Communication strategies in interactions involving language learners

Nishimura Satoko

BA (Yasuda Women's University); MA (The University of Arizona)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Research

Department of Linguistics

Faculty of Human Sciences

Macquarie University

October 2016

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work, and that, to the best of my knowledge, it does not contain any unattributed material previously published or written by any other person. I also declare that the work in this thesis has not been previously submitted to any other institution for, or as part of, a degree.

This study was granted approval by Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee (reference: 5201500824), and was conducted in accordance with them. This approval and associated participant documents are provided in Appendix B.

Nishimura Satoko

October 2016

Acknowledgements

I'm eternally grateful to my supervisor Dr Scott Barnes for giving direction to this study, and without whose help and guidance it would be absolutely impossible to complete this Master of Research.

I'm thankful to my students and my colleague for their willingness to participate in the project.

Abstract

Because of globalisation and government policy, English language learning and teaching has become an increasingly central part of education in Japan. Policy settings have asserted the primacy of effective communication, and emphasised the use of English as a lingua franca. However, this is not well reflected in English language teaching practices, nor in student outcomes. In order to support improved learning and teaching, there is therefore a need to better understand the communicative behaviours that facilitate communicative success in interactions between native and non-native speakers of English. This study explores communication strategies in interactions involving Japanese-speaking learners of English and a native English speaker. It employs the principles and practices of conversation analysis to analyse 15 interactions involving 8 Japanese learners of English and one native English speaker. Participants were asked to complete a communication task where the native speaker needed to gather information from the non-native speaker. It focuses on the use of next-turn repetition by the Japanese-speaking learners to accomplish confirmation and other-initiation of repair. With these practices, they facilitate completion of the communication task, but also generate opportunities

for language learning. The findings of this study add to our understanding of communication strategies in interactions involving native and non-native speakers of English, and demonstrate the possible value of a communicative and interactional approach to language learning and teaching in Japan.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This thesis explores patterns in interactions involving Japanese-speaking learners of English and a native English speaker. It focuses on communication strategies used by the Japanese-speaking learners; particularly, their use of next-turn repetition to accomplish confirmation and other-initiation of repair. I have undertaken this study because of my interest in English language learning and teaching in Japan, and the need for effective practices supporting students and teachers. This introductory chapter shall now turn to discussing the background to my project. It begins with a description of my own professional experiences and motivations, as well as the current state of English language learning and teaching in Japan. It then discusses English as a lingua franca, approaches to communication strategies in language learning, and the field of conversation analysis, focusing on repair. The chapter concludes with a discussion of some conversation-analytic studies examining interactions involving native and non-native speakers, and a statement of the present study's rationales and research questions.

1.2 Personal and professional background, and the Japanese context

I am a teacher in the English Department at Yasuda Women's University in Hiroshima. I have been teaching in this capacity for 29 years, and have a variety of experiences in other contexts of teaching and assessing the English competence of Japanese-speaking learners. For example, I have been engaged as an oral examiner for the English testing Association of Japan (EIKEN examination), which is sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). My professional experiences led me to the conclusion that, despite numerous speaking activities, many Japanese students seem to experience difficulty communicating in an effective and efficient manner. To look for possible answers, I started to research conversations between native and non-native speakers of English.

Block and Cameron (2002) note that competence in one or more languages represents a valuable linguistic asset. The English language is a global language, and this phenomenon is displacing traditional ideologies in which a language was primarily a symbol of ethnic or national identity. At the same time, globalisation changes the conditions of language learning and language teaching. These global trends are reflected in policy changes in

Japanese education. The Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) has recognised that learning effective, communicative English is needed amid intensifying international competition, and has implemented changes to enhance English-language education. For example, in elementary schools, English-language teaching focused on verbal communication skills is now an official subject for 5th and 6th graders (English Education Reform Plan corresponding to Globalization, 2013). In the report “On Integrated Reforms in High School and University Education and University Entrance Examination: Aimed at Realizing a High School and University Articulation System Appropriate for a New Era: Creating a Future for the Realization of the Dreams and Goals of all Young People”, MEXT (2013, p. 3-4) has also proposed reform policies for high school, university education, and university entrance examination. They assert that:

> (2) Cultivating and evaluating communication skills for a globalized world
>
> With the spread of globalization, in order to cooperate proactively with people of different cultures and languages, it is necessary to improve the level of skill in English, as the global lingua franca, and for Japan to

take an attitude of deep understanding toward its own traditional culture as well as understanding that of other countries and interacting with others without trepidation, etc.

In order to properly learn truly useful English it is not good enough to simply have the passive skills of “reading” and “listening”—it is important to foster and evaluate the four key skills comprehensively, including “writing” and “speaking,” so that students can assertively make use of their English skills, think independently, and express themselves.

