

# **CORRECTIVE RECASTS IN INTERACTION: A CASE STUDY**

**ERIC HAUSER**

*University of Hawai'i*

## **INTRODUCTION**

The research that this paper reports on comes from a pilot study that investigates three questions about how corrective recasts may fit into the local sequential organization of interaction. First, does, and if so, how does the local sequential organization of interaction, including the organization of repair, act as a variable influencing incorporation by language learners of recasts? Second, how do recasts, with and without being incorporated, affect the local sequential organization of interaction? And third, can evidence be found in interaction which indicates that recasts are associated with learning? The details of how particular recasts fit into the organizational structure of interaction are being investigated quite closely, so the methodology chosen for this research is conversation analysis, or CA, a methodology specifically designed to investigate the details of how interaction is organized (Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998; Psathas, 1995; ten Have, 1999). The adoption of this methodology leads to a fourth question of interest, which is the extent to which CA can be a useful methodology in the study of second language acquisition (SLA), and particularly in the study of corrective recasts.

The data for this pilot study come from four hours of conversation between a young adult, female, Japanese learner of English, Mieko (a pseudonym) and the researcher, a native speaker of English and a second language speaker of Japanese. One obvious limitation of this study is that the researcher is one of the participants in the interaction. However, this is only a pilot study and a larger body of data, involving more and different participants, is currently being collected. At the time the recordings were made, Mieko was a student at an English language school in Honolulu which focused on preparing students to enter academic institutions in the United States. We met for approximately one hour a week for two purposes—to give Mieko a chance to practice her English and to allow the researcher to collect data. There were no pre-planned pedagogical activities and no particular structures were singled out for recasting or other treatment. During the conversations, Mieko wore a clip-on microphone and recordings were made on a Sony Minidisc player.

Rough transcripts were made of the conversations, which were then searched for of potential corrective recasts. For the purposes of this research, an intentionally loose operationalization of potential corrective recast was used: the target-like production by the interlocutor of the corresponding form in the turn following the production of a non-target-like form by one of the participants. After several potential recasts had been identified in the rough transcripts, more fine-grained transcripts, including such details as pauses, overlaps, and so on, were produced of segments containing the potential recasts. All analyses were based on these fine-grained transcripts, used in conjunction with the original recordings.

This paper focuses on aspects of the first two questions above. That is, how the local sequential organization influences incorporation and how recasts influence the local sequential organization of interaction.

## RECASTS IN INTERACTION

In a recent book by Carroll, *Input and evidence: The raw material of second language acquisition* (Carroll, 2001), some interesting hypotheses and arguments are made about how negative evidence may fit into interaction. As some of these hypotheses and arguments are relevant to my own research interests, the data presented here are analyzed with respect to what Carroll says about negative evidence and interaction. One point that Carroll makes is that, in order for negative evidence to be of any use to the language learner, the learner must construe an utterance containing potential negative evidence as negative evidence. In order for this to happen, she hypothesizes that (a) the learner must perceive the interlocutor as someone who is qualified to provide negative evidence and (b) that the utterance containing the negative evidence must be irrelevant to the ongoing discourse. She also points out that, even if an utterance is construed as negative evidence, the learner is still faced with what Pinker (e.g., Grimshaw & Pinker, 1989) has called the blame assignment problem. That is, the learner must try to locate the problem in her original utterance that the interlocutor is correcting. Finally, Carroll argues that, in order for negative evidence to play a role in restructuring, it must be related to something that the learner does not already know. On the basis of five excerpts from the data of the pilot study, each of these points will be taken up in turn.

