Contact Situation and Foreigner Talk —Japanese language

[Abstract] This study explores the nature of foreigner talk (FT) which occurs in the naturalistic conversation between a native speaker of Japanese and a non-native speaker, to find out if the characteristics match those proposed by Skoutarides (1980) or Long (1992).
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Introduction

Ferguson (1971) first introduces the idea of “foreigner talk” (FT) and examines the grammatical simplicity in FT by indicating the absence of the copula in “grammatical machinery for equational clauses” (for instance, in the case of the Japanese language). Evidences of simplified speech in FT is similar to ‘retarded talk’. And, because it can also be directed at children, it is also referred to as "baby talk".

Ferguson. (1975) also defines FT as commonly regarded as an ‘imitation of the way foreigners speak”. In other words, foreigner talk is the reduced and simplified version of a language that native speakers use to address other non-native speakers. According to Ferguson, foreigner talk is the basis of the emergence of pidgin and creole and his studies focus mainly on the initial stages and process of pidginization.

Long (1992) and Skoutarides (1980) further conceptualize and explore FT in the context of foreign-language learning (second language acquisition). In the following section, we will focus mainly on the characteristics of FT listed by Skoutarides (1980) and with some references to the characteristic proposed by Long, D. (1992). The aim of this study is to examine norm violations (speech adjustments) made by the Japanese Native Speaker (NS) to a non-
native speaker (NNS). I will explore and report about the nature of 'foreigner talk' which occurs in the naturalistic conversation which I have with a native speaker of Japanese.

Background information:

The NS:
The recording was then done via the mobile phone with Mrs M. Gideon, a friend of L. W., who lives in Adelaide. Mrs Gideon is a native Japanese speaker and an Associate lecturer teaching Japanese language in an Australian University. She has about 20 years of teaching the Japanese Language to foreigners of varies ages ranging from 13 years-old (students taking the JLPT levels 5-1, and GCE Cambridge “AO” and “A” level examinations) to adult-businessmen (business Japanese). She has taught in Japan, England, Singapore and currently she is teaching in Australia.

The NNS:
L. W. is a Chinese-Singaporean and she emigrated from Singapore to Perth about 8 years ago with her family. Her native language is Chinese(Mandarin) and English and she studied at the Japanese Language School affiliated to Tokyo University of Foreign Studies for 1 year and subsequently completed her undergraduate studies thereafter at the University about 20 years ago. Upon graduation, she has taught Japanese to Singapore students aged 13-17 (who take Japanese as a 3rd language) taking the GCE Cambridge ‘O’ Level Japanese language examination and has been an oral examiner for the GCE Cambridge ‘A’ and ‘AO’ Level Japanese language examination.

Methodology
A recorded telephone conversation of approximately five minutes with a NS (native speaker) of Japanese was conducted and
recorded (with the consent of both parties) in the mp3 format. Both parties are female and the topic was taken from the list of topics provided. Out of the many topics given, the NS chose (g), which is 好きな料理（日本食）の作り方.

**Topic: (g) 好きな料理（日本食）の作り方**

**Time: 5 mins**

**Other information**

As the topic is about learning to make Japanese *Niku-jyaga*, I (NNS) had a pencil and a notepad to take down notes on the instructions (from the NS) and after the recording I would also prepare the dish to test out if I could grasp the instructions correctly.

The transcription of the conversation includes hesitations, pauses, and both parties’ emotional reactions (laughter) for this study. There is also overlapping talk in the conversation that cannot be transcribed fully.

**Transcription keys**

- ❓ pause, hesitations
- 🎧 laughter
- ⚪ rising intonation
- ⏱ overlapping
- T: Native speaker (NS)
- L: Non native speaker (NNS)

The conversation is authentic and naturalistic and the NS is not aware of the study of FT before the recording. She is only told during the follow-up interview. Although the conversation is mainly about the NS giving instructions, the NNS reacts to what the NS says by signalling verbally or questions if she has any queries pertaining to the instructions.

There is some overlapping talk in the recording and thus unable to transcribe fully. However, it does not affect the findings because
incursions into the other speaker's supposed turn is a feature of involvement and active participation of both parties.

