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ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the features of intonation used by Japanese English as a Foreign Language Learners (JEFLs) in terms of their realisation of illocutionary forces. Recordings of JEFLs reading dialogues with instructed intentions were analysed and compared with ‘standard’ models from Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) and Roach (2000). The results showed that, overall, JEFLs used a falling tone irrespective of intention. This could indicate a blanket inability to realise illocutionary force through intonation. However, some tendencies were also apparent in the data. For example, unlike the models, some JEFLs used rising or level tone to realise the illocutionary force of ‘implication, possibility’, whereas, in line with the models, some JEFLs used rise–fall tone to realise the illocutionary force of ‘exclamation’. Evidence also showed that the group of high-proficiency subjects used a wider variety of tones than the low group. These results suggest that teaching and learning the relations between intonation and illocutionary forces are needed and that fundamental elements such as pitch ranges may be the primary need, particularly for low-proficiency groups.

Current situation of pronunciation teaching in Japan

It has been more than a decade since trends in pronunciation teaching changed direction and communicative approaches came to English language teaching in Japan. Even so, teaching in the area of suprasegmentals (for example stress and tone) is still in its infancy, and may be even less recognised in the Japanese context than elsewhere. Although the teaching of suprasegmentals is slowly gaining recognition as an integral part of language teaching, the teaching of pronunciation is still not systematic in Japan and materials are still not entirely satisfactory. Even worse, intonation teaching is frequently left out of programs altogether, or based only on teachers’ intuitive knowledge.

Pragmatic function of intonation

The functions of English intonation have been described in numerous studies (Couper-Kuhlen 1986; Kenworthy 1987; Tench 1990, 1996;
Cruttenden 1997; Roach 2000). Most of these studies proposed three to six functions of intonation: grammatical, attitudinal or emotional, and style functions are commonly described. In addition, illocutionary functions, as noted by Couper-Kuhlen, and communicative functions, as in Tench, can be summarised under pragmatic function and information structure. Of these, the pragmatic functions of intonation are the focus of this paper.

The following well-known example (from Gumperz 1982) clearly illustrates the pragmatic function of intonation. The setting is a service encounter in a cafeteria.

an Indian attendant: //GRAvya//

a British attendant: //GRAvya//

Because of her falling intonation, the Indian attendant in this example was perceived as ‘surly and uncooperative’ (Gumperz 1982: 173) by her supervisors when she served patrons. Her falling tone was interpreted as simply conveying an announcement, while a British attendant would most probably have said the word ‘gravy’ with a rising tone when making an offer. ‘[T]he pragmatic role of intonation can be potent in conveying the speaker’s intention in speech acts (Searle 1969) such as persuasion, making excuses, or apologies’ (Clennell 1997: 121). In other words, the pragmatic function of intonation is to indicate the speaker’s illocutionary force (IF), that is, in Austin’s and Searle’s terms, it is an IF-indicating device (Austin 1962; Searle 1969). It is important to note that, as illustrated in the example above, a speaker’s intonation can convey unintended meanings.

The importance of the pragmatic function of intonation

Until recently, areas such as pragmatics, suprasegmentals and non-verbal communication have not had a strong focus in second language (L2) learning. Hurley (1992: 259) argues the importance of teaching these areas to L2 learners: ‘Learning skills in these areas [pragmatics, prosody and non-verbal communication] could enable L2 learners to communicate more effectively, without having inappropriate gestures or conversational strategies sabotage the communicative intent of their utterances.’ Moreover, in research into communication strategies, which have been prominent recently, it is essential for L2 learners to perceive and recognise acoustic and pragmatic differences. In L2 learning, pronunciation learning involves learning how to articulate various sounds, and also learning how to understand the sometimes complex relationships between sound and meaning (Pennington and Richards 1986; Celce-Murcia, Brinton and Goodwin 1996).
In the Japanese setting, the strong influence of the functional–notional approach is evident in the Japanese Course of Study description to illustrate the importance of the pragmatic function of intonation (Ministry of Education 1998, 1999). In order to realise the functions or notions included in the Course of Study, students have to use language appropriately, and this includes knowing how to use suprasegmental features appropriately to convey their intended meanings.