### *Construing Negative Evidence as Negative Evidence*

Perhaps the most interesting hypothesis made by Carroll is that negative evidence, which would include corrective recasts, must be irrelevant to the ongoing discourse in order for it to be construed by the language learner as negative evidence. In discussing

what she means by irrelevant, Carroll draws on the Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986). The details of this theory will not be dealt with here, but the general thrust of the theory is that a hearer infers a speaker's intended message by trying to come up with the maximally relevant interpretation of what the speaker says at a minimum of processing cost. According to Carroll, when a language learner's interlocutor says something that can easily be construed as relevant to the ongoing discourse, then it will be so construed and will not be treated as something else, such as negative evidence. However, when it cannot be so construed, when it seems totally irrelevant to the ongoing discourse, then the learner will try to construe it as something else, with one possibility being that it will be construed as correction, a specific kind of speech act.

Excerpt 1, from the data of the pilot study, should help make this clear. (Transcription conventions can be found in Appendix A. All excerpts can also be found together in Appendix B.)

#### Excerpt 1

- 1 M: but (0.7) before (.) like (0.6) two: weeks ago (.)  
 2 in: my dorm: (0.6) the girl (.) who is studying  
 3 (0.6) Japanese?=  
 4 E: =mm-hm  
 5 M: and uh (.) she asked (.) us (.) asked me (.) me I  
 6 mean (.) Japanese (.) we're (.) Japanese student?  
 7 you know about grammar?  
 8 E: yeah  
 9 M: nobody could uh nobody could answer [ha ha  
 10 E: [oh really?  
 11 M: .hh oh (0.5) yeah (0.9) eve[ryone (.) couldn't a-  
 12 E: [wha- (.) what was her  
 13 question=  
 14 M: =like (1.2) she:: asked like (0.6) the (1.0)  
 15 watashi ga: (.) like ((said while laughing)) (0.8)  
 16 like one word  
 17 E: mm-hm=  
 18 M: =ga? (0.7) what is this ga you know like ((said  
 19 while laughing))  
 20 E: oh okay=  
 21 M: =.hh (1.1) we (.) we could you know we could  
 -->22 understand the mean,

- 23 E: yeah=  
 24 M: =[but  
 -->25 E: [the meaning.  
 26 M: we (0.6) couldn't (0.7) know: like (.) how to  
 27 explain (1.5) but (.) ga is ga you know like ((said  
 28 while laughing)) (.) that's it  
 29 E: yeah (1.0) so (1.0) ga marks the sub- subject  
 30 right=  
 31 M: =yeah ((said while laughing))  
 32 E: the thing I could never understand about Japanese  
 33 is is the difference between like ga and wa.  
 34 M: mm  
 35 E: right [( )  
 -->36 M: [sometimes same mean: sometimes different  
 37 mean:=  
 38 E: =yeah=  
 39 M: =you know  
 40 E: that was (.) really hard ( )  
 41 M: yeah

In this excerpt, Mieko is telling a story about a student in her dorm who asked her and other Japanese students a question about Japanese grammar, specifically, about the meaning of the case marker *ga*. The point of the story is that, even though Mieko and the other students could understand what *ga* means, they could not answer the student's question. The story begins in line 1 of the transcript. In several places, such as lines 4, 8, 10, and 12, Eric can be seen to be taking the role of recipient of the story, using brief continuers or backchannels, as well as, in line 12, a question related to the story. In line 22, marked by an arrow, Mieko produces "we could understand the mean," to which Eric responds in line 25 with what could potentially be a corrective recast by stating "the meaning." However, there is no evidence that Mieko construes this as a corrective recast<sup>1</sup> and she continues with her story in lines 26 to 28 by saying "we couldn't know

<sup>1</sup> Conversation analytic research does not generally deal with mental processes. In fact, an aversion to inferring mental or cognitive processes is an important component of the analytic stance of CA. For example, Sacks (1992) states:

When people start to analyze social phenomena, if it looks like things occur with the sort of immediacy we find in some of these exchanges, then, if you have to make an elaborate analysis of it . . . then you figure that they couldn't have thought that fast. I want to suggest that you have to forget that completely. Don't worry about how fast they're thinking. First of all, don't worry about whether

like how to explain but ga is ga you know like that's it.” In line 36, Mieko says “sometimes same mean sometimes different mean,” providing further evidence that she did not notice the correction. It could be that the most relevant and simplest way for Mieko to construe Eric's utterance at line 25 is as a backchannel or continuer, a prompt to continue the story, much like his mm-hms and yeahs in earlier parts of the story. Construed in this way, Eric's utterance is perfectly relevant to the ongoing discourse and Mieko thus has no reason to construe it in any other way. This would seem to support the hypothesis that an utterance must be irrelevant to the ongoing discourse in order to be construed as negative evidence.

