

# 神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

## Formulaic sequences to initiate negotiation in a Model United Nations

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2011-03-31 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Zenuk-Nishide, Lori メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	<a href="https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/977">https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/977</a>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 International License.



# Formulaic Sequences to Initiate Negotiation in a Model United Nations

**Lori Zenuk-Nishide**

Kobe City University of Foreign Studies

Negotiation is one of the most widely used skills in Model United Nations (MUN) simulations, where international issues are debated. In MUN, students representing countries as delegates, negotiate to get cooperation and support from others, and to resolve conflict affecting the international community. It has been observed at international university MUNS that Japanese non-native English speakers (NNES), have difficulty initiating discussion with native English speakers (NES), both in small and large groups. This paper identifies and analyses, multi-word or formulaic sequences that NES and highly proficient NNES, retrieve from memory as whole units, and use to interject to get the floor during negotiation, in a MUN Security Council committee.

## Introduction

The repetitive formulaic strings of spoken discourse in the Model United Nations (MUN), where international issues are negotiated, provide support and structure for non-native English speakers (NNES) to participate in the academic simulation. In the literature, there are over 40 terms (Carter & McCarthy, 1988; Carter, 1998; Wray, 2000) used to describe aspects of formulaic language or the repetitive stringing of words. Wray and Perkins (2000) propose the term formulaic sequence and define it as:

a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other meaning elements, which is, or appears to be fabricated: that is stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar. (p.1)

Native speakers use frequent and familiar formulaic sequences and the language learner's job is to acquire them. The presence or absence of common formulaic

sequences distinguishes the speech of NNES from native English speakers NES (Ellis, 1997; Prodromou, 2005; Nation, 2008). Ellis (1997, p. 129) states that native speakers “do not exercise the creative potential of syntactic rules of a generative grammar” as many believe; and “formulaic sequences are the normal building blocks of fluent spoken discourse.”

Altenburg (1998) through corpus research estimates as high as 80 percent of language is formulaic sequences. A corpus, a collection of text stored in computer readable form. It can give us information including the most frequent single words or sequences of formulaic sequences in spoken English. Frequency informs us what single words and formulaic sequences are the best to learn first. For example in the 900-million word Cambridge International Corpus (CIC), the two most frequent spoken words are “*I and the*” and the two most frequent 2-word formulaic sequences are “*you know and I mean*” (Carter & McCarthy, 2006, p. 289). The most frequent formulaic sequences are not complete phrases. General corpuses and some for specialized fields of study exist, but there is no corpus for the MUN.

There are two basic functions of formulaic sequences in the literature, first showing how effort in processing can be minimized; and second how they are used in interaction.

### **Saving Effort**

Through rehearsal, the mind stores frequently used formulaic sequences as individual whole units that can easily be retrieved, bypassing generative processing; therefore demanding less on our cognitive capacity, every time we want to speak or write (Becker, 1975; McCrone, 1999; Pawley & Syder, 1983; Raichle, 1998). Wray (2000) states that the formulaic sequences like turn holders (and let me just say) and discourse markers ( I mean) enable us to buy time, to register the content of the message to be heard or spoken. Many formulaic sequences have places that can accommodate different words according to the situation, providing a scaffold for quick and flexible language use.

### **Interactional Functions**

For speakers to acquire pragmatic fluency they need to know the right formulaic sequences for the right functional situation. (Schmitt, 2000; Nation, 2008). Learners

need to “experience the language of formulaic sequences in the medium in which they need to use them” (Nation 2001, p. 324). Therefore to successfully participate in a MUN, participants need to prepare in an environment where they can speak and listen to the formulaic sequences, in order to acquire them. Nation (2001) cautions that long formulaic sequences will only be stored if they are used frequently.

Schmitt and Carter (2004, p. 3) report there is diversity in formulaic sequences; “length can differ, they can be used to express ideas, social solidarity and transact specific information.” De Cock et al. (1998) found formulaic sequences in spontaneous interaction like negotiation, where speakers have to plan, encode and produce utterances in real time, are neglected in language teaching as they are perceived to contribute little, to the content of the speakers utterances. In addition Aijmer (1996, p. 9) points out they function to “allow speakers to talk with out hesitation or without too many pauses.”

Carter and McCarthy (2006) in an analysis of formulaic sequences in the CIC report four pragmatic interactive functions, or the creation of speaker meaning in context as follows:

1) Interpersonal function

They reflect interpersonal meaning, showing how speakers are constantly monitoring the state of shared versus new knowledge; or assumptions about common ground; how speakers can hedge or lessen the impact of an utterance; and express degrees of uncertainty. (p. 835)

These formulaic sequences include discourse markers used to signal a transition and interactive relationship, between the speaker and listeners. They are the most frequent form of formulaic sequences based around the verbs; know, mean and think (do you know what I mean?). In addition formulaic sequences are also used as indirect forms to preserve face through the expressions of politeness. Speakers use these speech acts in directives such as commands, requests and suggestions (What do you think?, I don't know if). Also formulaic sequences encode hedging a device used to modify propositions, conveying an imprecision, making them less assertive and less open to challenge (I kind of think).

