	Teaching the Speech Act of Greetings in Japan.
	ZEFF, B. Bricklin
	(181): 85-103
	2020-03-25

Teaching the Speech Act of Greetings in Japan.

B. Bricklin ZEFF

Abstract:

Greetings in Japan and the West differ in distinctive ways, yet some greeting practices are considered universal. The temporal greeting of "good morning" is typically acknowledged with a response of "good morning" in most languages. What makes this type of response differ from other responses often stems from the politeness rules (Brown & Levinson, 1987), related to particular social contexts. Nevertheless, in all contexts, the same set of issues needs to be considered for the production of an appropriate greeting. These include turn taking, face, and spatial and temporal issues. Greeting practices in Japan include culturally required honorifics because they are fundamentally grounded in and determined by a hierarchical status system (Burdelski, 2013; Okamoto, 1997). According to Okamoto (1997), "Both referent and addressee honorifics are most commonly regarded as markers of social distance—i.e., hierarchical relation, the lack of intimacy, or *soto* 'out-group' relations as opposed to *uchi* 'in-group' relations" (p.797). Few rules like this exist in American-English when it comes to greetings. Rather, the primary rule is that once a greeting is initiated, a response is required. Because of the complexity of its socio- pragmatic function and yet commonplace nature of its position in everyday communication, the speech act of greeting was chosen as the focus of this study to develop and test an assessment for measuring whether students can transfer pragmatic instruction as demonstrated in a computer-based test and in a natural setting (Zeff, 2017). This paper is adapted from work done for a dissertation focusing on pragmatics and speech act theory at Hokkaido University (Zeff, 2018).

Keywords: EFL, explicit, greetings, implicit, Japanese, pragmatic awareness, speech acts

1. Introduction

1.1 Greetings

According to Ebsworth et al. (1996), "Greetings are among the first speech acts that are learned by children in their native language" (p.89). Often, one of the first things a student is explicitly taught in the language classroom is how to perform a basic greeting. The utility that greetings perform in a communicative role is usually considered subordinate to other purposes in the ultimate goal of communication (Dufon, 1999). This subordinate position is often over-stated in the language classroom with very little attention given to the function greetings play in various cultures and how this may have some bearing on the ultimate goal of communication.

Variations within the greeting routine are often imbued with valuable cultural clues (Dufon, 1999). As Rivers (1983) pointed out, students "need to understand how language is used in relation to the structure of society and its patterns of inner and outer relationships, if they are to avoid clashes, misunderstandings, and hurt" (p.25). Greetings are an activity, and how people initiate communication. Misspeaking a greeting can be seen as rudeness or make someone uncomfortable in some societies. A misspoken greeting can impact a first impression or create the outcome of a lasting, sometimes negative, impression.

1.2. Communicative Competence

Communicative competence is a goal that many EFL teachers attempt to bring to the classroom. This can take many forms. One form is that of pronunciation to make your intent clear and easy to understand. The pronunciation of words or phrases can influence the prosody of the communicative task. Awareness of this type is important to getting meaning across in the way it is intended. This is awareness of the stress, intonation, rhythm and tone of an utterance. According to Zeff (2016):

Instruction in the production of language functions is crucial for EFL students to develop a command of speech acts that can be used fruitfully outside the classroom. Recent trends in language instruction in Japan have promoted communicative language teaching (CLT) to enhance the classroom experience albeit with mixed results and few concrete improvements. (p. 129)

2. The Study

2.1 Participants

For the full study three intact speaking classes at a private university were used. One class was part of the control data and two classes served as the treatment groups. During the three-

month period, 12 classes were held. An important characteristic for all students participating in the study was that they had limited experience communicating with native speakers.