**Results and discussion**

In this paper we will examine the 6 characteristics (pp57) of "foreigner talk" based on Skoutarides’ study (1980). Subsequently, we will examine the other 3 characteristics that is evident only in the Japanese language. We will also explore the areas in Long’s study (1992) that are not elaborated in Skoutarides’ study. All of these are done using evidences (examples) from the recording.

(Note: The 9 characteristics in total are briefly translated here. For Skoutarides’ own exact translations of the terms in English, please refer to: Skoutarides, Alina. 1986. *Foreigner talk in Japanese*. Thesis (Ph.D.)--Monash University, 1986.)

(1) A relatively slow tempo in speech, and there are frequent pauses between clauses and sentences.

*Ex.①* (There is a pause in between.)

T: 牛肉 。。。大体200グラムぐらい。

*Ex.②* (The speed of the speech is relatively slow in the above exchange.)

T: えっと豚肉、牛肉どちらもいいですけど、WONGさんどちらが好きですか。

L: 私、あのう、牛肉のほうが好きです。

T: じゃ、牛肉で行きます。

L: はい。

T: もしも、肉が好きだったら300入れてもいいですけど。

L: 300。。。はい。

**Observation:**
However, an interesting observation is that towards the end of the conversation, the NS speaks much faster. In some areas, the 2 overlapping areas in the recording could be the NNS was trying to talk but interrupted by the NS or that the NNS trying to clarify things as there was an overloading of information.

One possible reason that the NS speaks faster could be that she was more conscious at the start of the conversation to speak to a NNS thus spoke at a slower pace but less conscious at the end, or maybe because of fatigue.

Another possible reason is that the NNS feels that the NS is speaking faster as there is a noun that she does not understand—"otoshibuta".

Ex.① (speed compare to the beginning is much faster)
T: で、それを。。。あのう。。。材料のすぐ上に、びたっとくっつく乗せるんですよ。
L: あれ。
T: わかります
L: 想像出来ないですけど。。。●

Ex.②a (overlapping in the conversation here)
T: で、それを。。。あのう。。。材料のすぐ上に、びたっとくっつく乗せるんですよ。
L: あれ。
T: わかります∪
L: 想像出来ないですけど。。。●

Ex.②b (another example of overlapping in the conversation.)
T: それを一杯分だし汁一杯。
T: それから、えっと、砂糖、醤油、お酒を用意してください。
L: はい。
T: あとみりん。。。　L: みりん。
T: 大匙一と。。。　L: そうですね。
T: あとみりん。。。　L: みりん。
T: ごくと。。。　L: もう少し。。。　T: どこ、烹調の予定ですか。
L: そうですね。
T: で、あの、ふか、噴かないように、時々えっと、あくが出たら、あくをとって。
L: はい。
T: え、それで、それが。。。　L: どらい。。。15分ぐらいいいですか。
L: 15分ぐらいですか。

Ex.③ (NNS unclear of the procedure and questions, probably due to the speed of the conversation)
L: そうですね。え、順序[sounds like じいんじょ]はどうなるんですか。あのう、砂糖とか、みりんの。。。入れる。。。あのう。。。順序。。。 （NNS gets it right here）
T: 作るときに、言いますね。
L: はい。

(2) Emphasis on particles, auxiliary verbs or verb endings.
Contrary to the characteristics listed in number 2, there is not many particular emphasis on the particles used or verb endings in the recording. On the other hand, omission of particles such as ga or wo and instead of an emphasis on the verb endings, there are short staccato accents observed.

Ex.① ("ga" used with a pause behind)
T: で、あの、ふか、噴かないように、時々えっと、あくが出たら、あくをとって。
L: はい。
T: え、それで、それが。。。　L: どらい。。。15分ぐらいいいと思うんですけど。。。
L: 15分ぐらいですか。
Ex. 2a (NS pauses after the ‘te-form’ (emphasis) instead of the particles)
T: ええ、まず、じゃがイモ三つ。
T: まず、たまねぎを入れて。。。
L: はい。
T: それからニンジンを入れて。。。
L: はい。
T: ええ、最後に、お肉をさっと入れて。
L: はい。
The te-forms used are not accented most of the time. They are short but come in pauses after that.