2) Vague language function

They are formulaic sequences expressing vagueness and approximation enabling speakers to refer to semantic categories in an open ended way which calls on shared

knowledge to fill in categories (that sort of thing, things like that and a couple of). These formulaic sequences keep utterances from sounding “blunt and pedantic”. (Carter, 2007, p. 42)

### 3) Linking functions

Formulaic sequences are used to link clauses or sentences (but I mean, as a result of the). In spoken discourse, the most frequent formulaic sequences use the “conjunctions *and* and *but*” (Carter and McCarthy, 2006, p. 836).

### 4. Turn-taking

In turn-taking the speaking turn is handed over to the listener and demands a response. Responses can be interrogative and extended or minimal (what do you...?, do you think...?)

## **Formulaic Sequences in MUN**

In MUN an academic simulation, student delegates playing roles of ambassadors to countries, work to ensure their nation’s concerns are represented on committees. They follow formal rules of procedure that are formulaic sequences to make speeches, or negotiate face to face to propose solutions in resolutions to address issues of regional conflict; peacekeeping; human rights; woman and children; social and economic development; and the environment. A MUN conference will simulate one or more committees. The largest is the General Assembly (GA) with all 192 countries in the UN represented. On the other hand the Security Council (SC) with 15 member states, is one of the smallest bodies.

The formulaic sequences in the MUN Rules of Procedure (Table 1) are fixed phrases or have places where information can be slotted in. Through speeches a country asserts a separate identity on their policies. They are prepared and practiced before a conference; and can be read, memorized or spoken from an outline.

**Table 1. Formulaic Sequences: Rules of Procedure Speech**

Rules of Procedure	Lexical Phrases
Time limit on speeches	“I would like to propose that we limit the time of speeches to _____ minutes.”
Introducing a draft resolution	“I would like to introduce our draft resolution to the floor.”
Suspension of the meeting	“I would like to suspend the meeting for/until _____ (time) for the purpose of _____.”
Withdrawal of motions and amendments	“I would like to withdraw our motion (or amendment) from the floor.”
Introducing an amendment	“I would like to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution.”
Closure of the speaker’s list	“I would like to move for the closure of the speaker’s list.”
Closure of debate	“I would like to move for the closure of debate.”
Roll call vote	“I would like to request a roll call vote.”
Adjournment of the meeting	“I would like to move for the adjournment of the meeting.”

### Negotiation in MUN

Delegates negotiate during caucus, or informal debate. “Negotiation is a fundamental skill, a process by which we use language to try to influence others to help us achieve our needs, while at the same time taking their needs into consideration” (Lewicki et. al., 2007, p. 1). Caucuses, either moderated or unmoderated, are an important method of discussion allowing for consensus building and greater participation. During caucus delegates debate their country’s position and points to include in resolutions. One strategy is to use speech sound bites during caucus time negotiations. Unlike making a speech on the speaker’s list, where delegates have to wait their turn from a long list; during caucus time, the speaker can speak as many times as they can get the floor.

To move into caucusing, a delegate must make a motion, from the rules of procedure, to suspend the formal meeting by saying “I would like to suspend the meeting for/until \_\_\_\_\_ (time) for the purpose of \_\_\_\_\_.” and then the committee must pass the motion through a voting process. When a committee is in moderated caucus they remain in their seats in alphabetical order and the Chair calls on delegates one at a time, when they raise their placard to address the committee.

In unmoderated caucus the committee votes to break temporarily from formal

proceedings for delegates to work together in small groups, and freely move between groups to write working papers and draft resolutions; or collect signatories and sponsors for resolutions. A working paper is a document in which the ideas of some delegates on how to resolve an issue are proposed. Frequently it is the precursor to a draft resolution. Draft resolutions are the UN document equivalent of a law and formulaic in nature. They can be passed by an organ of the UN that aims to address a particular problem or issue. More than half of committee time is used for unmoderated caucusing, especially in large committees. Many delegates feel this is the easiest way for them to collaborate.

In MUN conference preparation guides there are no lists of formulaic sequences to use, or guidance on how to use them to caucus; there are only strategy suggestions such as: "Provide ideas: Tell others what your country is hoping to achieve. If you do not agree with an idea, do not hesitate to say that it is against your country's policy." (The United Nations Association of America, 2009).