Three separate classes with an average of 18 students in each were placed into three groups (n=60; 34 males; 26 females). One group was used for control and two groups were used for treatment. Sixty students completed all three of the computer-based tests, pre-, post- and delayed posttest. Thirty-six students completed all five sections of the evaluation including the applied production test: 11 from the control, 12 from Treatment Group 1, and 13 from Treatment Group 2. The disparity in numbers between the computer tests and applied production test was due to the logistics of carrying out such a study over three months and technical concerns for collecting the data.

2.2 Instructional Treatments

Students in all three groups had access to the website "English Central" (www.englishcentral. com), an online system for oral practice. Additionally, all students used one of two basic English conversation textbooks, *Touchstone 2 (1st Ed.)* (McCarthy, McCarten, & Sanford, 2005) and *English Firsthand Book 1 (Gold Edition)* (Helgesen, Brown, & Mandeville, 2004). Both of these books provided introductory lessons, which included opening patterns followed by basic conversation strategies and speech act patterns. For example, *Touchstone 2* addressed saying *no* in a friendly way, as well as such basic introductory questions as "Where are you from?" "Where do you live?" "What is your hobby?" and "What do you do in your free time?" Also, it introduced patterns for sharing information about the weather and past times.

English Firsthand Book 1 was used by the Control Group specifically because it does not address any particular pragmatic elements. *Touchstone 2* was used by both the implicit and explicit treatment groups, Treatment Group 1 and Treatment Group 2, respectively. The touchstone series has pragmatic elements throughout the book. For example, the first unit of *Touchstone 2*, "Making Friends" draws attention to aspects of the target speech act greetings and a conversation strategy that the students may gain awareness through implicit instruction. The term *conversation strategy* is used throughout this textbook to refer to basic strategies for participating in conversational acts.

The primary study began with both the Control Group and the two Treatment Groups completing an introductory unit in the class textbook that addressed greetings with limited pragmatic instruction. The instructor of the control group taught the unit as written in the textbook with no additional emphasis so as to not draw attention to the focus of the study. After the initial introduction to the course, all the students were given a pretest to evaluate their

understanding of greetings. Over the nine-week study period, both the treatment groups and control group covered three units in the textbook that addressed other speech acts, but they were only tested on greetings in the study. After nine weeks, there was an eight-week summer holiday. After the summer holiday, the students returned for the second semester. Most of the students did not have any contact with NSs during this time.

Table 1 illustrates the instructional treatment schedule. The instructional treatment of the two treatment groups, implicit (Treatment 1) and explicit (Treatment 2), lasted three weeks and five weeks respectively, at 30 minutes per session per week. The implicit group received 1.5 hours of implicit exposure to the greeting speech act in total. The explicit group received 2.5 hours of explicit instruction in total. However, review continued in practice for two weeks in the implicit groups and four weeks in the explicit group in that the instructor followed up with some practice with the students for 30-minute sessions per week. He added an additional 1 hour of focused exposure in the form of role play practice for the implicit group; and he added 2 hours of focused exposure, including both role plays and awareness building tasks in the form of journals and CA analysis for the explicit group, which consisted of addressing such questions as "What did they say?" "How did they say it?" and "What did you understand them to mean?" This type of analysis was very straightforward for greetings and provided a total of 2.5 hours of instruction for the implicit group and a total of 4.5 hours including instruction and practice over nine weeks for the explicit group (see Table 1).

There were several types of awareness-raising tasks. The first task consisted of students being asked to collect examples of the target structure of greetings in their daily life. To do this, students kept a greeting journal for one week where they recorded examples of greetings. For example, they were asked to keep a record of who the participants were, where the greeting occurred, and what was said. They were also allowed to use a few examples they observed in English speaking movies or TV shows that they were able to access through the university library. The examples collected were discussed and analyzed for similarities and differences with