As far as the teaching of intonation is concerned, Celce-Murcia, Brinton and Goodwin (1996) note that Allen’s (1971) pedagogical suggestions are still effective. According to Allen, teachers should:

1. direct students’ attention to a few major patterns
2. alert students to differences between the punctuation system and the intonation system
3. distinguish between the intonation of isolated sentences and the intonation of segments in extended discourse
4. teach students to think in terms of the speakers’ intention in any given speech situation (Allen 1971: 73; italicised by Yamato).

Celce-Murcia, Brinton and Goodwin (1996: 218) extend this list and suggest ‘using the notions of given and new information’ and ‘alerting students to similarities and differences between the L1 and L2’ as additional points. Yet information structure and the pragmatic functions of intonation are still overlooked in the current teaching situation in Japan.

Numerous research studies have attempted to deal with intonation from various perspectives. Some have considered the attitudinal function of English (Uldall 1972; Graham, Hamblin and Feldstein 2001), while others have focused on approximation to native speakers (Derwing and Munro 1997; Munro and Derwing 1999). However, few studies have dealt with the pragmatic function of intonation (see Luthy 1983; Yamato 2000). Further, descriptions of intonation use by JELLLs in terms of conveying intentions (that is pragmatic function) have not been investigated either, despite numerous phonetic descriptions of their intonation (Nakaji 1993; Watanabe 1994; Sugito 1996a, 1996b; Hosaka 1998; Sato 1999).

This study is, therefore, motivated by the fact that although the pragmatic function of intonation has a direct influence on the realisation of functions and notions, it has generally been overlooked in English pronunciation teaching in Japan.
Research questions
In order to describe the intonation used by JEFLLs from the viewpoint of realisation of IFs (that is pragmatic function), the following research questions are addressed:

1. Do JEFLLs realise IFs through intonation, as in the standard models, or in some other way?
2. Are there any differences in intonation use according to JEFLLs’ proficiency?

To answer these questions, the study outlined below was conducted.

Experiment
PARTICIPANTS
The participants in this experiment were 45 students at the National Nursing College in Hiroshima (3 male, 42 female) and 53 students at the National University in Hiroshima (15 male, 38 female). They ranged in age from 18 to 36, with an average of 20.1 years. Fifty-three participants, most of whom were university students, had previously visited English-speaking countries. Prior to the experiment, an edited version of the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) listening section (Harris and Palmer 1986) was administered to the participants in order to distinguish high- and low-proficiency groups. Table 1 shows the scores of this test.

Table 1: JEFLLs’ score of CELT listening section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sample</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>median</th>
<th>mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFLLs overall</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>36.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-JEFLLs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-JEFLLs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting the average score as a pivotal point, participants who scored more than the average plus one Standard Deviation (SD) are included in the high-proficiency group (H-JEFLLs) and those who scored less than the average minus one SD are included in the low-proficiency group (L-JEFLLs). A t test showed a significant difference between these two groups (t = 40.59, p < .05).

MATERIALS
In order to categorise the IF, the description provided by Tench (1996), which relates intonation and IFs, was adopted. Aware of speech act theory,
Tench includes the communicative function of intonation in his overall framework. He groups the pragmatic function of intonation into three broad categories: ‘information, reality and belief’, ‘suasion’ and ‘social exchanges’. Under each category, speech act types are allotted based on the idea that a falling tone is used when the speaker is dominant and a rising tone is used when the speaker is deferent (see Appendix A). Tench’s categorisation is useful because it is explicit in terms of the relations between intonation and IFs.

The nine dialogues used in the experiment were selected on the basis that they:

1. were relatively short in order to minimise the involvement of other factors;
2. had a clear relation between intonation used and an IF; and
3. were considered as a discourse, that is consisting of at least an adjacency pair.

As they fulfilled these requirements, dialogues were extracted from Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) and Roach (2000), as shown in Appendix B.

PROCEDURE

The experiment was conducted between January and March 2002. A language laboratory at the university and a room at the nursing college, both of which were suitably quiet, were used for the recordings. Nine dialogues were presented to the participants. Each dialogue had explanations on the context and the intention of speaker B, and participants were directed to read aloud the line as if they were speaker B (see Appendix B). Participants were asked to respond to speaker A’s line, which was played from an MD1 player. They were given five minutes to prepare for the recording.