### **Autonomous and Conversational Discourse**

Pawley and Syder's (1983) distinction between autonomous (speech with written features) and conversational (oral features) discourse clearly clarifies why making speeches and manipulating the rules of procedure are inherently easier in a MUN than negotiating during caucus time. The rules of procedure and speech making have autonomous discourse features where as negotiating is conversational. The rules of procedure are fixed formulaic sequences and speeches are scripted by different country delegates. The two types of text with autonomous discourse features are: made to be understood by everyone in the committee; the composition and reading of the texts are free of time constraints that are present in face to face meetings; the meaning is meant to be fully contained in the text; messages are informational and impersonal; is a static thing, once given it could remain in the written form.

On the other hand negotiation requires face-to-face meeting. What is said between delegates is a joint creation of those caucusing. Each message is shaped to fit the delegates or bloc or countries being addressed.

Messages are time bonded by meeting constraints and limitations on biological processing and conversational signals are manipulated as well as informational. Each utterance has personal significance for the address, being designed to

contribute to a specific interaction. Negotiation is composed of dynamic elements which contribute to an interaction and then disappear. (p.53)

The differentiation clearly illustrates how why conversational types of speech are inherently challenging for NNES.

### **Japan and the MUN**

In the Security Council at an international MUN, I observed a Japanese (NNES) delegate who did not verbally participate in caucusing during one day of committee sessions and very little on other days. The delegate participated as a listener and voted by raising a placard. To observers and the other participating delegates, she was seen to be out of character and not representing her country as she was expected to negotiate and give speeches. Documents she prepared in English before the conference, indicated she had a clear understanding of the outline of the agenda items and her country's policy in English. Yet, in her committee meetings she found herself in the role of an observer rather than an active participant because she did not take the floor to negotiate during caucus time. After the MUN she reflected on her experience:

What repeatedly comes to my mind is that the key is in my hand. Everything was up to me whether to be able to stand out on the floor, to logically respond to an unexpected idea, or keep up with the high-speed discussions. These are the walls I bumped into so many times and I am still looking for the way to get over them. What I can tell now is that, for me, this experience was more of an opportunity to recognize what I will need to do than an opportunity to actually achieve something. This means that I will need to make the most out of the experience, not being simply satisfied with the experience. That is also up to me. (Japan Model United Nations Society & Kansai Model United Nations, 2008, pp. 43-44)

The Japanese MUN delegate and the other nine members of the delegation, on different committees at the same international conference all reported, when and how to interject and 'take' the floor during caucus as one of their issues with conversation



and interaction uncertainty. In MUN, every delegate has equal opportunity to speak, but in reality it is the interplay of a number of factors to be able to get the floor during caucusing; knowing what to say being one of them. Everyone who has something valuable to contribute may not be heard, like the Japanese NNES Security Council delegate.

Very few Japanese students participate in international or domestic MUNs in English, even though they have been participating internationally since 1983. There are many university MUN clubs in Japan but almost no universities offer MUN classes, unlike other countries in the world. There are also no universities in Japan with MUN classes requiring students to participate in domestic or international conferences as part of their credit outside of class, for a greater experiential learning experience. Traditionally MUN clubs in Japan have no faculty advisors; rather experienced senior students tutor.

One of the reasons Japanese NNES face challenges negotiating at English speaking MUN conferences, is directly related to how they prepare for, and conduct their simulations. Most MUN conferences held by Japanese university clubs in Japan use the L1, Japanese and L2, English. When the language is autonomous resembling a script, as in rules of procedure and giving speeches; English is used. On the other hand, the conversational language of negotiation is all in Japanese. English is only used to write resolutions and practice speeches during MUN preparation. It is not possible for other countries to participate when MUN conferences require delegates to use two languages, as the majority of Japanese conferences. English is the language of international MUN conferences held all over the world.

What could the Japanese delegates have said at the MUN to get the floor during caucusing to negotiate? Relying on introspection, formulaic sequences for different functions of negotiation have been compiled by teachers and are can be found in teaching materials for NNES. There have been no studies that describe formulaic sequences delegates' use in a MUN to take the floor during negotiation.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What formulaic sequences do highly proficient NNES and NS use in a MUN Security Council to initiate negotiation in social interaction?

2. Are the first twenty of the two-five word formulaic sequences in the CIC used by highly proficient NNES and NS to initiate negotiation in a MUN Security Council?
3. What kinds of words are the most frequently used by highly proficient NNES and NS in formulaic sequences used to initiate negotiation in a MUN Security Council?