Ex. 2b
T: みりん、いちおう、入れて。。。 $row_number=7$
L: はい。
T: ええ、だし汁を入れて、あのう、鍋、蓋をして。。。  \[\]
L: はい。

Ex. 3a (omission of particle)
T: 好きな量で。。。 後は、だし汁。。。 これは、だし汁の作り方*わかりますう
There is an omission* of the particle ga as contrast to the proposed characteristic of a highlighted, accented particle. The reason could be it is a form of conversational usage so the NS does not emphasize the particle.

Ex. 3b (omission of particle)
T: サヤインゲン。。。 ごめんあさい、さっき、私、こんにゃく入れるの*、忘れ。。。
L: あ、こんにゃく。。。
(3) Usage of grammatically correct sentences; short sentences resembling textbooks with simple grammatical structures.

Ex.① Stating the topic of the conversation in a clear and systematic way.
T: お料理の時間ですね。まず、材料から行きますね。

Ex.② (use of temo-iidesu as seen in Japanese elementary textbooks.)
T: もしも、肉が好きだったら300を入れてもいいですけど。

Ex.③a
T: 牛肉。。。大体200グラムぐらい。

Ex.③b
T: うちでは200ぐらい入れます。

Ex.③c
T: だから、お芋だったら、大きな芋だったら、三つぐらいに分けて。。。

Ex.④a (Use of node as seen in Japanese elementary textbooks.)
T: あんまり入れ過ぎるとね、入れ過ぎるとね。でも、うちは肉好きでいっぱい入れるので。。。肉を入れます。

Ex.④b
T: サヤインゲン。色づけるためなんで。。。肉を入れます。
L: はい。

Ex.⑤ (Usage of ‘tari”, “nakutemo-iidesu”)
T: それを使ったり、あるいは、シラタキ。。。もし。。。あれば。。。ければ、あのう、手に入れにくければ、入れなくても大丈夫です。
L: あっ、はい。

Ex.⑥ (Usage of nai-to- ikenai.)
L: サヤインゲン。。。
T: 英語で説明しないといけないんですね。
Ex.①a (Usage of no-hou-ga-ii / ta-hou ga ii.)

T: あんまり、あのう、型崩れのしないお芋のほうがいいと思うんですね。

Ex.①b

T: らんぎりでやったほうがいいかな。

**Observation:**

However, the above examples can be classified as intermediate depending on the textbooks used. For instance, *te-kudasai* is taught at the elementary level but the verb *yuderu* is taught at a higher level.

Ex.①

T: サヤインゲンを別に茹ででて下さい。

L: あっ、はい。

T: そうすると、あのう色がきれいなんですね。

L: あ、そうですか。飾りのほうですか。飾りだけで。。。

(4) Repetition of key words, key phrases or main ideas to check comprehension

**Observation:**

This feature is the most frequently used in the recording.

Ex.①

T: あんまり入れ過ぎるとね、入れ過ぎるとね。でも、うちは肉好きでいっぱい入れるので。。。肉を入れます。

Ex.②

T: それから。。あとは。。。色づけに、サヤインゲンう。。。

L: あっ、はや。。。何ですか。

T: サヤ。サヤイン

L: サ。。。ヤ。。。イ。。。ン。。。ים。。。ゲ。。。ン。。。ン。。。

Ex.③
③ T: にんじんはまあ、あのう、そうですね。。。らんぎり、で。

L: らんぎり、はい。

T: らんぎりでやったほうがいいかな。

L: はい。

Ex.④

T: で、えっと、たまねぎはせんぎりがいいと思います。

L: はい、たまねぎ、せんぎり。

Ex.⑤

T: あ、薄切り、薄切り。

L: 薄切り。

T: 薄切り、薄切りで。

L: 薄切りで。

Ex.⑥

T: よく日本語では、日本ではさ・し・す・せ・そ・の順番です。

L: さ・し・す・せ・そ・です。

Ex.⑦

T: でも、あのう、これ、さっき言った、大匙三つ、あのう三杯ずつ、ええ、砂糖、醤油、酒を。。。大匙一ヶ。

Ex.⑧

T: 最初で最初で、最初の時一緒です。

L: 一緒ですか。

T: 最初の時、にんじん、キノコ炒める時、一緒に入っ込んでください。

Ex.⑨

T: それを一杯分だし汁一杯。

Ex.⑩

T: で、そこに、えっと、豚肉、あっ、ごめんなさい。

L: あの、牛肉。

T: 牛肉。牛肉。

L: はい。

Ex.11
Observation:

In the above examples, some could be classified as repetitions to promote understanding. However, sometimes, it could be the NS stuttering or thinking (Ex.⑩) about the next step or self-correction (Ex.⑪). Thus, this observation differs from the proposed one.