However, in the other four excerpts, in which Mieko does seem to construe an utterance by Eric as a corrective recast, it can be seen that, in a sense, these utterances are also relevant to the ongoing discourse, and that it is the specific way in which they are relevant that allows them to be construed as, or to function as, corrective recasts.

#### Excerpt 2

- 1 M: since I came here,  
 2 E: yeah  
 -->3 M: every wee:k (0.5) week- end I have (0.5) two (0.6)  
 -->4 two weekend?  
 -->5 E: two days  
 -->6 M: yeah two days, (0.9) so: ha ha .hh you know befor:e  
 7 I really ha ha I was really  
 8 hard ((said while laughing))  
 9 E: yeah (0.6) may maybe now you're getting spoiled  
 10 M: ha ha  
 11 E: it'll be [difficult to go back to Japan  
 12 M: [spoiled .hh  
 13 M: yeah very difficult I don't want to go back ((said

---

they're 'thinking.' Just try to come to terms with how it is that the thing comes off. Because you'll find that they can do these things. Just take any other area of natural science and see, for example, how fast molecules do things. And they don't have very good brains. So just let the materials fall as they may. Look to see how it is that persons go about producing what they do produce” (p. 11).

This aversion to inferring mental processes is not shared by Carroll or Sperber and Wilson. In discussing the data of this pilot study with respect to the hypotheses and arguments of Carroll, I have found that I cannot avoid using terms that suggest a mentalistic explanation. However, in all cases in which terms such as *construe* are used, they should be interpreted as being qualified by the phrase *behave as if*. For example, “... there is no evidence that Mieko construes this as a corrective recast ...” should be interpreted as “... there is no evidence that Mieko behaves as if she construes this as a corrective recast ...” As an additional note, such *as if* interpretations are fairly common in research on animal behavior (e.g., Cheney & Seyfarth, 1990; Hauser, 1996).

14 while laughing))

Excerpt 3

- 1 M: my friend said (.) it's (.) kind of o:ld (.) old  
 2 one (.) like=  
 3 E: =oh okay  
 -->4 M: re::=  
 -->5 E: =(so) rerun  
 -->6 M: rerun. yeah. (2.1) I like comedy, (.) these days

Excerpt 4

- 1 E: how about like a tour guide or something  
 2 M: sorry?  
 3 E: how about a tour- like a tour guide job  
 4 [or something  
 -->5 M: [tour guide? ((unusual pronunciation of *tour*))  
 -->6 E: tour guide  
 -->7 M: tour guide ((more target-like pronunciation, though  
 8 still unusual)) like travel=  
 9 E: =yeah  
 10 M: with (0.9) you know (.) customer  
 11 E: [yeah  
 12 M: [( ) travellers  
 13 E: yeah  
 14 M: ah but I heard it's very very hard [( )  
 15 E: [yeah I would  
 16 think so  
 17 M: ch- you know (0.8) passenger? you know (.) very-  
 18 always complain to ((while laughing)) [.hh  
 19 E: [yeah=  
 20 M: =ha ha .hh  
 21 E: yeah you get to travel a lot but you hafta take  
 22 care of many people=  
 23 M: =yes [so  
 24 E: [right (0.8) and (0.5) they're paying money so  
 25 maybe they they have lots of (0.8) things they wa-  
 26 they expect you to do

