointment 2:00 in downtown.
So,
I have got to hurry.

K: No, problem...

What about...after dinner 6:30pm, your house?

J: That's fine.

K: We are goin to see at your house on Saturday 6:30pm

J: Good.

See you later...

N1 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: Hey
what's up

J: Hey
how about this test.
Wanna get together and look things over?

K: Hey
this weekend's pretty packed
you know

J: Yeah
I hear that...
How about Saturday?

K: Yeah
I could probably do that

K: What about 6:00 at the library?

J: Well
I'll be busy then

K: How about at 9:00

J: Yeah
I can do that.
9:00 at the library

K: Right on
See you then

J: See you then. one

N2 "Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: Hey John.
It's going OK

J: You want to get together and study Friday?

K: I can't.
I have plans.

J: Alright,
Saturday then?

K: Saturday's good.

K: How about 7 PM at my apartment

J: Nah.
Date with my girlfriend at 8.

K: How about 4 at the Union

J: Sounds good.

K: Great.
See ya then

J: OK.
Later.

N3

"Studying together for the Test"

J: Hello Kevin, how's it going?

K: I'm doing ok.

J: Would you like to study with me on friday?

K: No,
I can't
because I have to help a friend move.

J: Do you think you could study on saturday?

K: Saturday would be ok.

K: How does 9:00 AM at my place sound?

J: Sorry,
I have to work from nine until two.

K: Would 4:00 at the library be any better?

J: That would be perfect.

K: Great,
I will see you there.

J: I'll see you later.

APPENDIX B: DATA FOR THE FORMAL CONVERSATIONAL SCENARIOS

B1

“Meeting with the Teacher”

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Yes, I do

J: I’m sorry,
but I need help with your homework?

J: May I take a homework with you?

D: Oh, I’m sorry.
I am busy.

D: How about tomorrow?

J: OK.
thank you.

J: How do you think about 7:00 PM.

D: Oh,
I’m sorry.
I’m going to a movie.

D: How do you think about 10:00 PM

J: oh.
I’m sorry
I’m going to go to the Rec Center.

D: How do you think about 8:00 P.M

J: I’m ok.

D: Oh. Good
I see you later.

J: Thank you.

see you later

B2

“Meeting with the Teacher”

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Yes. I do.

J: Do you need to help your homework?

J: Today, Do you have a time?

D: No, I don't I have appointment

D: Can I meet you tomorrow?

J: It's OK.

J: What time do you meet at 12pm?

D: No, I do

I'm going to eat the lunch with my friend

D: What time do you meet at 2 o'clock?

J: Sorry John

I have a another meeting that time.

D: What time do you meet at 5 o'clock

J: It's OK

D: See you later.

J: Goodbye John

B3

“Meeting with the Teacher”

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?
D: Yes, I do

J: Can I help you with your homework?

J: I want to help
D: I'm sorry
Today is busy

D: How about tomorrow
J: OK.
See you then

J: Let's get 6 P.M
How about you?
D: I'm sorry
then, I will busy

D: How about 7. PM?
J: I'm sorry
then I will busy

D: How about 8. PM?
J: OK.
then, I will free time

D: Good bye
See you then
J: Good bye
You must late.

II "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?
D: Hello.
What's up?

J: I need some your help for my homework.

J: Could meet you today?
D: I'm sorry,
I'm busy today.

D: Maybe,
I can meet you tomorrow
J: Yes, I can.

J: Could I met you at 6:00?
D: I maybe can't.

D: How's about at 8?
J: I'm sorry.
Professor
I' can meet time

D: How's about at 9?
J: That's O.K.

D: See you then
J: See you then

I2 "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?
D: No. I don't.

I have some plan.

J: Professor.
I have some question

J: Do you have a moment today?

D: Sorry,
I am busy

D: How about tomorrow?

J: That sounds good.

J: How about at 7 P.M tomorrow?

D: Oh.
I'm sorry
It is so late
I'll pick my son

D: Do you want to meet at 5 P.M?

J: I'm sorry
I have a part time work at that time.

D: How about 3 PM?

J: That all right.

D: O.K.
See you then

J: Me too
see you ther

I3 "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: So goo!
How are you doing?
I'm free I have many time.

J: Not bad..
Can you do me a favor.
I need to help my homework.

J: Can you meet me today?
D: I'm so sorry.
I'm busy today
I will have seminar.

D: How about tomorrow.
J: I agree

J: When do you have time?
I want 16:00
D: I'm going to play tennis 2:00.
I can't meet that time

D: And then,
How about noon
J: I'm sorry too
I have lunch appointment.

D: OK.
Just Let's meet in the morning
How about 9:00 AM.
J: That sound good!

D: good.
good.
good.
See you at that time.
J: Good bye. Dr Smith
See you tomorrow.

A1 "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Sure.
Come in

J: I'ven't had your point about homework.
So I want to ask you looking over my report.

J: Do you have some time for me today?

D: Sorry,
I have a semena in the evening.

D: How about tomorrow afternoon?

J: Sure.

J: How do you think to meet at 5?

D: At that time, I will have a class.

D: How about 7?

J: I'm sorry.
After 7 I will have to work at cafeteria.

D: Um,
How about at noon?

J: Yes,
of course.

D: Ok.
Let's meet at noon in my office.

J: Thanks, Dr. Smith.
Have a good day.

A2

“Meeting with the Teacher”

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: OK!

Sure

What can I do for you?

J: I have some question about homework

J: Do you have free time today?

D: Let me check my schedul

Oh!

I'm sorry.

Today. I'm so busy

D: Why don't you meet tomorrow?

J: Sure I will

J: What time do you want to meet?

I want to meet at 3:00 pm

D: Sorry.