(5) Use of NNS’s native language

Observation:

The NS did not code-switch (use the learner’s native language) at all even though she is very competent in English (she has lived and studied in UK for many years and speaks fluent British English.)

The possible reason could be that she is a Japanese language teacher and believes in the Direct Method in teaching Japanese, ie using the target language to teach the target language. Hence, she tries hard to describe the noun using different ways, instead of using English directly. This can be an exhaustive way for the NS but eventually the NNS is able to learn more.

In any way, the employment of language transfers in the spoken discourse (both NS and NNS) is not detected.

Ex.①
T: 緑の。。。あのう、豆♂
T: お豆で。。。♂
L: 緑の豆。。。
T: 緑で。。。あのう、何と言ったらいいんでしょうかね。。。長細い。。。。
L: サヤインゲン。。。。
T: 英語で説明しないといけないんですね。

Observation (NNS):
If the NS have used the term “インゲンマメ” instead of “サヤインゲン” initially, the learner could have grasped the meaning quicker. In this case, for the learner, “サヤインゲン” does not ring a bell instantaneously but is understood later with the descriptions and the recall of the noun “インゲンマメ” learnt. The learner is seen to pronounce “サヤインゲン” a few times in the conversation, trying to recall, which sounds like ‘baby-talk’ itself.

Ex.②

T: ええとね。。。そうしたら、何がいいかな。。。わかりやすいの。。。あのう。。。 例えば、アルミホイルとか。
L: はい。
T: それから、クッキング。。。シートありますよね。
L: はい。
T: あてでも代用できるんですけど。真ん中に穴を開けて、。。。
L: 穴を開けて、。。。

Observation:

The NS used “aluminium foil” and ‘cooking sheet’ (Katakana) but these are not considered English due to the fact that they exist in the Japanese vocabulary. Thus we do not classify the use of these two nouns as the characteristic of “Using of learner’s native language” in the study.

6) Simplification of words used.

Ex.①
T: 。。。糸。。。糸状というか。。。線状に切ってある。。。線のように切っているものなんですね。

Ex.②
T: 普通の蓋とは別に。。。 
L: はい。
T: 普通は木、木の小さめの蓋あるんですね。

Observation:
The 2 examples show that the NS tries to simplify (rephrase, or explain) and switch the vocabulary used accordingly with patience and putting herself in the shoes of the NNS.

Characteristics unique in the Japanese language (Skoutarides, A. 1980)

Besides the 6 characteristics listed above, Skoutarides, A. (1980) also discusses about the 3 other unique characteristics in Japanese FT. They are: A) Use of simple grammar structures, expressions without changes in the basic structures resulting in repetitive and redundant phrases; B) Extremely detailed expressions to the extent of sounding overly polite; C) Excessive use of the first person pronoun that is usually omitted in the Japanese language.

However, according to the results of this recording, there is insufficient examples to fully prove the above 3 characteristics except the third one. A suggestion is that a further investigation could be conducted with different topics or different individuals (NS or NNS).

A) Use of simple grammar structures, expressions without changes in the basic structures resulting in repetitive and redundant phrases.

There is hardly any explicit instances in the recording that can justify this characteristic. An explanation about the lack of evidences in the recording could be individual variation (this will be discussed later).

B) Extremely detailed expressions to the extent of sounding overly polite.
Ex.① (example that seems to be very detailed)
T: よく日本語では、日本ではさ・し・す・せ・そ・の順番ですね。
L: さ・し・す・せ・そ・。
T: さ、砂糖。
L: はい。
T: し、醤油。
T: す,
L: ああ。。。☆
T: そういう順番で。
L: おもしろいんですね。
T: そういう順番で入れろうとよく言うんですけど。
L: あ、そうですか。☆
T: 聞いたことないんですか。
L: 聞いたことないんです。☆ああ、おもしろいですね。はい。。。

Observation

Although there are some repetitive expressions, there are again no distinctive evidences in the recording that have extremely detailed explanations to the extent of sounding overly polite.