Table 1. *Instructional Treatment Schedule*

Group	Week 3	Treatment Instruction Weeks 4-8	Review/Practice Weeks 9-12	Week 13	Week 21
Treatment 1 (*Implicit*)	Pretest	3 weeks x 30 minutes =1.5 hours	2 weeks x 30 minutes =1.0 hours	Posttest/Applied Production Test	Delayed Posttest
Treatment 2 (*Explicit*)	Pretest	5 weeks x 30 minutes =2.5 hours	4 weeks x 30 minutes =2.0 hours	Posttest/Applied Production Test	Delayed Posttest
Control	Pretest			Posttest/Applied Production Test	Delayed Posttest

the L1 and L2. Another awareness-raising task used was watching videos of greetings being performed on American TV shows. These shows were selected for the study and reflected situations that might be similar to students' experiences. This included meeting and greeting friends and teachers, as well as situations while shopping or moving around in their neighborhood. These examples were used to increase awareness of a variety of alternate routines available in everyday exchanges. Attention was drawn to the role of the participants, the relationship, and the imposition that may be present in each context. The students were also made aware of times when a greeting appeared inappropriate and how it was or could have been repaired by the speaker.

Using both the journal and TV show examples, additional words and phrases were taught that could be used to perform the greeting speech act and then practiced in role play activities. Additionally, the form-focused input tasks were presented in a structured role play where students were given a handout with a greeting routine and asked to use the additional words and phrases taught to practice exchanges with other students in the class. This exercise was used to practice and reinforce each week's learning. Students also were asked to fill in discourse completion tasks, which are considered effectual assessment tools for determining retention of learned language patterns (Barron, 2003; Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Johnston, Kasper, & Ross, 1998; Kasper, 2000). For the discourse completion tasks, students were given a handout with three situations that required either opening a greeting routine or responding to a greeting by providing the second adjacent pair part. After each situation was completed, the students discussed their responses in class.

For the implicit pragmatic instruction group, lessons from the textbook covered aspects of the greeting routine and demonstrated situations with a variety of greeting patterns. A lesson describing how to start a conversation with someone new was presented followed by the introduction of form-focus and awareness raising tasks. No explicit instruction was included in relation to the concepts involved with determining role, distance, and imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Role plays were conducted with a variety of scenarios presented in the textbook, but no special attention was given to appropriate or inappropriate language use. The teacher did, however, give feedback on the performances.

The control group was given textbook based instruction with no pragmatic elements. Only the elements within the textbook were addressed. No pragmatic elements were described in the first chapter which addressed greetings entitled "First Time Meeting." Some form focus and listening exercises were accompanied by written vocabulary and grammar practice. Certain interrogation questions were introduced, including "Where are you from?" and "What is your

hobby?" This presentation was without having explained any specific pragmatic knowledge or having practiced with any attention to the pragmatic elements. In sum, in the control group, the instructor did not pay any attention to pragmatic elements.

The implicit group was exposed to pragmatic elements of speech acts implicitly within the textbook which contained elements of pragmatic tasks within the lessons. The explicit group class given explicit pragmatic knowledge about the target speech act and performed exercises based on form focus, awareness raising, and task-based instruction in addition to the textbook lessons. The target speech act was addressed in both textbooks used by the three classes.

3. Measurements

3.1 Computer Assessment Methods

This study used two assessment methods to evaluate the instructional methods used in the study: (1) a computer-based pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest and (2) an applied production test. The first method was a computer-based pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest.

The pretest was administered seven days before the instructional treatment began, the posttest was administered seven days after treatment, and the delayed posttest was administered eight weeks after the instruction was completed. Two versions of the test were used—one version for the pretest and the second version for the post and delayed posttest. Test learning effects were minimized given the length of time between the post- and delayed posttest.

The five parts of the computer-based testing instruments featured scenarios focused only on greetings with the three sociolinguistic variables of Power, Degree of Imposition, and Distance as introduced by Brown and Levinson (1987). These greetings scenarios were related to two contexts: student life at school and student life outside of school (Takimoto, 2009) in keeping with the focus of the nine-week course of lessons.