## **Method**

### **Context and Participants**

The Security Council delegates in, one of 22 committees, at the 2008 National Model United Nations (NMUN) in New York, March 18-22 were observed in this study. The (NMUN) is the largest MUN in the world. The sponsor of the event is the National Collegiate Conference Association (NCCA), a nonprofit educational organizational corporation and a Non-Governmental Organization associated with the United Nations Department of Public Information. The National College Conference Association (2008) reported they hosted 4698 university students, 347 faculty, 327 colleges from five continents 26 countries at the event. There were diverse cultural, religious, and social backgrounds represented. Fifty-two percent of the delegates came from outside the United States. The venues were the United Nations for the first and last day and the Sheraton Hotel, near the UN and the permanent missions.

In the Security Council, only one of the 2008, 15 countries was not represented. Twelve university student delegates were NES, and two highly functional NNES in the group were Japanese. One delegate was from New Zealand, seven from the US, and four from Canada. One Japanese student was male from an elite private university studying international relations, and the female participant was from an elite public university in majoring in English. There were three topics on the Security Council agenda that delegates had to prepare for in advance in were:

- 1) The Situation in Somalia
- 2) The impact of Climate Change on Global Security
- 3) Post-Conflict Peace Building

Only the second and first topic were debated in the given time. In MUN, delegates decide what topic they will discuss and then spend as much time on the topic as they like.

### **Procedure**

All of the delegates sat around a table in alphabetical order with a placard (name card) in front of them during formal debate and moderated caucus. There were two Chairs who sat at one end of the table and conducted the meeting. During unmoderated caucus delegates were able to move freely inside and outside the room. Delegates though stayed in the room during caucus. Meetings were held daily from 8:30-11:30 am, 1:30-4:00 pm and 7:00-10:00 pm in English.

### **Data Collection**

Data was collected during the set committee meeting times, even though delegates also met informally outside of the designated times. Recordings were made with either a digital audio tape recorder or a video recorder in the Security Council sessions. To facilitate transcription, field notes about nonverbal contextual information were taken. The proceedings were recorded with verbal consent from the participants and the head of the Model United Nations. Demographic information was collected from the MUN committee. All audio recordings were captured and stored as MP3 format sound files for transcription. Video files have been stored.

One video recorder was hand held at the back of the room and the audio recordings were also made from there. The size of the room was small, making it impossible to move around the table without interfering to place the microphone, when delegates were in unmoderated caucus. Data could be collected during informal caucusing from groups at the back of the room only. Also there was background noise from groups other than the target group in unmoderated caucus. Ideally there should be two cameras to record both sides of the table.

### **Data Analysis**

Conversational units were transcribed and unintelligible utterances were omitted from the transcription. Backchannels such as *hmm* or *er* were also included and granted full word status. Contracted forms like *don't* were counted as two words.

Formulaic sequences were through my intuition as a NES. Wray (2008) states formulaic sequences across a speech community can be reliably identified by most native speakers. Intuition, she said plays a role even in most corpus studies. All types of the formulaic sequences in the data were identified, frequency was not calculated, as there was not enough data collected. Carter and McCarthy's (2006) "functions of clusters" (p. 834-36) were used to analyze the MUN formulaic sequences gathered. These functions include: interpersonal, vague language, linking and turn taking previously outlined.

The computer based British National Corpus (BNC) and Coxhead's Academic Word List (AWL) were chosen to profile the single words in the MUN formulaic sequence data using vocabulary profilers (Cobb, 1994; Heatley & Nation, 1994). The frequency level profiler is a computer-based analysis of vocabulary in a text, to find out information about the kinds of words and the lexical type-token ratio for estimating the degree of productivity. The BNC is currently the only spoken corpus of English publicly available with 100 million orthographic words from 4124 both spoken and written texts. Contractions were counted as separate words. The MUN data was compared to the two-five word CIC formulaic sequences, a computerized data base of 900-million words which uses mainly British, English in everyday situations (Carter & McCarthy 2006, 829-30).

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Research Question 1**

1. What functions of formulaic sequences do highly proficient NNS and NS use in a MUN Security Council to initiate negotiation?

Appendix A shows data for four functions of formulaic sequences in initiating negotiation in MUN: interpersonal, vague language, linking and turn-taking. Sixty-six of the types of formulaic sequences that were found in the data were interpersonal function and one-third% were turn-taking. This evidence illustrates MUN delegates are building and consolidating relations and demanding or expecting a response from the listeners, other delegates.

### **Interpersonal Functions**

Delegates, used formulaic sequences that were clauses and clause fragments to

initiate negotiation by giving their own opinions on the agenda items; asking about other countries opinions; or the meeting proceedings. Their opinions were based on the policies of the country they represent and are not their own personal beliefs or feelings. Most of the formulaic sequences used to initiate display aspects of politeness and directness.