The “Prospective University Entrant Scholastic Abilities Evaluation Test [provisional name]” will include questions that can comprehensively evaluate the four skills and incorporate commercial qualifications and skill level tests. Also, in terms of goals for education in English in high schools, focus will be put on what precisely it is that English can be used for in aiming to shape what achievements should be focused on from elementary through to high school. Revisions will be made to curriculum guidelines in order to shape the content to make it consistent with the goal of addressing the four skills.

As a result of these policy shifts, English learning and teaching focused on communication has become an increasingly central part of school curricula in Japan. On February 2, 2016, the MEXT released the 2015 results of its nationwide survey of third-year junior high and high school students in four English language skills: reading, listening, writing and speaking. According to MEXT guidelines, students must reach level 3 on the EIKEN examination, corresponding to level A1 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR), at the time of their graduation from junior high school. Level 3 of the EIKEN examination requires students to provide simple answers to questions on familiar topics. However, all four English skills of junior high and high school students have failed to meet the MEXT's targets. The percentage of third-year high school students who attained pre-level 2 on the EIKEN examination, which corresponds to CEFR Level A2 suggested by MEXT guidelines for high school graduates, was as follows: 29.9% for reading; 24.2% for listening; 17.2% for writing; and 9.8% for speaking (*The Japan Times*, February 2, 2016; *The Mainichi*, February 3, 2016). Clearly, the figure for speaking is the lowest, and is troubling. While the outcomes of this survey reflect a variety of complex factors affecting English-language teaching in the

Japanese context, it also provides clear motivations for developing teaching methods that foster expressive language and communicative abilities.

1.3 English as a lingua franca

Today, English is the most widely used lingua franca in the world (Seidlhofer, 2005). House (1999, p. 74) defines the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) as being “between members of two or more different linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue.” That is, ELF is a contact language used among speakers who do not share a first language (L1). However, in the terms of ELF, there is a problem with the traditional definition of a lingua franca, and the involvement of native speakers (NSs) of English. The historical lingua francas had no NSs, and this could imply that NSs of English should be excluded from the definition of ELF. As a result, some authors have drawn a distinction between English language interactions only involving speakers who do not use it as L1, and those where English is used as an international language (EIL), which also includes L1 English speakers. Nickerson (2015, p. 398) suggests that this conceptual approach does not necessarily prioritise native speakers:

> …although there may be differences between a native speaker of English and everyone else, as evidenced in the extent of vocabulary and other expressions they have at their disposal, their success as a business communicator in multicultural interactions can only be measured in terms of whether they can communicate in a professional appropriate way; for native speakers this includes whether they can adjust their use of the language to accommodate those around them and therefore communicate effectively.

On the other hand, House (2012, p. 364) supports the notion that ELF "can occur anywhere and in any constellation of speakers, and can also integrate native speakers of English, though they tend to play a minor role." Also, Jenkins (2007, p. 2) defines ELF as follows:

> Others differentiate between ELF and English as an International language (EIL), the former excluding NSs and the latter including them. However, this distinction has become less frequent of late, perhaps because it runs the risk of causing confusion.

The prime aim of any lingua franca use is mutual intelligibility and efficient communication, and therefore abstract notions of correctness and conformity may be treated as less important. Thus, the emphasis shifts away from language proficiency towards being a good communicator. Similarly unimportant for ELF is what learners of English unsuccessfully imitate, e.g., idioms, or other phrases referring to its cultural phenomena (House, 2012). Yet it is also necessary for learners of English to understand how an interlocutor's cultural background may influence their choice of discourse strategies. House (2012, p. 364) points out:

> ELF is not a language for specific purposes, nor a pidgin or creole. Nor is it some species of 'foreigner talk'. And it is certainly not 'Globish' of BSE – Bad Simple English. The interlanguage paradigm, with its focus on deficits in learners' competence in a foreign or second language measured against a native norm, is also clearly no longer valid here. Instead of comparing ELF speakers' competence with a hypothetical native speaker competence, it is rather the multilingual individual and his or her 'multicompetence'…

So, with this conceptual framework, we can comfortably turn to thinking about contact between NSs and non-native speakers (NNs) of English as being driven by ultimately communicative ends. Moreover, this conceptualisation is consistent with the communication-focused position adopted by MEXT in the Japanese English-language teaching context. However, in order to fill out this picture, we must better specify the communicative demands in question.