All the speech data recorded on the MD was converted into, and saved as, wave files. In the analysis of the speech data by computer software Onseirokubunken (Datel 2002) and Sugi Speech Analyzer (Sugito 2001), speech samples from Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) and Roach (2001) were considered as standard reference points against which the participants’ speech data were compared. In other words, the analysis by computer software was used to show how close participants’ speech data were to the Brazil, Coulthard and Johns, and Roach models.

The dialogues from Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) and Roach (2000) were written; the utterances in Roach were single syllable, as in ‘yes’,
and those in Brazil, Coulthard and Johns had four syllables, as in ‘in the cupboard’. These items had been used with Japanese learners of English in Yamato (2000) and found to carry differences in pitch and so can be considered suitable intonation models against which to compare the participants’ speech data.

Results and discussion

In this section, the overall results are presented and discussed prior to considering the results that relate to JEFLL proficiency levels (that is H-JEFLLs and L-JEFLLs).

OVERALL RESULTS

As mentioned above, the participants’ speech data was compared with the intonation models. If the same intonation pattern was used by the participants, that dialogue was considered to be a correct answer3. Table 2 illustrates the number of correct answers JEFLLs obtained in the nine dialogues. If the task is considered to be a test worth nine points, the mean score of JEFLLs was 1.77. This score clearly reflects the fact that most JEFLLs got one point from dialogue 1, but few points elsewhere.

Table 2: Tone choice of JEFLLs for each dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dialogue illocutionary force</th>
<th>1 statement</th>
<th>3 warning</th>
<th>2 implication, possibility</th>
<th>4 exclamation, approval, disapproval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tone choice</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>rise</td>
<td>fall–rise</td>
<td>rise–fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall–rise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise–fall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Shaded cell represents the correct tone choice, ie same tone choice as model)

As can be seen from Table 2, in terms of dialogues, 93 of 98 JEFLLs gave the correct answer (that is they chose a falling tone) for dialogue 1. The second best performance, however, was much weaker: only 25 JEFLLs chose a rise–fall tone in dialogue 8. In the other dialogues, less than 20 JEFLLs chose the correct tones. Where incorrect intonation was used, it is interesting to note which tones were chosen. From Table 2, it is clear that the majority of JEFLLs chose a falling tone on all of the dialogues except dialogues 5 and 6, where 20 and 42 JEFLLs respectively chose falling tone.
The least-used tone choices were the complex tones of fall–rise and rise–fall, with 25 and 66 instances respectively, across all nine dialogues. Even when JEFLs chose complex tones, their pitch shifts were not quite as steep as those of the models. To summarise these results, JEFLs tend to use simple tones, in particular falling tone, rather than complex tones, irrespective of the intention of the dialogues.

**ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE**

*Illocutionary force of ‘statement’ (dialogue 1)*

Ninety-three JEFLs correctly used falling tone for dialogue 1 (that is performing the IF ‘statement’), two JEFLs used rising tone, and three used a level tone. The reason why so many JEFLs matched the model is likely to be that this IF requires only that a proposition be conveyed and this seems simpler and easier than the other IFs. Moreover, the falling tone or ‘declination’ is the simplest tone and can occur naturally (Trask 1996: 102). These factors explain the large number of instances of correct tone choice in this dialogue and, conversely, help explain the scarce number of correct tone choices in other dialogues.

*Illocutionary force of ‘warning’ (dialogue 3)*

In the ‘warning’ dialogue 3, 90 JEFLs chose a falling tone rather than the rising tone of the model; two JEFLs used a rising tone, one used a rise–fall tone, three used fall–rise and two used a level tone.

![Figure 1: Intonation contour by a JEFL (no 19) from dialogue 3, ‘in the cupboard’](image)
The pattern of these results seems to be similar to those for dialogue 1 (see Table 2, page 61). However, most of the 90 JEFLLs applied additional prosodic elements: shifting prominence and providing additional power. For example, many JEFLLs shifted prominence from ‘in the cupboard’ to ‘in the cupboard’, and they put extra power on the prominent elements (see Figure 1). Thus, in realising the IF of ‘warning’, JEFLLs utilise additional prosodic elements such as prominence shift and extra power to distinguish this IF from that of a ‘statement’.