The two versions (see Appendices A and B) of the test were developed by analyzing the responses and comments of more than 100 students over three years of a speech act course taught at the same university. The situations were counterbalanced so they would address similar target linguistic forms. The instructions for the tests were in English and Japanese. Each test was divided into five sections for a total of 10 questions. Four different types of questions were used. In Sections A and B, there were two types of DCT questions. Section C focused on pattern identifying test (PIT) questions. Section D consisted of AJT questions. These included input-based test sections, a DCT using structured language choices, structured discourse completion tests (SDCTs) to produce both greetings and appropriate responses, a PIT to evaluate awareness of greeting routine patterns, and an AJT that focused attention on the appropriateness of greeting routines.

There was also a video element that showed greeting situations with the second adjacent pair part missing. Students were asked to choose from four phrases that would be the most appropriate. Only one answer was possible. Section E was a video-based evaluation where students were shown a short video (eight seconds) with the second part of the adjacent pair removed. The computer then displayed three possible choices for providing the second adjacent pair part. This LT followed Takimoto's (2009) assessment framework.

The SDCTs had possible responses displayed with no output required. All possible choices were displayed in contrast to standard DCTs, where the participants were asked to produce language in written form appropriate to the situation. The latter types of test were considered output-based. By providing possible choices to complete the discourse, a limited range of linguistic forms were introduced. This type of testing allowed lower-level learners greater opportunity for expressing awareness of the target structures without burdening them with having to produce written examples, which may have been affected by time constraints or writing ability, which was not being tested.

In this study, all students were first given a computer-based pretest which included questions designed to evaluate general greeting practices, including the use of various expressions and their appropriateness in different contexts. As described earlier, this pretest was given three weeks into the first semester of classes. The posttest was administered nine weeks after the pretest, and its results offered a general comparison outline of the effectiveness of the teaching strategies applied to the treatment group. A delayed posttest was applied nine weeks after the posttest to observe whether the awareness of the greeting strategies taught was retained. The total time of the test was conducted over 21 weeks.

3.2. Reliability and Validity

One hundred and seven students took the pretest and 82 took the posttest to establish validity and reliability. These students were taken from six intact English- speaking classes at the university.

There were five sections in each test for a total score of 56 points. Section A consisted of two questions valued at 5 points for each correct answer. Section B consisted of three questions valued at 5 points for each correct answer. Section C consisted of one problem that asked students to arrange phrases into a conversation. There was only one possible solution, and this was valued at 5 points. Section D consisted of three sample conversations and the students were asked to judge the appropriateness of the conversations on a scale of 1 to 7. Seven points were given for a correct answer with 6 points allotted for a second level judgment. Section E consisted of a video display

with four possible answers to complete an adjacent pair part. There was only one possible solution, and this was valued at 5 points. These values are depicted in Table 2.

Table 2. *Test Sections and Scoring*

Section A	Section B	Section C	Section D	Section E	Total Score
2 Questions×5 =10	3 Questions×5 =15	1 Question×5 =5	3 Questions×7 =21	1 Question×5 =5	10 Questions 56

The pretest and posttest were evaluated using Cronbach's alpha reliability estimates for each section (see Table 3). The same questions used for the posttest were also used for the delayed posttest. The two versions of the test, pre- and post-, had the same section types and numbers of questions but with different questions of similar content and structure. Of the five sections, however, only three were calculated using this measurement because sections C and E only consisted of one question and thus did not adhere to the criteria for Cronbach's alpha. Yet, these questions were important to provide targeted data for evaluating pragmatic competence for the test as a whole. The internal consistency estimates for Sections A (0.74) and D (0.67) were demonstrated as statistically significant; however, Section B (0.33) was low in reliability because of one question that appeared problematic. Whereas it is possible to remove the question for future analysis, it was left in because it provided a balance to the other two questions in the section. The question may have been too easy compared to the other questions, but including it in the analysis balanced the possible difficulty of the other two questions within the range of statistical significance. The total score for both versions was within range of acceptable reliability.