I will have class

D: I will finish 4:00 pm

How about 4:00

J: I'm sorry

I also have a class at 4:00 pm

D: OK.

I'll have free time at 7:00 pm

so do you want?

J: of course!

Thank you so much.

You're really a good professor

D: Ok.

See you tommorrow

J: see you tommorrow

A3 "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Hi John!
Do you have anything to talk with me?

J: Yes, Sir
I have some questions
and
need your help about homework.

J: Could you give me some time today?
D: I love to talk about that...
but
I'm sorry.
I have to take part in a meeting right now.

D: What about tomorrow?
If comfortable (available),
see you tomorrow
J: That's fine
I finish my class around 2:30 pm

J: Could I see you at 3:00 pm, Sir?
D: I'm so sorry.
I will be on a class at that time.

D: Why don't you come
and
see me 11:30 am?
J: Sorry, Sir
I have a speaking class from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm

D: If so,
what about 4:30pm ?
J: That's fine
I will be here tomorrow 4:30pm.

D: All right.
See you tomorrow

J: Thank you, Sir...
See you...

N1 "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Yes John
what's on your mind?

J: Well,
I'm having some questions about this week's assignment.

J: Can I talk to you today?

D: John I'm busy right now
unfortunately

D: Can you stop by tomorrow at all?

J: yeah

J: How's 3:00?

D: Ooooh,
I have a meeting then

D: But
I'm free at 11:00

J: I'm in class until 12:00

D: Well how about 12:15?

J: Yeah, that's great

D: Ok john
see you then

J: Thanks Dr. Smith
See you tomorrow

N2 "Meeting with the Teacher"

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Sure John, what can I help you with?

J: My homework
actually.

J: Can I come by later today
and
ask you some questions?

D: I can't today,
I have faculty meetings

D: How about tomorrow?

J: Sure.
Tomorrow's fine

J: Noon?

D: I eat lunch at noon.

D: How about 1:30?

J: I have class then

D: Umm... 10:30?

J: That's good.

D: Until then.

J: Thanks Dr. Smith.
See you tomorrow.

N3

“Meeting with the Teacher”

J: Hello Mr. Smith, do you have a moment?

D: Yes John, what can I do for you?

J: I have some questions about the homework I would like to ask you.

J: Do you have any time today that we could go over the material?

D: I'm sorry John.

I am very busy today.

D: Do you think that you could meet with me tomorrow?

J: Yes,

that would be fine.

J: Do you have an opening in your schedule at 9:00 AM.

D: I'm sorry,

but

I will be in class at that time

D: Do you think you could meet with me at 1:00 PM?

J: I'm sorry,

I have work at 1:30 PM.

D: I will be in my office at 7:30 AM

if you want to come by then.

J: That would be fine.

Thank you very much.

D: Thank you

for stopping by

and

I will see you tomorrow.

J: OK,
thank you,
goodbye.

APPENDIX C: CALCULATIONS FOR THE SPEECH ACT REALIZATIONS

B1	Informal		B2	Informal		B3	Informal	Average
Primary	14		Primary	14		Primary	15	14.333333
Secondary	3		Secondary	3		Secondary	1	2.333333
Complementary	2		Complementary	1		Complementary	0	1
Total	19		Total	18		Total	16	17.66667
I1	Informal		I2	Informal		I3	Informal	
Primary	14		Primary	15		Primary	18	15.66667
Secondary	4		Secondary	6		Secondary	5	5
Complementary	2		Complementary	2		Complementary	4	2.666667
Total	20		Total	23		Total	27	23.33333
A1	Informal		A2	Informal		A3	Informal	
Primary	15		Primary	16		Primary	15	15.33333
Secondary	6		Secondary	5		Secondary	4	5
Complementary	6		Complementary	2		Complementary	5	4.333333
Total	27		Total	23		Total	24	24.66667
N1	Informal		N2	Informal		N3	Informal	
Primary	16		Primary	12		Primary	10	12.66667
Secondary	2		Secondary	2		Secondary	4	2.666667
Complementary	5		Complementary	3		Complementary	1	3
Total	23		Total	17		Total	15	18.33333
B1	Formal		B2	Formal		B3	Formal	Average
Primary	17		Primary	14		Primary	18	16.33333
Secondary	4		Secondary	3		Secondary	4	3.666667
Complementary	5		Complementary	0		Complementary	0	1.666667
Total	26		Total	17		Total	22	21.66667
I1	Formal		I2	Formal		I3	Formal	
Primary	15		Primary	14		Primary	20	16.33333
Secondary	2		Secondary	5		Secondary	7	4.666667
Complementary	0		Complementary	3		Complementary	3	2
Total	17		Total	22		Total	30	23
A1	Formal		A2	Formal		A3	Formal	
Primary	17		Primary	19		Primary	18	18
Secondary	3		Secondary	2		Secondary	7	4
Complementary	3		Complementary	6		Complementary	6	5
Total	23		Total	27		Total	31	27
N1	Formal		N2	Formal		N3	Formal	
Primary	16		Primary	16		Primary	18	16.66667
Secondary	2		Secondary	1		Secondary	4	2.333333
Complementary	5		Complementary	5		Complementary	4	4.666667
Total	23		Total	22		Total	26	23.66667

VITA

Nevin Liddy was born and raised in upstate New York. He was president of his high school and his community college, and played soccer at both schools. He traveled south to attend LSU and graduated with two bachelor's degrees; one in religious studies and the other in international studies.

Outside of the study of language, he enjoys several extra-curricular activities including, but not limited to: backpacking, soccer, hiking, bouldering, reading, traveling, and music.

Within the study of language, he is interested in speech comprehension, phonetics, and of course, second language acquisition.

In the future, Nevin plans to pursue a doctoral degree in Linguistics from LSU.