Politeness prevents the speakers from imposing on listeners or forcing them to act against their will. Some examples in the data were the phrases with *would* (we would just like to see; (own country) would first like to look at). *Would* is more polite and formal than *want* and there were four times the number of formulaic sequences with *would*. *Just* and *like* are softeners that were found (um, we would just like to, we would just like to see, we should just). Other polite softening structures evident included phrases with *hope*, *think* and *wonder* (we hope, I think we are going in the right direction, I wonder if we could). There were not many formulaic sequences with *will* despite the MUN is a formal setting (My country will). *Will* represents a declaration the speaker has decided to promise to do something according to Carter and McCarthy (2006, p. 700).

Verbs like *disagree* are not very common. Carter and McCarthy's (2006, p. 708) report "only once in a 15-million word sample are there direct challenges to the listener. In this MUN data it was used " ((Own country) disagrees with (another country)). Most disagreement was found to be down toned or hedged in the data: (perhaps it isn't the wisest, we are concerned about the request/position of, (another country) expresses it's mild displeasure, we are concerned about the request of (another country)).

Delegates also showed they support and agree with other member states (we share (another country) solution to, The (own country) shares the same, that's true, the (owe country) agrees with (another country)).

Politeness enables harmonious communication to proceed in an MUN where delegates meet for many days to talk about an agenda item. This data shows evidence that through the formulaic sequences they choose to initiate, delegater care about not offending others while still putting their countries ideas on the floor.

### **Turn-taking Functions**

A number of the common formulaic sequences in spoken text give the speaking

turn to the listener, or in some way demand a response even if it is minimal. Most of the formulaic sequences found were not grammatically complete and were interrogative fragments (Do you think...?). Formulaic sequences were found in this data to be grammatically complete turns (Are there any comments on that?, Is it effective?). There were also open ended questions asking for feedback on a suggestion (How about...?); asking for information (What is...?) Delegates use the name of their country ((own country) requests...?) Closed, yes-no questions (Is it effective?) were also evident.

Many of the questions in the MUN used signals of politeness and hedging expressions to avoid directness or threatening the dignity of other delegates: (Do you mind if I read...?; I am wondering why....? sorry guys do we; do we want to...?; can everybody...?; can we...?; so what is...?)

Say was featured as a preface to a turn is evident in the data (Own country) would like to say a few things and I could say).

### **Linking Functions**

There were few linking sequential sequences functions found in the data using *for with, as* and *but: and another* (and another part; and also; and I would love; and, I think we can; and looking at; as a side note; but I suppose; but then; and but it's not). Linking examples could also include *at, in* and *on*. In the CIC and *but* are the most common linking functions. (Carter & McCarthy, 2006)

### **Vague Language**

In the data there was almost no evidence of vague language. There was only one formulaic sequence found (something like that). It could be that the MUN delegates tried to be precise and didn't assume their listeners would understand what they are referring to. None of the delegates had spoken to one another before the conference so perhaps they did not make assumptions about knowledge.

### **Research Question 2**

2. Are the first twenty formulaic sequence markers of the two-five words formulaic sequences in the CIC used to initiate negotiation in a MUN?

For research question two, the two, three, four and five word formulaic sequences

used to initiate in a MUN during caucusing, were not similar to the first 20 in the CIC (Carter & McCarthy, 2008, p. 29-831). The MUN data was collated into formulaic sequences two to eleven words in length. For two-word sequence (I think and I mean) were the same as the CIC and one four-word sequence (Do you want to).

The MUN data is not frequency based and only shows the types of formulaic sequences that were used to initiate. The CIC examines spoken language from many kinds of “sociolinguistic contexts and genres of talk” (Carter & McCarthy, 2006 p.11) and the data analyses formulaic sequences in the whole text. The differences could also be due to the specific academic nature of the speech event.

There are often relationships between shorter and longer formulaic sequences as the longer can be an extension of the shorter. For example the two-word formulaic sequences, *I think* is also part of the 6-word sequence *I think it is important to*. The results for research question two reveal that the formulaic sequences the delegates used were not similar to the most frequent in the CIC.

**Research Question 3**

3. What kinds of words are the most frequently used by highly proficient NNES and NS in formulaic sequences used to initiate negotiation in a MUN?

Using the (BNC) and (AWL) frequency level-profiler, word-focused frequency counts of the formulaic sequences used to initiate were analyzed (Cobb, 1994; Nation, 1994) The formulaic sequences found in the MUN are all literal sequences, which according to Nation (2008) can be understood from their parts.