Table 3. *Cronbach's Alpha*

	Total	Section A	Section B	Section D
Pretest n=107	0.75	0.74	0.33	0.67
Posttest n=83	0.75	0.52	0.40	0.72

To establish the validity of the testing model, the total number of students that participated in the pretest was 107. This allowed a large sample for determining statistical significance of the testing instrument. Eighty-three of those students participated in the posttest.

The validity was tested using measurement equation modeling through AMOS, and a tested model of greeting pragmatic competence was created. Specifically, in the model, sections A through E have paths to the total, which indicates that scores in these five sections represent

elements for understanding of greeting speech acts. According to these data, $\chi^2=.105$, $d/f=2$ proved a p-value=.94, which is considered not significant. This result indicated that this model can be adopted. RMR=.09 is close to 0, which indicated a good fit. GFI=.99 with the AGFI=.99 are both close to 1, which indicated this model is valid. This result shows that the test questions are structured in such a way as to allow the students' responses and subsequent scoring to demonstrate understanding of the greeting speech act.

3.3. Real-Life Assessment

A real-life (Bachman, 1990) assessment of a greeting situation was created as part of the overall study. A unique assessment strategy in an Applied Productive Oral Performance was developed to better observe the roles these types of instruction played in raising students' awareness of the target speech act, as well as their competence level (Zeff, 2017). This type of testing gave the instructor a chance to observe each student's attempt to perform the speech act in a real-life scenario, thereby creating a more authentic testing method. This, in turn, allowed the instructor to see what was effective and what might need more attention to improve the processing of this input and thereby to improve communicative competence. The results of a rubric developed for the study were evaluated with four raters for accuracy. These raters were calibrated to represent the most accurate representation of a performance of the targeted speech act.

3.4. Results

The results of the pretest and posttest had a small increase with Treatment Group 2, but this increase could have been a result of familiarity with the technology or testing tool because this researcher was the instructor for that group. The number difference was only seven points and, therefore, not significant. This result and that of the non-significant computer-based test suggested a need for additional examination with the applied production test, which assessed the effects of implicit and explicit pragmatic instruction. The strongest group overall in the applied production test was the Control Group, in which all the students provided adequate greetings overall. This surprising result might be attributed to individual level or experience. For example, I was not able to control for students who had studied abroad. I did not learn whether any of the students from the full data set went abroad during the summer break between the post and delayed posttesting. While the data did show a small increase in use of the target structures, *chat greeting*, and *greeting on the run* by Treatment Groups 1 and 2, the fact that the Control Group was rated the highest deserves additional study and consideration.

The quantitative data provided some evidence of increasing student competence in greetings, at least by written test standards where numbers unambiguously suggest results. However, the data from the applied production test produced language to analyze, which clearly is crucial for language studies research (Zeff, 2017). Such data could undergo a variety of different analyses to include word frequency or time lapse. A new study that removes some of the individual variables among students might lead to clearer data. Selecting students based on previous experience with native American-English speaker conversations also might help to reconsider the value of this approach and to analyze the data.

Regarding a need for additional and varied testing to establish some communicative competence, this dissertation study's testing showed that students who receive mid- to low-scores on DCTs compared to students of similar experience and levels can perform adequately in a real-life applied production testing scenario. This ability to perform certainly may assist the students in understanding how they may do in their future English-speaking life; it may also spur them to seek additional opportunities to learn and practice such speech acts as greetings.

The overall study data was inconclusive in that Treatment Groups 1 and 2 in the applied production test did not score higher than the Control Group. However, the tools appear to have tested the subjects with a real-life performance.