- 27 M: mm
- 28 E: yeah I wouldn't like that job
- 29 M: yeah (.) I want to travel (0.5) like myself or (.)
- 30 just (.) with t (0.9) um close friends something
- 31 ((said while laughing))=
- 32 E: =mm-hm=
- 33 M: =.hh yeah
- 34 E: mm
- 35 (1.1)
- 36 M: like (.) oh- my- f:rie:nd (0.5) was interested in
- 37 the (0.5) tourist?
- 38 E: mm-hm
- 39 M: so s (.) she: (0.7) ( )- tried to get the
- 40 information about wow oh ha ha ((wow is in response
- 41 to the start of a sudden heavy downpour)) (3.3) ha
- 42 ha .hh so heavy. (1.1) yeah (.) so: but (1.1) when
- 43 she (.) went to (0.8) Europe some (0.5) package
- 44 tour,
- 45 E: yeah ((both M and R speaking more loudly due to
- 46 noise from rain))
- 47 M: and uh (0.6) many (0.5) you know customer, (1.0)
- >48 tourists, (.) complained to the trav trav tourist?
- 49 [um
- >50 E: [oh to the tour guide?
- >51 M: tour guide
- 52 E: yeah
- 53 M: so: she: realize (0.7) I I she cannot ((said while
- 54 laughing)) .hh she cannot do like that job ((said
- 55 while laughing)) [ha ha
- 56 E: [oh okay yeah
- 57 M: wow huh ((in response to increased strength of
- 58 downpour))
- 59 (4.5)
- 60 E: when I uh (.) the first day I came to Hawaii
- 61 [I saw a rainbow,
- 62 M: [mm-hm

## Excerpt 5

- 1 E: when when is your birthday.  
 -->2 M: uh Ju- Ju::ne twenty:: one.  
 -->3 E: June twenty first?=  
 -->4 M: =first. yeah.  
 5 E: oh okay  
 6 (2.1)  
 7 M: sometimes I'm (.) confused you know like (0.8) if I  
 8 (.) say (.) my age  
 9 E: [yeah  
 10 M: [twenty one,  
 11 E: yeah=  
 12 M: =but if I say date (.) twenty first ha  
 13 [ha sometimes confusing you know  
 14 E: [yeah that can be confusing  
 15 (2.3)  
 16 M: mm  
 17 E: yeah I guess so  
 18 (1.6)  
 19 M: [(confusing)  
 20 E: [but uh: (1.0) in in Japanese also it's kind of  
 21 kind of (different) right?  
 22 M: yea:h actually  
 23 E: so the way you say the days ( ) in Japanese is  
 24 different from  
 25 M: mm=  
 26 E: =other numbers  
 27 M: yeah  
 28 E: sometimes (1.0) especially like- one through: (0.7)  
 29 uh one to ten.  
 30 M: yeah

In excerpt 2, lines 3 and 4, Mieko seems to be trying to say something like she has a two-day weekend every week, something she didn't have in Japan. If this is what she is trying to say, she seems to be having serious problems formulating it. She first says "every week," stretching the vowel in week, which is then followed by a half second pause. She says "week" again, glottalizing the final consonant before adding on "end."

She then says “I have,” pauses, says “two,” pauses again, and finally says “two weekend” with rising intonation. Eric then provides the phrase “two days” in line 5 which Mieko immediately incorporates in line 6. In excerpt 3, line 4, Mieko seems to be searching for the word “rerun,” but is unable to produce the entire word. Instead, she produces only “re,” stretching the vowel. Eric then provides the word in line 5, which Mieko immediately incorporates in line 6. In excerpt 4, line 5, Mieko produces the compound “tour guide” with an unusual pronunciation, apparently in response to Eric’s use of “tour guide” in line 3. When Mieko produces it in line 5, she uses rising intonation. Eric repeats it in line 6 and Mieko incorporates it in line 7. In line 48 of the same excerpt, Mieko appears again to be trying to produce “tour guide,” but instead produces “trav” twice, followed by “tourist” with rising intonation, and finally says “um” in overlap with Eric’s turn in line 50. In line 50, Eric recasts the last part of Mieko’s utterance by saying “to the tour guide,” and Mieko immediately incorporates “tour guide” in line 51. Finally, in excerpt 5, line 2, Mieko is providing an answer to Eric’s question about her birthday. She starts to say “June,” but cuts it off with glottalization. She then says “June” again, stretching the vowel, followed by “twenty,” in which the final vowel is also stretched, and finally “one” with falling intonation. Eric recasts this in line 3 with “June twenty-first,” with rising intonation, which Mieko immediately incorporates, with no pause, in line 4.