**Table 2. BNC/AWL Frequency Profile of Words in MUN Formulaic Sequences**

Frequency Level	Percent
K-1 1-1000	94.91%
K-21001-2000	3.09%
1k + 2k	98%
Academic Words	2.41%
Type-token Ratio	0.33
Tokens per Type	3.06

Table 2 shows most of the single words that delegates used to initiate speech were in the most frequently used 1000 words, making comprehension easier for the listener.

Ninety-eight percent of all the language used in the formulaic sequences to initiate in MUN negotiation is in the 2000 most frequently used words. The number academic words from (AWL) were 2.41%. This is higher than two percent or less; Nation (2008) reports are the academic running words in a conversation text. This is not surprising as the MUN is an academic speech event.

It is valuable to know which words are the most used to initiate in the formulaic sequence data in a MUN Security Council meeting. These findings do not show which words were the most used in a running MUN text. Delegates used *their country name and we* more than *you* or *I*. In the BNC (Shin & Nation, 2009) and the CANCODE (Carter & McCarthy, 2006) *you* and *I* are listed in the four most used words and *we* isn't in the top 15. The MUN as a speech event appears to use some different words more frequently than the BNC.

Modals were frequently used and “would” was the most used. It was used three times more than *can* or *could*. The following are examples of formulaic sequences containing the word *would*: *and I would love...*; *(own country) would like to...*; *also (own country) would like to...*; *what (own country) would like to see is...*; *um, we would just like to...*; *( own country) would like to say a few things...*.

### **Limitations of the Study and Implications for Future Research**

Clearly this research is preliminary since there is a small amount of data from an MUN Security Council context used to begin to identify what types of formulaic sequences highly proficient NES and NNES use to initiate negotiation. Comparisons were made with the most used formulaic sequences in the CIC. With more data, the frequency of the sequences could be analyzed. Rigorous analytical software needs to be used once there is more data; one that is capable of automatically generating multiword sequences and compiling concordance lines for the phrases to see how they are used. Other personal intuitions from native speakers should have been sought to identify formulaic sequences and give them more credibility.

In the future compiling a MUN spoken corpora would be valuable as there are a growing number of MUN-NNES participants. A corpus would yield more information about what formulaic sequences are the most used by frequency, not just the types identified in this study. Investigations could be conducted on formulaic sequences used with different kinds of participants in MUN's including: NNES's and



NS's; multinational NNES's; and national NS's and NNS's. Formulaic Sequences used in unmoderated and moderated caucus could be compared. Also an investigation to see if committee size affect the use of formulaic sequences.

Others analytical models could be used to further look at the data functions. Wray and Perkins (2000) is one model that could be recommended to analyze the functions of formulaic sequences in social interaction from a different perspective. They have identified three meaningful functions for the speaker in action: first how speakers manipulate their world to achieve outcomes using requests and commands; second how they are different from the group, individual identity; the third reflects an individuals sameness to the group, group identity.

## **Conclusion**

This preliminary research begins to identify which formulaic sequences are used by highly proficient NNES and NES, to initiate negotiation during caucus time in a small MUN committee, Security Council. Only a small amount of data was collected but as McCarthy (1999) believes; even a small data sample can show original insights and raise awareness for future observation. These formulaic sequences found can be used to scaffold NNES delegates to be more similar to the NS norm.

The formulaic sequences found consisted of individually high frequency words and used mostly by delegates to build relationships, trying to find the common ground by giving their opinions. To a lesser extent, delegates hand the speaking turn, demanding a response. Therefore delegates should not wait to be asked for their opinion. I never observed, the Security Council delegates pass the floor from person to person around the table, to hear everyone's opinion.

Polite language and hedging to express uncertainty are evident in opinions and questions in the diplomatic MUN speech event. Even when delegater disagreed they were polite. They also used every opportunity to remind others who they were by using their country name in the formulaic sequence. From this MUN data the formulaic sequences used to negotiate were not the ones most frequently used in conversation like the CIC; therefore it is necessary to provide NNES students with the ones that are used by NS in the MUN speech event. A MUN corpus would be very helpful.

The first thing to do in negotiation is to get the floor and the conversational

features Pawley and Syder's (1983) outline are a reminder why negotiating is inherently complex. It is important that NNES acquire spoken discourse markers, hedges and vagueness early on in their language learning. Even if they lack vocabulary proficiency at these stages their speech will be more cohesive and they will sound more polite and soft. The words needed to initiate in negotiation are in the first 1000 most frequent word. Nation (2006) reminds us that learning vocabulary takes time. To acquire the first 2000 most frequent words can take 3-5 years.