4. Conclusion

This research study examined greetings, which are functionally different in use in Japanese and American English. In Japan, greeting practices are complex primarily because there are culturally required honorifics connected to appropriate means of address, and Japanese greetings are fundamentally grounded and determined by a hierarchical system of status (Burdelski, 2013; Okamoto, 1997). In American English, there are few, if any, culturally required honorifics surrounding greetings (Ebsworth, Bodman, & Carpenter, 1996; Goffman, 1971; Kakiuchi, 2005), making the greeting speech act somewhat tricky for Japanese users of English. The primary rule is that an initiated greeting requires a response. The complexity of its socio-pragmatic function and yet commonplace nature in everyday communication made the greetings speech act ideal for research. In the research and following study, by developing and testing a real-life setting assessment process, an attempt was made to answer the question, "do greeting need to be explicitly taught," but not only for greetings, but for any speech act to build pragmatic awareness

Providing pragmatics knowledge and practice for EFL students helps to prepare them to make new friends, build new relationships, be effective employees, and be safe and secure in the English-speaking world. In this research study, I proposed to demonstrate effective ways to

enhance students' awareness of pragmatic rules related to American-English greeting routines. To determine the effectiveness of the pragmatics instruction, I used both implicit and explicit instruction in addition to standard textbook instruction. I developed discrete form tests that required students to exhibit the skills and information they had been taught. I also used an applied production test using a real-life scenario to learn whether the students could perform greetings spontaneously with a native American-English speaker in an appropriate manner. Even though the computer-based testing scores were inconclusive, the applied production test provided data that showed that many of the students could perform a greeting in an appropriate manner. From a survey conducted with native English teachers throughout Japan, being able to greet Japanese non-native speakers seemed to be an area for improvement. In this study, I sought to develop an instructional and assessment method geared to enhancing such learning in the EFL classroom in Japan.

Most studies dealing with pragmatics in the Japanese classroom consist of DCTs, Acceptability Judgment Tests (AJTs), Pattern Identifications, and/or role play performances (Hill, 1997; Houck & Gass 1996; Ishihara, 2003; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987; Takahashi & DuFon 1989; Takimoto, 2009). This study presents a fifth evaluation section as a way to collect more natural data in the form of a test of applied productive oral performance, which is an oral communication attempt. Observing nonnative speakers' attempts at speech acts is a valuable tool for assessing ability (Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

An objective of this study was to develop real-life tests for the EFL classroom to give students the chance to demonstrate their ability to perform a greeting appropriately. The assessment described in this study could be applied to other classroom practices of pragmatic language acts and to studies of student language communicative competence. Additionally, such pragmatic instruction can be further used with other Asian students who may be challenged with similar or other discrete pragmatic speech acts.

Moreover, these assessments were not only used as a means for assessing ability but also as a part of the process for instruction, providing feedback to the students, and continuing education in the communicative aspect of language education. By doing so, these tests sought to address the idea Barraja-Rohan (2000) expressed: "If what we teach is real life, then the students will be able to transfer that knowledge into the real world" (p.68).

This study isolated one speech act, the greeting between JNNS and American-English NS, and investigated it. The study led to considering certain problems Japanese learners of English might have with this speech act. Certainly, the speech act of greetings is very important to good communication. Although some students gain this knowledge throughout their education in Japan

and some do not, it is important from an educational perspective to point out the differences a given culture can have with any speech act. Education in the appropriate and competent use of speech acts are an important part of L2 educational goals.

References:

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

Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2000). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with conversation analysis. In A. J. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (Eds.), *Teaching languages, teaching cultures* (pp.65–77). Melbourne: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burdelski, M. (2013). Socializing children to honorifics in Japanese: Identity and 127 stance in interaction. *Multilingua, 32*(2), 247–273.

Ebsworth, M., Bodman, J., & Carpenter, M. (1996). Cross-cultural realization of greetings in American English. In S. Gass & J. Neu (eds.) *Speech acts across cultures. Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp.89–107). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public.* New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers.

Helgesen, M., Brown, S., & Mandeville, T. (2004). *English firsthand 1: Gold edition.* Hong Kong: Longman Asia ELT.