In each of these excerpts 2 through 5, but not in excerpt 1, Mieko can be seen appealing for help, or at least that her utterances are treated as appeals for help by both Eric and Mieko herself. In excerpt 2, this appeal is made through Mieko’s repetitions, pauses, and rising intonation on “two weekend.” In excerpt 3, this appeal is made by stretching the vowel in “re.” In excerpt 4, it is made through rising intonation on “tour guide” in line 5 and by repetition and rising intonation in line 48. And in excerpt 5, it is made through the cut-off of Mieko’s first try at “June” and by the vowel stretching in “June” and “twenty.” Following an appeal for help from Mieko, Eric’s offering of help becomes, to use the terminology of CA, conditionally relevant. That is, an offer of help becomes expected and failure to provide such help would be noticeable by its absence. It may be that Carroll is thinking about a different kind of relevance, the relevance of the propositional content of an utterance, not the relevance of an utterance as a next action. Still, I would argue that, in each of these cases, Mieko behaves as if she is able to construe Eric’s utterance as a correction, as a corrective recast, as a kind of negative evidence, not because it is irrelevant to the ongoing discourse, but because, in providing a correction, it performs an action, providing help, which at this moment in the interaction has become conditionally relevant. (See also recent articles by Kurhila (2001) and Ohta (2000) for similar findings.) jd

### ***Collaborative Blame Assignment***

Once an utterance has been construed as some kind of negative evidence, there arises the blame assignment problem, which is generally seen as a problem for the language learner. Upon receiving negative evidence such as a recast, and construing it as a correction, how does the learner decide what exactly is being corrected? I would like to argue that, in the excerpts presented here, the blame assignment problem is not so much a problem just for Mieko, the language learner, but a problem for both participants. It is a problem of intersubjectivity, or the maintenance of a shared understanding of what is going on in the interaction. In appealing for help, the problem becomes, for Mieko, how to indicate what it is that she needs help with. For Eric, the problem involves recognizing that an appeal is being made, recognizing what kind of help Mieko is appealing for, and deciding how to provide this help. A possible additional problem for Mieko involves showing that the help has or has not been adequate. In these excerpts, Mieko and Eric can be seen to deal with these intersubjective aspects of the blame assignment problem quite effectively. Mieko uses such things as rising intonation and vowel stretching to indicate where she needs help, which allows Eric to immediately provide the help in his next turn. This is then followed by immediate incorporation on Mieko's part, indicating the adequacy of the help provided.

### ***Being Qualified to Provide Negative Evidence***

Another point made by Carroll is that, in order for a language learner to construe an interlocutor's utterance as negative evidence, the learner must perceive the interlocutor as someone who is qualified to provide negative evidence. It can be illuminating, though, to look at this argument in a slightly different way. For any person, there are numerous, perhaps infinite, ways that that person can be truly categorized. For example, I can be categorized as a male, a Caucasian, a native speaker of English, a language teacher, a graduate student, a carnivore, a former bachelor, and so on, all of which are true. Mieko can be categorized as a female, an Asian, a native speaker of Japanese, a learner of English, a research subject, a person who's too young to drink according to Hawai'i state law, and so on. In interaction, though, only a limited number of these possible categorizations are relevant, are oriented to by participants as relevant. And only those categorizations which are oriented to as relevant can have what Schegloff (1991) has termed *procedural consequentiality* for how the interaction is organized. That is, categorizations which are oriented to by participants at a particular moment may influence the local sequential organization of interaction. I would like to argue that in excerpts 2 through 5, but not in excerpt 1 and not necessarily at other times during their