Instead, the NNS tries to fill in some of the information gaps by asking questions and the NNS also apologises that she has missed out certain details.

Ex.② (misses out one of the ingredients “konnyaku”)
T: サヤインゲン。。。ごめんあさい、さっき、私、こんにゃく入れるの、忘れ。。。
L: あ、こんにゃく。。。

C) Excessive use of the first person pronoun that is usually omitted in the Japanese language.
Ex.①a (“watashi” used)
L: はい。で、こんなやくは、何か調理しないと、その前調理しないといけないところは。。。。
T: ああ、そうか。。。。
L: 直接入れるんですか。それとも。。。。
T: 私は入れちゃいますけど。。。。
L: はい。

Ex. ①b（“watashi” used）
T: で、それで、大体、こう、油が通たら、え、だし汁、調味料入れます。
L: 調味料、はい。
T: それは、あのう、全部いっぺんに、私はしますけど。
L: はい。

Ex. ②a（“uchi” used instead）
T: もしも、肉が好きだったら３００入れてもいいですけど。
L: ３００。。。はい。
T: うちは２００ぐらい入れます。

Ex. ②b（“uchi” used instead）
T: で。。。あとは、キノコとかね、シイタケ、もし好きなら。。。うちは嫌いだから、入れません。
L: 私も嫌いです。
T: 。
L: 入れないことにします。

Observation:

Contrary to the 3rd characteristic listed, ‘watashi’ is only used twice in the entire conversation.

The NS uses ‘uchi’ to refer to herself or her family as seen in the following examples. So, contrary to the proposed characteristics, the first person pronoun is not used excessively.
Additional examples (Long’s 1992 study)

In section 10 of Long’s (1992) study, additional characteristics listed are “Request for clarification”, “Confirmation of understanding” and these can be found in the recording. Long states that the feature is characterized by the use of “wakaru?”, sentence final particle "ne " and ‘deshou” to elicit response from the learner. In this recording, in addition to “wakaru?”, “ne” and ‘deshou”, “yo”, yone” is also used.

On top of that, the NS also uses the “te-form” or nouns and pauses to check if the learner understands. In other words, some information is not given as a whole ‘chunk’ in order to check if the NNS is following the conversation. The learner responds by answering ‘hai’, ‘wakarimashita” etc to show her understanding.

Ex① a
T: こんにゃくって、わかりますか。
L: はい、わかります。
T: こんにゃくが、あのう、なんというかしら。。。糸。。。糸状というか。。。線状に切ってある。。。線のように切ってあるものなんですねよね。
L: はい。
T: シラタキみたいなの。。。糸こんにゃく。
L: あああ。。。はい。
T: あのう、すき焼きにいれる。。。。
L: はい。
T: わかりますか。でも、もうちょっと。。。。
L: 見たことがあります。

Ex① b
T: 好きな量で。。。後は、だし汁。。。これは、だし汁の作り方がわかります

L: ええ、わからないんですが。。。いつも、あのう。。。まあ。。。あのう。。。パックになってるものを買うんですけど。。。
T: ☞
L: ☞
T: それでもいいんですか。。。もしも、ちゃんととるんであれば。。。

Ex① c
L: はい。で、こんにゃくは、何か調理しないと、その前調理しないといけないところは。。。。
T: ああ、そうか。。。
L: 直接入れるんですか。それとも。。。
T: 私は入れちゃいますけど。。。
L: はい。わかりました。

⑨ T: で、それを。。。あのう。。。あのう。。 ☞ 材料のすぐ上に、ぴたっとしっかり乗せるんですよ。
L: あれ。。。。
T: わかりますね。
L: 想像出来ないんですけど。。。

Ex ②a
T: 。。。線のように切ってあるものなんですよ。
Ex ②b
T: で。。。あとは、キノコとかね、シイタケ。。。。
Ex ②c
L: そうですか。え、順序はどうなるんですか。あのう、砂糖とか、みりんの。。。入る。。。あのう。。。順序。。。。
T: 作る時に、言いますね。
L: はい。
Ex ③
T: で、それを。。。あのう。。。材 料のすぐ上に、びたっと ふっつく乗せるんですよ。
L: れえ。。。
( followed by T: わかりますよ  as stated above)
L: 想像出来ないのですけど。。。。