Hill, T. (1997). *The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University Japan, Tokyo.

Houck, N., & Gass, S (1996). Non-native refusal: A methodological perspective. In S. M Gass and J. Neu (eds.) *Speech acts across cultures.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 45–64.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua, 8*(2/3), 223–248.

Ishihara, N. (2003). Giving and responding to compliments. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & R. Mahan-Taylor (Eds.), *Teaching pragmatics.* Washington DC: Office of English Programs, U.S. Department of State. Retrieved from http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Kakiuchi, Y. (2005). Greetings in English: Naturalistic speech versus textbook speech. In D. H. Tatsuki & N. R. Houck (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language learning, theory and practice* (pp.61–86). Tokyo: Pragmatics Special Interest Group of the Japan Association for Language Teaching.

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp.316–341). London: Continuum.

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

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* Oxford: Pergamon.

McCarthy, M., McCarten, J., & Sanford, H. (2005). *Touchstone 2, Student's book.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Okamoto, S. (1997). Social context, linguistic ideology, and indexical expressions in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*, 795–817.

Rivers, W. (1983). *Communicating naturally in a second language: Theory and practice in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takahashi, S., & DuFon, M. (1989). *Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: The case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of English as a Second Language, University of Hawai`i at Manoa. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED370439).

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT Journal, 8*(2), 131–155.

Takimoto, M. (2009). Exploring the effects of input-based treatment and test on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(5), 1029–1046.

Zeff, B. (2016). The pragmatics of greetings: Teaching speech acts in the EFL classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 54*(1), 2-11.

Zeff, B. (2017). The assessment process as real-life performance: Rethinking assessment of pragmatic instruction in the Japanese EFL classroom. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 129–140.

Zeff, B. (2018). Pragmatic Teaching and Japanese EFL Learners' Use of Greeting Routines Unpublished Dissertation. Hokkaido University.

APPENDIX A
Greetings Quiz: Pretest

A) Please select the answer(s) you think is (are) appropriate.

1. What phrase(s) can you use to respond to the following greeting? (You can choose up to 4):
   "How's it going?"
   a. Great.
   b. I'm fine, thank you. And you?
   c. What's up?
   d. Terrible.

2. What is the <u>first</u> thing you can say to someone the first time you meet them? (You can choose up to 4):
   a. Where are you from?
   b. Nice to meet you.
   c. What do you do?
   d. Hello. My name is _____.

B) Read the situation. Select the best answer.

3. You meet your professor in front of the elevator. You can say . . .
   a. Hey, Bill.
   b. Good afternoon, Professor.
   c. Hi.

4. You are in your English class. A new student sits down next to you. You can say . . .
   a. Where are you from?
   b. Do you like English?
   c. Hi, my name is Jim.

5. You are a worker and you are sitting at your desk. A new co-worker comes into the office. Your boss brings the new co-worker over to your desk. Your boss says: "Hey Ken, this is Miki Tanaka. She will be working with us from today." You stand up and can say . . .
   a. Nice to meet you.
   b. I'm Ken Takawa.
   c. Where are you from?

C) Arrangement

6. Arrange the following phrases to make a conversation, 1-5. One phrase is not used.

_____ Great. And you?

_____ Good afternoon

_____ How's it going?

_____ Good afternoon

_____ Pretty good, thank you.

_____ Nice to meet you.

D) Rate the following conversations from 1 to 7, 1 for least appropriate and 7 for most appropriate.（以下の会話文を読んで，それらの会話が状況に適したものであるか，適している度合いを1から7（7が最も適している）からえらびなさい。）

7. Two people are standing on a train platform in Tokyo. One is Japanese (J). The other is non-Japanese (NJ). The train platform is not crowded.

    J) Hello. Nice to meet you. I am Kimura.

    NJ) Hello, Kimura.

    J) Where are you from?

    NJ) California.

    J) I know California. I went to San Francisco.