conversations, Mieko and Eric can be seen to be orienting to their roles as language learner and language teacher, or to their roles as novice user of English and expert user of English. This can be seen especially clearly in excerpts 4 and 5. In excerpt 4, lines 5 through 7, Mieko and Eric are orienting to these roles as, for Mieko, one who may make a mistake with the language and, for Eric, one who may provide a correction. In lines 7 through 12, though, Mieko clearly displays that she knows the meaning of *tour guide*, indicating that she does not need the word to be explained to her, and that she need not be categorized as a complete novice. Mieko then goes into a story about a friend who had considered becoming a tour guide, but thought better of it. Here, neither Mieko nor Eric seem to be orienting to roles as learner or teacher. There is, then, a brief reorientation to these roles in lines 48 through 51. In excerpt 5, orientation to the roles of learner and teacher starts at line 2. Starting in line 7, the discussion turns away from talk about when Mieko will be old enough to drink to the problems Mieko has with deciding on whether to use cardinal or ordinal numbers in English and the confusion that these different numbering systems cause her. Here, the participants' orientation to their roles as learner and teacher, or at least Mieko's orientation to these roles, results in a shift in the topic of conversation to a discussion of language as object. In this particular case, then, the sequence which includes the corrective recast, and the concurrent orientation of the participants to the roles of learner and teacher, exert a strong influence on the trajectory of the conversation.

### ***The Role of Negative Evidence***

Finally, there is Carroll's claim that, in order to serve as negative evidence, a correction must be related to something which the learner does not already know. Otherwise, it cannot lead to a restructuring of the learner's grammar. To quote from Carroll (2001):

Once a learner has acquired a grammatical distinction and can reproduce it at least some of the time, feedback and correction about it will merely provide the learner with evidence that she has made a performance mistake. This is not trivial if it leads the learner to stabilise production schemata, but it will not lead to restructuring of the mental grammar. (p. 385)

In excerpts 2 through 5, though, the feedback does seem to be related to things that Mieko already knows at least to some extent. I would like, not to claim, but just to speculate, that a major role for negative evidence, such as corrective recasts, perhaps *the* major role, is to help "stabilise production schemata," to help the learner gain control over a form that she is in the process of mastering.

## CONCLUSION

It bears emphasis that the analyses presented in this paper are based only on five excerpts from conversations between only two interlocutors. No claim is being made, for example, that in all cases in which a language learner behaves as if she is construing an utterance as negative evidence, the construal is the result of the learner appealing for help. Rather, this paper illustrates some of the resources learners may use to elicit negative evidence and to construe an interlocutor's utterance as negative evidence.

Rather than starting with a theoretical framework and making deductions about how corrective recasts fit into interaction or are construed as negative evidence, the analyses in the paper adopted the minimal, somewhat implicit, theoretical and analytic stance of CA. That is, that what people are doing in interaction is something that can be found by investigating quite closely the details of their interaction. Though based on a limited set of data, the analyses presented in this paper are empirically rather than theoretically grounded. As mentioned above, one of the purposes of this pilot study, and of a program of continuing research by the author, is to investigate the usefulness of CA as a methodology for SLA research. Markee (2000) argues that CA can be used to illuminate the details of how languages can be learned through interaction. By showing how appeals for help can provide a context for corrective recasts, how the blame assignment problem can be dealt with in and through interaction, and how participants in interaction can orient and reorient to roles as language novice and language expert, this research illustrates how CA can indeed be a useful methodology for the study of SLA.