Illocutionary force of ‘implication, possibility’ (dialogues 2, 5 and 6)
Turning to the dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, 5, 10 and 5 JEFLLs respectively scored correct answers. However, with regard to dialogues 5 and 6, as previously noted, the proportion of JEFLLs using falling tone was relatively low (20 and 42 respectively): 38 and 16 used a rising tone, and 28 and 33 selected a level tone respectively (see Figures 2 and 3).

These results suggest that the IF of ‘implication, possibility’ is related to the use of a rising tone or a level tone for JEFLLs, since a large number of them used a rising or a level tone in order to realise this IF. The use of these two different tones was also related to proficiency level, as will be discussed later.

Interestingly, dialogue 2 does not seem to show the same tendency, and this may be due to the complexity of the utterance. Dialogue 2 consists of four syllables and this complexity might have led to the use of the most basic tone (that is, a falling tone). Even so, 5 JEFLLs chose the correct answer, 9 chose rising tone and 12 chose level tone. This choice of tones is, in fact, similar to that made in dialogues 5 and 6.
Illocutionary force of ‘exclamation’ (dialogues 4, 7, 8 and 9)

In the dialogues of ‘exclamation’, 6, 17, 25 and 13 JEFLLs respectively scored correct answers using a rise–fall tone (see Figure 4). Although a falling tone was the dominant tone choice in these dialogues (for 78, 81, 68 and 71 participants respectively), other choices did not scatter in the same pattern as with the dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, indicating a different relationship between the IF of ‘exclamation’ and rise–fall tone.
Summary of illocutionary force

Overall, the most noticeable tendency is for JEFLLs to use a falling tone, and this may even suggest that they cannot realise IFs through intonation. However, there are two possible explanations for their performances. One is that JEFLLs made use of other prosodic features such as power and shifting prominence, as seen in the dialogue of ‘warning’. The other possibility is that they could not distinguish the functions of intonation and tended to use the most basic and simple tone, that is, falling tone. Since JEFLLs did not use particular prosodic features in the dialogues other than ‘warning’, the latter reason seems to be the more plausible explanation.

Despite the fact that most of the JEFLLs selected a falling tone, some significant tendencies could be seen in the results for the IFs of ‘implication, possibility’ and ‘exclamation’. In these dialogues, some of the JEFLLs could manipulate intonation in order to perform the IF. For example, in the dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, some attempted to perform the IF using a rising tone or a level tone, and a considerable number did use a rise–fall tone correctly in the dialogues of ‘exclamation’. Thus, in spite of the overall preference for using a falling tone, some JEFLLs used a rising or a level tone in order to perform ‘implication, possibility’, and it was not uncommon for some JEFLLs to use rise–fall tone to perform ‘exclamation’.

PROFICIENCY

Table 3 (page 66) shows the distributions of H- and L-JEFLLs’ tone choice in each dialogue, and clearly shows the overall tendency of both groups to choose falling tone. Indeed, for both groups, a falling tone seemed to be dominant except in dialogues 5 and 6. However, the rate of falling tone use overall by H-JEFLLs was less than that of L-JEFLLs (65% and 81% respectively). This shows that H-JEFLLs did not rely entirely on falling tone, but also used complex tones such as fall–rise and rise–fall more than did L-JEFLLs (14% and 6% respectively).

The major difference between H- and L-JEFLLs appears to be in their responses in dialogues requiring complex tones, where the H-JEFLLs were more successful.

Illocutionary force and proficiency

As there was no difference between the two proficiency groups in dialogues 1 and 3, only the results of dialogues 2, 5 and 6 (‘implication, possibility’) and 4, 7, 8 and 9 (‘exclamation’) will be discussed here.

Although neither group scored well in the dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, the choice of tone does seem to mark a difference between the groups, even though they did not always follow the intonation pattern given
Table 3: Tone choice of H-JEFLLS (n = 17) and L-JEFLLS (n = 18) for each dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dialogue illocutionary force</th>
<th>1 statement</th>
<th>3 warning</th>
<th>2 implication, possibility</th>
<th>4 exclamation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proficiency</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall–rise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise–fall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(shaded cell represents the correct tone choice, ie same tone choice as model)

in the models. Thus H-JEFLLS more often used a rising tone in dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, where L-JEFLLS used a level tone. Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) argued that a rising tone and a fall–rise tone, which they refer to as a ‘referring tone’, are included in the same category, and that speakers use these when they think they share information or knowledge with their hearers. The use of a rising tone by H-JEFLLS can, therefore, be considered an approximation to the tone choice of the native speaker (NS) models. In dialogue 5, 11 H-JEFLLS chose a rising tone and only 1 chose a level tone: among L-JEFLLS, only 3 chose a rising tone, while 5 chosen a level one. In dialogue 6, 5 H-JEFLLS chose a rising tone compared with only one L-JEFLL, and more L-JEFLLS than H-JEFLLS chose a level tone (six and four respectively). Thus, even though H-JEFLLS did not choose a correct tone in the dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, their manner of deviation was not far from the models as those of L-JEFLLS.