Ex ④
T: 今、煮ている間ね、それで、あのう。。。大体そうですよね。

Ex ⑤
T: それから、クッキング。。。シートありますよね。

Ex ⑥
T: まだでしょう。まだでしょう。それで、別にサヤインゲン。。。。

Ex⑦a
In this case, the NS may be using the structure to check if the learner is following the conversation, and also provides ample time for her to take down notes
T: それから、たまねぎ一個。
L: はい。
T: それから、にんじん、一本。
L: はい。

Ex⑦a
T: みりん、いちおう、入れて。。。。
L: はい。
T: ええ、だし汁を入れて、
あのう、鍋、蓋をして。。。。
L: はい。

Ex⑦b
T: ええ、まず、ジャガイモ三つ。
T: まず、たまねぎを入れて。。。。
L: はい。
T: それからにんじんを入れて。。。
L: はい。
T: え、最後に、お肉をさっと入れて。
L: はい。

Other Observations

There are some observations deduced from the recording which is not in the studies of either Skoutarides, A. (1980) or Long(1992). This is interesting and further investigations could be done if possible.

(1) “desu-masu” form
On the whole, the NS uses the formal forms in the final predicate, i.e., the “desu-masu” form which appears in Japanese language textbooks instead of the plain forms with their friends. In this way, it is easier for the NNS as most start learning the language with the formal form. In fact, speaking using the plain form could be difficult for most learners. Honorifics taught in the textbooks are not used in this case, probably because the NS is older than the NNS and that they have always been on a teacher-student relationship even though they have been colleagues before.

(2) Interchange in forms of language—formal and informal.
The NS does not just use the formal form or informal form. Both forms are used instead. Therefore, we can deduce that NS do not use synthetically adjusted sentences in their speech to accommodate to the NNS. There are numerous examples in the recording. We will only list the 2 more prominent ones here.

1 T: うちは200ぐらい入れます。(formal)

2 T: シラタキみたいなの。(informal)
L: あああ。。。はい。
T: あのう、すき焼きにいれる。

(3) Complex sentences structures--- conditional, passive etc.
More complex form of sentence structures are used in the recording and another study could be done regarding this using references from other researchers besides S or Long.

① Conditional "tara"/"nara"-form to mean if/when

①T: もしも、肉が好きだったら３００入れてもいいですけど。
L: ３００。。。はい。
②T: で、あの、ふか、噴かないように、時々とっと、あくが出たら、あくをとって、
L: はい。
③T: で、それで、大体、こう、油が通たら、え、だし汁、調味料入れます。
L: 調味料、はい。
④T: で。。。あとは、キノコとかね、シイタケ、もし好きなら。。。うちは嫌いだから、いれません。
⑤T: 煮汁がほとんどなくなるまでに、煮詰めたら出来上がり。
L: はい。

② Conditional form "to"

①T: でも、あんまり肉入れると、肉のほう。。。あ
②T: それを使うと、型崩れしないんですね。
L: あっ、そうですか。
③ "ba" form

①T: それを使ったり、あるいは、シラタキ。。。もし。。。あれば。。。なければ、あのう、手に入れにくければ、入れなくても大丈夫です。
L: あっ、はい。
②T: それでもいいんですけど。。。もしも、ちゃんととるんであれば。。。げ

④ Compound verb

①T: あんまり入れ過ぎるとね、入れ過ぎるとね。
②T: 煮汁がほとんどなくなるまでに、煮詰めたら出来上がり。
L: はい。

⑤ idiomatic phrase
T: 糸こんにゃく、手に入りますか。

⑥ contracted/ casual form of "te-shimau" ----"chau" or "Jyau"
①T: 。。。こう、固まっちゃて。。。 
②T: で。。。えっと、ジャガイもって、解けちゃうんで、あんまり小さく切るとよ L: はい、ジャガイ。。。だから。。。普通のサイズで半分ぐらい切ればいいんですよね。
T: そうですね。
③L: 直接入れるんですか。それとも。。。 
T: 私は入れちゃいますけど。。。 
L: はい。え、わかりました。
④L: 一緒にですか。
T: 最初の時、にんじん、キノコ炒めてる時に、一緒に突っ込んでてください。