## REFERENCES

- Carroll, S. E. (2001). *Input and evidence: The raw material of second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cheney, D. L., & Seyfarth, R. M. (1990). *How monkeys see the world: Inside the mind of another species*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Grimshaw, J., & Pinker, S. (1989). Positive and negative evidence in language acquisition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 341-342.
- Hauser, M. D. (1996). *The evolution of communication*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1083-1110.
- Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA: Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 51-78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation, volume one*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Schegolff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**APPENDIX A**

**TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS**

- . falling intonation
- ? rising intonation
- , continuing intonation
- : sound stretch
- cut-off with glottalization
- = latched utterances (absolutely no pause, almost overlap)
- [ beginning of overlap
- (.) micropause (less than 0.5 seconds)
- (1.0) pause longer than 0.5 seconds (length indicated inside parentheses)
- ( ) unintelligible speech
- (xx) best guess at almost unintelligible speech
- ((xx))verbal description
- ha ha laughter
- hh audible outbreath
- .hh audible inbreath

**APPENDIX B**  
**TRANSCRIPTS**

## Excerpt 1

- 1 M: but (0.7) before (.) like (0.6) two: weeks ago (.)  
 2 in: my dorm: (0.6) the girl (.) who is studying  
 3 (0.6) Japanese?=  
 4 E: =mm-hm  
 5 M: and uh (.) she asked (.) us (.) asked me (.) me I  
 6 mean (.) Japanese (.) we're (.) Japanese student?  
 7 you know about grammar?  
 8 E: yeah  
 9 M: nobody could uh nobody could answer [ha ha  
 10 E: [oh really?  
 11 M: .hh oh (0.5) yeah (0.9) eve[ryone (.) couldn't a-  
 12 E: [wha- (.) what was her  
 13 question=  
 14 M: =like (1.2) she:: asked like (0.6) the (1.0)  
 15 watashi ga: (.) like ((said while laughing)) (0.8)  
 16 like one word  
 17 E: mm-hm=  
 18 M: =ga? (0.7) what is this ga you know like ((said  
 19 while laughing))  
 20 E: oh okay=  
 21 M: =.hh (1.1) we (.) we could you know we could  
 -->22 understand the mean,  
 23 E: yeah=  
 24 M: =[but  
 -->25 E: [the meaning.  
 26 M: we (0.6) couldn't (0.7) know: like (.) how to  
 27 explain (1.5) but (.) ga is ga you know like ((said  
 28 while laughing)) (.) that's it  
 29 E: yeah (1.0) so (1.0) ga marks the sub- subject  
 30 right=  
 31 M: =yeah ((said while laughing))  
 32 E: the thing I could never understand about Japanese  
 33 is is the difference between like ga and wa.

- 34 M: mm  
 35 E: right [( )  
 -->36 M: [sometimes same mean: sometimes different  
 37 mean:=  
 38 E: =yeah=  
 39 M: =you know  
 40 E: that was (.) really hard ( )  
 41 M: yeah

## Excerpt 2

- 1 M: since I came here,  
 2 E: yeah  
 -->3 M: every wee:k (0.5) week- end I have (0.5) two (0.6)  
 -->4 two weekend?  
 -->5 E: two days  
 -->6 M: yeah two days, (0.9) so: ha ha .hh you know befor:e  
 7 I really ha ha I was really  
 8 hard ((said while laughing))  
 9 E: yeah (0.6) may maybe now you're getting spoiled  
 10 M: ha ha  
 11 E: it'll be [difficult to go back to Japan  
 12 M: [spoiled .hh  
 13 M: yeah very difficult I don't want to go back ((said  
 14 while laughing))

## Excerpt 3

- 1 M: my friend said (.) it's (.) kind of o:ld (.) old  
 2 one (.) like=  
 3 E: =oh okay  
 -->4 M: re::=  
 -->5 E: =(so) rerun  
 -->6 M: rerun. yeah. (2.1) I like comedy, (.) these days

## Excerpt 4

- 1 E: how about like a tour guide or something  
 2 M: sorry?  
 3 E: how about a tour- like a tour guide job