The ‘exclamation’ dialogues showed further differences between H- and L-JEFLLS. In dialogues 4, 7, 8 and 9, the number of H-JEFLLS who chose a rise–fall tone was 2, 5, 6 and 1 respectively, whereas the number of L-JEFLLS was 1, 0, 3 and 3 respectively. These differences are small, however, and do not allow generalisation of these trends beyond these groups.

Overall, therefore, the H-JEFLLS performed closer to the models than L-JEFLLS in their use of a rise–fall tone in dialogues of ‘exclamation’ and fall–rise tone in dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’. In other words, the use of complex tones may serve as an indicator of proficiency level. Moreover, the variety of tone choice by H-JEFLLS is wider than that by L-JEFLLS. These results suggest that either L-JEFLLS could not choose the appropriate tone of intention or they could not manipulate the chosen tone. Whichever
the case, there are pedagogical implications for JEFLLs in terms of the process by which they acquire intonation.

Summary and pedagogical implications

This paper has described the patterns of intonation used by JEFLLs from the viewpoint of realising intention through intonation. Following on from the research questions stated earlier, the findings can be summarised as follows:

1. The use of intonation by JEFLLs, in order to realise their intentions, was different from that of the model, that is Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) and Roach (2000).

2. H-JEFLLs used complex tones (fall–rise and rise–fall) more often than L-JEFLLs, and this seems to distinguish the higher-proficiency group.

With regard to the first research question, the overall tendency in tone choice was the dominant use of falling tone and this was the most significant difference from the model. As to other differences, in the dialogue of ‘warning’, JEFLLs tended to use other prosodic features such as power and shifting prominence, rather than rising tone as in the model. In the dialogues of ‘implication, possibility’, there was a greater tendency for higher-proficiency levels to use rising tone and for lower-proficiency levels to use a level tone, instead of fall–rise tone as in the model. These tendencies were heavily influenced by characteristics of the participants’ native tongue (Japanese).

With regard to the second research question, H-JEFLLs tended to use complex tones (that is fall–rise and rise–fall tone) and scored more correct answers than L-JEFLLs. Even when responding incorrectly, H-JEFLLs used a wider variety of tones than L-JEFLLs. L-JEFLLs seemed unable to control tones consciously and appeared to have problems in manipulating pitch and/or in recognising the relation between IFs and tones.

The discrepancies in performance between JEFLLs and the NS models suggest that there may well be difficulties in interactions between JEFLLs and native speakers of English, which could lead to misunderstandings. To avoid these potential disruptions, it would be useful to include specific attention to the pragmatic functions of intonation and how to relate IFs and intonation in English language training courses. The general advice to simply ‘use rising tone with a yes/no question and falling tone with a Wh- question’ is clearly not sufficient for teaching intonation.

Given the discrepancies noted above between JEFLLs’ performance and NS models, it would be particularly useful to focus on the use of complex tones: JEFLLs are frequently not familiar with the various pitch movements...
in an English utterance, and so may tend to substitute simpler tones for complex tones. By providing learners with sufficient context in which complex tones are used, the learners might begin to deductively notice the pragmatic functions of intonation, although they would still need mechanical training in order to properly manipulate complex tones. While H-JEFLLs could tackle ‘relating IFs and intonation’ in greater depth, the focus for L-JEFLLs could initially be placed on raising their consciousness of intonation in general and acquainting them with basic pitch ranges as a first step before moving on to a consideration of the relationships between intonation and pragmatic intention in greater detail.