    NJ) Oh really. That's great.

    J) Yes.

    (The train comes and the conversation ends.)

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Three people are at the airport waiting at the arrival gate. They are Japanese (J). A fourth person, a non-Japanese (NJ), comes out the gate and joins them.

    J1) Hi, Rebecca! Welcome to Japan.

    NJ) Thanks, Yumiko. It's nice to finally meet you.

    J1) Yes. It's nice to meet you, too. Rebecca, these are my parents.

    J2+J3) How do you do, Rebecca?

    NJ) How do you do Mr. and Mrs. Suzuki?

    J1) How was your flight?

    NJ) It was good. I am very tired. It took 10 hours!

    (They walk together toward the parking area.)

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Two co-workers pass by each other in the hallway of their office. It is the first time they meet that day. One is Japanese (J). The other is non-Japanese (NJ).

  NJ) Good morning, Keiko.

  J) How's it going, Matt?

  (They do not stop and continue in opposite directions)

  1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX B
Greeting Quiz: Posttest and Delayed Posttest

A) Please select the answer(s) you think is (are) appropriate.

1. What phrase(s) can you use to respond to the following greeting? (You can choose up to 4):
   "Good afternoon."
   a. I'm fine, thank you. And you?
   b. Good afternoon.
   c. What's good about it?
   d. What's up?

2. What is the <u>first</u> thing you can say to someone the first time you meet them? (You can choose up to 4):
   a. How's it going?
   b. Good morning.
   c. Where are you from?
   d. Nice to meet you.

B) Read the situation. Select the best answer.

3. You meet a friend in front of the elevator. You can say . . .
   a. Hey, Takeshi.
   b. Good afternoon, Takeshi.
   c. (Say nothing.)

4. You are walking down the hallway of your school. You see your professor. It is 9:00 AM. You can say . . .
   a. Good morning.
   b. Hey.
   c. Hello.

5. You are at a homestay in an English-speaking country. You return from school to your homestay house. You enter the house and see your host-mother with a person you have never met in the living room sitting on a sofa and chatting. Your host-mother calls you over and says: "Hey Ken, this is my old friend Betty. She is visiting from Florida and stopped by to say hello." You walk over and say . . .
   a. Great to meet you.
   b. I'm Ken Takawa.

c. Where are you from?

C) Rearrange the following phrases to make a conversation. One phrase is not used.

6. How long have you been waiting?

_____ Beautiful day, isn't it?

_____ Yes. It is.

_____ Good morning.

_____ About 10 minutes.

_____ Talk to you later.

_____ Good morning.

D) Rate the following conversations from 1 to 7, 1 for least appropriate and 7 for most appropriate.（以下の会話文を読んで，それらの会話が状況に適したものであるか，適している度合いを 1 から 7 （7 が最も適している）からえらびなさい。）

7. Two people are standing on a train platform in Tokyo. One is Japanese. The other is not Japanese. The train platform is not crowded. One is Japanese (J). The other is non-Japanese (NJ).

J) Excuse me, may I ask you a question?

NJ) Sure.

J) Where are you from

NJ) California.

J) I know California. I went to San Francisco.

NJ) Oh really. That's great.

J) Yes.

(The train comes and the conversation ends.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Two people are at the airport waiting at the arrival gate. They are Japanese. A third person, a non-Japanese, comes out the gate and joins them. Two are Japanese (J). The other is non-Japanese (NJ).

NJ) I'm Rebecca! You must be Yumiko.

J1) Nice to meet you. My name is Yumiko.

NJ) Good to meet you too.

J1) How was your flight?

NJ) It was good. I am very tired. It took 10 hours!

(They walk together toward the parking area.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Two co-workers pass by each other in the hallway of their office. It is the first time they meet that day. One is Japanese (J). The other is non-Japanese (NJ).

NJ) Hey, Keiko.

J) Hi, Matt.

(They do not stop and continue in opposite directions)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7