In Japan for students to be able to negotiate their needs to be a shift in teacher's language teaching approach as written English, not conversational is the priority (Sakui, 2004; Taguchi, 2005; Nishino & Watanabe, 2008), likewise with the MUN clubs. Most of the language used in MUN meetings and teacher centered classrooms is the L2, Japanese. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology (MEXT, 1999) has "stipulated the development of practical communicative abilities." and in 2003 added "so that the entire public can conduct daily conversation and exchange information in English", but it is not the reality (Nishino & Watanabe, 2008). Shirato and Stapleton (2007, p. 410) in their qualitative study found spoken vocabulary "acquired by Japanese NNES differs markedly from the NS norm" and formulaic sequences have been neglected to included in language teaching material and are usually not taught (Shirato, 2005).

Knowing what formulaic sequences are used to initiate negotiation and then through regular use in face to face conversation, NNES will be able to get the floor in a MUN and communicate their message. These frequently most used words that all the highly proficient NNES students in MUN know in isolation, but can't use as formulaic sequences are one of the factors that blocks their participation in negotiation; which is critical for them to be in character and represent their countries position. Even a two word formulaic sequence can mean the difference of being heard or not. The power and importance of formulaic sequences used to initiate in negotiation have been neglected for too long. More research needs to be done.

## References

- Aijmer, K.(1996). *Conversational Routines in English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Altenberg, B. (1998). On the phraseology of spoken English: the evidence of recurrent

- word-combinations. In Cowie, A.P. editor, *Phraseology: Theory analysis and applications*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 101-22.
- Becker, J. (1975). The phrasal lexicon. Bolt Beranek & Newman Report no. 3081, AI Report 28.
- Carter, R. (1998). Orders of Reality: CANCODE, communication and culture. *ELT Journal* 52 (1): 43-56.
- Carter, R. (2007). What is advanced vocabulary? The case of chunks and clusters. Davidson P., Coombe C., Lloyd D., & Palfreyman, D. (Eds.) *In Teaching and Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Dubai: TESOL Arabia.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy. M. (1988). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy M. (1997). *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Cobb, T. *Web Vocabprofile*. Retrieved August 20, 2009 from <http://www.lex tutor.ca/vp/>, an adaptation of Heatley & Nation's (1994) *Range*.
- Coxhead, A. (1998). *An academic word list*. English Language Institute Occasional Publication No. 18. Wellington, NZ: School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- De Cock, S., Granger, S., & Leech, G. (1998). An automated approach to the phrasicon of EFL Learners' in S. Granger (ed): *Learner English on Computer*. London: Addison Wesley Longman, 67-79.
- Heatley, A. & Nation, P. (1994). *Range*. Victoria University of Wellington, NZ. Computer program, available at <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/>.
- Ellis, N.C. (1997). Vocabulary acquisition: Word Structure, collocation, word class, and meaning. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.). *Vocabulary Acquisition and Pedagogy* (pp. 122-139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2007). *Negotiation Readings, Exercises and Cases*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McCarthy, M. (1999). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCrone, J. (1999). States of mind. *New Scientist*, 2178 (20 March), 30-33.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (1999). *Kotogakko*

- gakushu shido yoryo [The course of study for upper secondary school]*. Tokyo: Author.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2003). *Regarding the establishment of an action plan or cultivate" Japanese with English abilities*. Retrieved August 19, 2009 from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm>
- Japan Model United Nations Society and Kansai Model United Nations. (2008). *Report on the 25<sup>th</sup> Japanese Delegation to the Model United Nations Conference Programme*. Japan.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2008). *Teaching Vocabulary Strategies and Techniques*. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- National College Conference Association 2007/8 Reflections. (2008). Retrieved August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009, from [http://www.nmun.org/downloads/NCCA%20Annual%20Report%2008\\_web.pdf.html](http://www.nmun.org/downloads/NCCA%20Annual%20Report%2008_web.pdf.html)
- Nishino, T. (2007). *Japanese high school teachers' beliefs and practices*. Paper presented at the JALT conference. Tokyo.
- Nishino, T. & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-orientated Policies Versus Classroom Realities in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly* 42, 133-138.
- Pawley, A. & Syder, F.H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native like selection and native like fluency. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp.191-226). London: Longman.
- Prodromou, L. (2005). *You see I as sort of risky for the L2-user' The puzzle of idiomaticity in English as a lingua franca*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Nottingham: Nottingham University.
- Raichle, M.E. (1998). The neural correlates of consciousness an analysis of cognitive skill learning. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B* 353, 1889-1901.
- Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing two pairs of shoes; Language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 58, 155-163.
- Shin, D. & Nation I.S.P. (2009). Beyond single words: the most frequent collocations in spoken English. *ELT Journal* 62 (4), 339-348.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. & Carter R. (2004). Formulaic Sequences in Action. In N. Schmitt (Ed.),