⑦ Use of Onomatopoeia
①T: 中に、ぷつぷついっぱい丸いの入っています。
L: はい。
②a T: そうです。最後に、最後に Serious に、パッと、乗せるだけ。。。 
② b T: え、一握り。。。鰹節。
L: はい、一握り。
T: いいですか。パッと。。。ffeee3e で、そんなところは。。。 
L: はい。
③ T: で、それを。。。あのう。。。材料のすぐ上に、びたっとくっつく乗せるんですよ。
L: どのぐらい入れるんですか。鰹節。。。 

⑧ "ta-form" + tokorode
Use of Co-ordinate Conjunctions

Question 1:
Were you aware of the speech adjustments in the conversation?
Answer: No, I don’t think I have deliberately altered my speech in any way to accommodate to you. I just spoke to you like what I do to my other Japanese friends.
Question 2:
Do you think you had made an effort to slow down your speech in the recording?

Answer: No, I do speak quite slowly as compared to most Japanese (laughter).

Observation 1

The answers provided by the NS above can be explained by what Skoutarides (1988) refers to as “individual variations”. Skoutarides has examined the different characteristics of individual variations in Japanese FT (for instance, excessive pronominalisation) for a specific contact situation. The investigations are done mainly in the linguistic aspect, ie. the aspects of “linguistic expression of politeness”, “grammatical complexity” and selection/correction of vocabulary” are examined and the distribution of occurrence of the 3 sets of data are discussed.

However, insufficient research (case studies) has been done on the non-verbal aspects of intercultural interactions. In Neustupny’s (1985) study on “Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations”, with regards to cross-cultural encounters, he illustrates the process and stages in the proposed language management framework, used in communication and interaction problems and intercultural contact situations. Individual communicative behaviour differs and perhaps a further study can be done using Neustupny’s theory.

Observation 2 (some deviations)

1) Omission of ‘desu’

I realised that I did not use ‘desu’ many times in the recording, like I usually use with my NS friend. Probably I am influenced by the way the NS is talking or that I am too engrossed in taking down notes.

Although omissions of the copula are acceptable in spoken Japanese but somehow I think I am being rather impolite.

Ex ① L:どのぐらい入れるんですか。鰹節。。。
Some other misc. things that I have learnt

1) The NS corrected my speech in the recording:

ex①
L: そんなに小さく。。。はい、わかりました。
T: そんなに小さくしないで。。。

I did not finish my sentence appropriately and should have said something like “そんなに小さく切らないほうがいいですね。” So the NS corrected me by saying “そんなに小さくしないで。。。”.

2) self-correction/slip of tongue

ex②L: そうですか。え、順序〔 sounds like “じいんじょ” はどうなるんですか。あのう、砂糖とか、みりんの。。。入れる。。。あのう。。。順序。。。」
(self-corrected)

T: 作るときに、言いますね。(NS finally understands)
L: はい。

Besides practising speaking and learning from the NS, other non-linguistic aspects are also acquired.

1) I have learned how to prepare an authentic Japanese dish using Japanese ingredients.

2) I have learned about the procedure in used flavouring Japanese cooking in the form)”sa, shi, su, se, so”, which I have only heard for the first time and I find it really interesting and helpful as it will affect the overall taste of the food.

3) More vocabulary is learned like “otoshibuta” and “sayingen’.
Conclusion

The simplified register referred to as “foreigner talk” (FT) and its characteristics can be generally summarised by shorter sentences; more grammatical and complete sentences; repetitions of key words; slower pace in speech; abundance of pauses; frequent checks for comprehension, frequent use of the NNS’s native language; and frequent use of paraphrasing or substitution of words. Nevertheless, the "talking down" or "talking-up" modifications in Japanese (or English ) FT can go beyond the syntactic aspect to include frequent comprehension checks.

Although the results of this study do match the characteristics listed by Skoutarides (1980) or Long (1992), a further study on the readings of other scholars could be conducted to investigate the reasons behind this.

All in all there are limitations in this short study and the un-investigated dimensions of NS/NNS interactions can be explored further in the future.
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