- 4 [or something  
 -->5 M: [tour guide? ((unusual pronunciation of *tour*))  
 -->6 E: tour guide  
 -->7 M: tour guide ((more target-like pronunciation, though  
 8 still unusual)) like travel=  
 9 E: =yeah  
 10 M: with (0.9) you know (.) customer  
 11 E: [yeah  
 12 M: [( ) travellers  
 13 E: yeah  
 14 M: ah but I heard it's very very hard [( )  
 15 E: [yeah I would  
 16 think so  
 17 M: ch- you know (0.8) passenger? you know (.) very-  
 18 always complain to ((while laughing)) [.hh  
 19 E: [yeah=  
 20 M: =ha ha .hh  
 21 E: yeah you get to travel a lot but you hafta take  
 22 care of many people=  
 23 M: =yes [so  
 24 E: [right (0.8) and (0.5) they're paying money so  
 25 maybe they they have lots of (0.8) things they wa-  
 26 they expect you to do  
 27 M: mm  
 28 E: yeah I wouldn't like that job  
 29 M: yeah (.) I want to travel (0.5) like myself or (.)  
 30 just (.) with t (0.9) um close friends something  
 31 ((said while laughing))=  
 32 E: =mm-hm=  
 33 M: =.hh yeah  
 34 E: mm  
 35 (1.1)  
 36 M: like (.) oh- my- f:rie:nd (0.5) was interested in  
 37 the (0.5) tourist?  
 38 E: mm-hm  
 39 M: so s (.) she: (0.7) ( )- tried to get the  
 40 information about wow oh ha ha ((*wow* is in response

- 41 to the start of a sudden heavy downpour)) (3.3) ha  
 42 ha .hh so heavy. (1.1) yeah (.) so: but (1.1) when  
 43 she (.) went to (0.8) Europe some (0.5) package  
 44 tour,  
 45 E: yeah ((both M and R speaking more loudly due to  
 46 noise from rain))  
 47 M: and uh (0.6) many (0.5) you know customer, (1.0)  
 -->48 tourists, (.) complained to the trav trav tourist?  
 49 [um  
 -->50 E: [oh to the tour guide?  
 -->51 M: tour guide  
 52 E: yeah  
 53 M: so: she: realize (0.7) I I she cannot ((said while  
 54 laughing)) .hh she cannot do like that job ((said  
 55 while laughing)) [ha ha  
 56 E: [oh okay yeah  
 57 M: wow huh ((in response to increased strength of  
 58 downpour))  
 59 (4.5)  
 60 E: when I uh (.) the first day I came to Hawaii  
 61 [I saw a rainbow,  
 62 M: [mm-hm

## Excerpt 5

- 1 E: when when is your birthday.  
 -->2 M: uh Ju- Ju::ne twenty:: one.  
 -->3 E: June twenty first?=  
 -->4 M: =first. yeah.  
 5 E: oh okay  
 6 (2.1)  
 7 M: sometimes I'm (.) confused you know like (0.8) if I  
 8 (.) say (.) my age  
 9 E: [yeah  
 10 M: [twenty one,  
 11 E: yeah=  
 12 M: =but if I say date (.) twenty first ha  
 13 [ha sometimes confusing you know

- 14 E: [yeah that can be confusing  
15 (2.3)  
16 M: mm  
17 E: yeah I guess so  
18 (1.6)  
19 M: [(confusing)  
20 E: [but uh: (1.0) in in Japanese also it's kind of  
21 kind of (different) right?  
22 M: yea:h actually  
23 E: so the way you say the days ( ) in Japanese is  
24 different from  
25 M: mm=  
26 E: =other numbers  
27 M: yeah  
28 E: sometimes (1.0) especially like- one through: (0.7)  
29 uh one to ten.  
30 M: yeah

Eric Hauser  
Department of Second Language Studies  
1890 East-West Road  
Honolulu HI, 96822

[hauser@hawaii.edu](mailto:hauser@hawaii.edu)