- Formulaic Sequences* (p. 1-22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shirato, J. (2005). A Corpus-based analysis of basic spoken vocabulary in EFL textbooks conversations. *Hokusei Gakuen University Graduate School Literature Review* 2:5-31.
- Shirato J. & Stapleton P. (2007). Comparing spoken English vocabulary in a spoken learner corpus with a native speaker corpus: Pedagogical implications arising from an empirical study in Japan. *Language Teaching Research* 11(4): 393-412.
- Taguchi, N. (2005). The communicative approach in Japanese secondary schools. Teachers' perspectives and practices. *JALT Journal*, 29(3), 3-11.
- The Japan Model United Nations Society & Kansai Model United Nations (2008). The Report on the 25<sup>th</sup> Japanese Delegation to the National Model United Nations Conference 2008 Programme. Japan, 1-61.
- United Nations Association of America. (2009). Retrieved August 20, 2009 Caucusing Model UN Preparation Guide. <http://www.unausa.org/munpreparation/caucusing>
- Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic Sequences in Second Language Teaching Principles and Practice. *Applied Linguistics* 21(4):463-498.
- Wray, A. (2008). *Formulaic Language: Pushing the Boundaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wray A. & Perkins M. R. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: an integrated model. *Language and Communication* 20:1-28.

## Appendix A

### Types of MUN Formulaic Sequences as Functions of Interaction

<b>Interpersonal Functions</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ah, It could be</li> <li>• And also</li> <li>• Also (country) would like to</li> <li>• And another</li> <li>• Country) believes</li> <li>• (Country) should</li> <li>• Country) would first like to look at</li> <li>• (Country) would like to work on</li> <li>• First of all we would like to express</li> <li>• I could say</li> <li>• I'm saying</li> <li>• I see</li> <li>• It also</li> <li>• It is evident</li> <li>• *I think</li> <li>• *I mean</li> <li>• I suppose that would</li> <li>• I think we are going in</li> <li>• If we read (document name) word for word</li> <li>• I wonder if we could</li> <li>• Go through clause by clause</li> <li>• My country will ...</li> <li>• Own country) agrees with (another</li> <li>• Or perhaps everybody</li> <li>• (another country) should Or perhaps everybody</li> <li>• Own country) disagrees with (another country)</li> <li>• (Own country) expresses it's mild displeasure</li> <li>• (Own country) would like to encourage</li> <li>• (Own country) would like to reiterate</li> <li>• Own country) would like to</li> <li>• Perhaps it isn't the wisest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perhaps a clause</li> <li>• Perhaps it isn't the</li> <li>• Possibly it could be</li> <li>• So they can...</li> <li>• So we can</li> <li>• Something like that</li> <li>• So addressing</li> <li>• That's true</li> <li>• The right direction</li> <li>• The way</li> <li>• That's what my country would like</li> <li>• The (another country) should be able to tell us why they need</li> <li>• The (own country) shares the same ... as the (another country)</li> <li>• The (own country) sympathizes with (another country)</li> <li>• Um, we would just like to</li> <li>• We should</li> <li>• We hope</li> <li>• We would like to extend</li> <li>• We need</li> <li>• Well, I don't know</li> <li>• We should just</li> <li>• We should probably</li> <li>• We would just like to see</li> <li>• We would like to see an explanation by(country)</li> <li>• We are concerned about the request of (another country)</li> <li>• We are concerned about the position of the (another country)</li> <li>• We share (another country) solution to</li> <li>• What (country) would like to see in a resolution is</li> <li>• Yes perhaps</li> <li>• Yes perhaps</li> <li>• Yeah but</li> <li>• Yeah perhaps</li> <li>• Yeah, well perhaps...</li> <li>• You stated</li> </ul>

<p><b>Turn-taking Functions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there any comments on that?</li> <li>• A question to (other country)...</li> <li>• Are we going to...?</li> <li>• Can everybody...?</li> <li>• Can we...?</li> <li>• Do we want to ...?</li> <li>• Do you want to...?</li> <li>• Don't they always...?</li> <li>• Do you mind if I read ...?</li> <li>• How about...?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How about if we...?</li> <li>• I am wondering why...?</li> <li>• I have a question...?</li> <li>• Is it effective? Own Country requests ...?</li> <li>• (Own country) would like to say a few things</li> <li>• Perhaps everybody...?</li> <li>• So what is ...?</li> <li>• What (own country) would like to see is ...?</li> <li>• What is the ...?</li> <li>• What about ...?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Linking Functions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• And think we can</li> <li>• And I would love</li> <li>• As a side note</li> <li>• But it's not</li> <li>• But then</li> <li>• Looking at</li> </ul>
<p><b>Vagueness and approximation functions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Something like that</b></li> </ul>