Lastly, since this experiment investigated only part of the whole picture of intonation use and the signalling of intention, other possible interactions such as NS–JEFLlls, JEFLlls–JEFLlls and NS–NS should be investigated, and the results compared to those of this study. Moreover, since the participants were asked to read their responses aloud, this will have influenced their intonation. Future studies could try to capture their intonation in more spontaneous speech.

NOTES
* This paper is based on a presentation at the 28th Annual Convention of the Japan Society of English Language Education, Kobe, 2002.
1 MD (Mini Disc) is a trademark term for the Sony digital audio recordable optical storage system utilising data compression to reduce disc size.
2 Onseirokubunken (version 2.3.0) and Sugi Speech Analyzer are speech analysing tools that analyse and visualise various features of the speech, waveform, spectrogram, formants, pitch, etc.
3 The use of the word ‘correct’ may concern some readers. ‘Correct’ in this paper refers only to the correspondence of intonation use to that of the model, that is Brazil, Coulthard and Johns (1980) and Roach (2000), and does not presuppose a single proper way of using intonation.
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### Appendix 1

**Tench’s (1996) Communicative Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tone</th>
<th>communicative functions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information, reality</td>
<td>suasion</td>
<td>social exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and belief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statements</td>
<td>command</td>
<td></td>
<td>greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answers</td>
<td>prohibition</td>
<td></td>
<td>thanking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanations</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reports</td>
<td>advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>toasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>congratulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledgment</td>
<td>announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td>praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descriptions</td>
<td>promises</td>
<td></td>
<td>appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suppositions</td>
<td>threats</td>
<td></td>
<td>approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypotheses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disapproval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>summons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>back channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducive questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclamations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prompt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead-ins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second-attempt question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---
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Appendix 2

DIALOGUES USED IN THE EXPERIMENT (ADOPTED FROM BRAZIL, COULTHARD AND JOHNS (1980) AND ROACH (2000))

Note: Explanation on contexts and intentions was written in both Japanese and English.

1 You are Speaker B. Speaker A is looking for the typewriter. You reply to A with the intention of ‘I assume you don’t know and have never known’.

A: where’s the typewriter
B: in the cupboard
(‘I assume you don’t know and have never known’) (‘statements’, ‘answers’, ‘explanations’)

2 You are Speaker B. Speaker A is looking for the typewriter. You reply to A with the intention of ‘where it always is’.

A: where’s the typewriter
B: in the cupboard (‘where it always is’) (‘possibility’, ‘implication’)

3 You are Speaker B. Speaker A is looking for the typewriter. You reply to A with the intention of ‘Why don’t you ever remember’.

A: where’s the typewriter
B: in the cupboard (‘Why don’t you ever remember’) (‘coaxing’, ‘warning’)

4 You are Speaker B. Speaker A is looking for the typewriter. You reply to A with the intention of ‘I’m as surprised as you are, but I can see it on the shelf there’.

A: where’s the typewriter
B: in the cupboard
(‘I’m as surprised as you are, but I can see it on the shelf there’) (‘exclamation’)

5 You are Speaker B. Speaker A has heard the reputation of a school and is telling you about it. You reply to A with the intention of ‘Yes, but I am doubtful’.

A: i’ve heard that it’s a good school.
B: yes (‘Yes, but I am doubtful’) (‘implication’)
6 You are Speaker B. Speaker A picks up a record and comments on its price. You reply to A with the intention of ‘No, but I am doubtful’.
   A: it’s not really an expensive record, is it
   B: no (‘No, but I am doubtful’) (‘implication’)

7 You are Speaker B. Speaker A heard that someone did an awful thing to others and comments on that. You reply to A with the intention of ‘No. Surprised! Of course I wouldn’t’.
   A: you wouldn’t do an awful thing like that, would you
   B: no (‘No. Surprised! Of course I wouldn’t’) (‘disapproval’, ‘exclamation’)

8 You are Speaker B. Speaker A sees the beautiful mountain and comments on that. You reply to A with an intention of ‘Yes. I’m surprised!’.
   A: isn’t the view lovely
   B: yes (‘Yes. I’m surprised!’) (‘approval’, ‘exclamation’)

9 You are Speaker B. Speaker A tries on many clothes and comments on these. You reply to A with an intention of ‘Yes. I’m surprised!’.
   A: do you like this one best?
   B: yes (‘Yes. I’m surprised!’) (‘approval’, ‘exclamation’)