1.4 Communication strategies and language learning

The notion of “communication strategies” has a long history in language learning and teaching. For the most part, communication strategies in this tradition have been considered as part of a variety of behaviours directed towards solving communication problems (Nakatani, 2010). For example, Celce-Murcia et al. (1995, p. 26) argue that “communication strategies involve appeals for help as well as other cooperative problem-solving behavior which occur after some problem has surfaced during the course of communication, that is, various types of negotiation of meaning and repair mechanisms.” Dörnyei and Thurrell (1991, p. 17) define communication strategies as “the ability to get one’s meaning across successfully to communicative partners,

especially when problems arise in the communication process". Communication strategies have also tended to be approached from either an interactional perspective or a psycholinguistic perspective. The interactional perspective of communication strategies is based on the interactional process thorough which interlocutors negotiate meaning to achieve mutual understanding (Canale, 1983; Nakatani, 2005). On the other hand, the psycholinguistic perspective considers communication strategies as the cognitive process involved with facilitating comprehension and production (Faerch and Kasper, 1983; Poulisse, 1990). Celce-Murcia et al. (1995, p. 26) define the psycholinguistic perspective as "verbal plans used by speakers to overcome problems in the planning and execution stages of reaching a communicative goal: e.g., avoiding trouble spots or compensating for not knowing a vocabulary item."

In addition, communication strategies have usually been considered as handling only one type of language problem; namely, gaps in language users' knowledge. Drawing on the work of the researchers mentioned above, Dörnyei and Scott (1997, p. 183) suggest that communication strategies handle the following three types of communication problems: own-performance problems, other-performance problems, and processing time pressure:

1. *Own-performance problems*: the realization that something one has said is incorrect or only partly correct; associated with various types of self-repair, self-rephrasing and self-editing mechanisms.
2. *Other-performance problems*: something perceived as problematic in the interlocutor's speech, either because it is thought to be incorrect (or highly unexpected), or because of a lack (or uncertainty) of understanding something fully; associated with various meaning negotiation strategies.
3. *Processing time pressure*: the L2 speaker's frequent need for more time to process and plan L2 speech than would be naturally available in fluent communication; associated with strategies such as the use of fillers, hesitation devices, and self-repetitions.

From this definition of communication strategies, we can see that the interactional perspective places emphasis on other-performance problems, while the psycholinguistic perspective puts a high value on own-performance problems. In addition, using this definition, we can see that both NS and NNSs

of English use communication strategies (Ellis, 1984). Long (1983) suggests that the structure of verbal communication involving NSs and NSSs is modified through repetition, confirmation and comprehension checks, and clarification requests. Confirmation checks and clarification requests initiated by more skilled language users offer negative input, encouraging less skilled users to revise their output because their current message has not been understood (McDonough, 2005). Less skilled users may also use communication strategies that help them overcome problems of communicating with limited language resources (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Mills, 2004; Spencer-Oatey, 2008; Swain, 2013), such as strategies like paraphrasing, approximating, self-repair, clarification requests, literal translations, and appeals for help (Rabab'ah, 2015).

Still, there are problems with the ways that communication strategies have been approached in the literature so far. Most prominently, much of this work has been initiated from the perspective of language learning and teaching, and focused solely on communication problems. This means that integration of empirical findings about communication more broadly—particularly face to face spoken interaction—has not be a priority. Beginning with empirical findings about interaction would provide a basis for a more systematic, empirically-

grounded understanding of communication strategies, and patterns specific to language learners (see Hellerman and Lee, 2014).

1.5. Conversation analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) is an empirical research method concerned with the organisation of social action in interaction. Sidnell (2013, p. 77) compares the work of the conversation analyst to that of the explorer and cartographer.

> Conversation Analysis is meant to be a kind of exploration, the goal of which is the discovery of previously unknown regularities of human interaction. Like the cartographers of the 18th century who mapped large sections of the globe, the conversation analyst is not content simply to identify new phenomena. Rather, the conversation analyst must also “map” them and thus describe what kinds of things they are.

Sidnell (2013) argues that objective of CA is to identify the recurrent practices of interaction, and that they should be discovered inductively. A large body of CA

work has been concerned with describing the basic, likely universal features of interaction (Schegloff, 2006). Dingemanse and Floyd (2014, p. 449) formulate this as the "technical details of talk-in-interaction ... a set of generic organizational problems that have to be dealt with in any occasion of social interaction". This is often expressed as a set of interactional systems, including (but not limited to) the organisation of turn-taking, the organisation of sequences of talk, and the organisation of repair (Schegloff, 2006).

Repair is the interactional system dedicated to dealing with troubles in conversation; specifically, problems with speaking, hearing, and understanding talk. There exists a distinction between initiating repair and actually carrying out the repair. Kitzinger (2013, p. 230) states that "this is an important distinction because repair can be initiated by one party and completed by another". Repair initiation is composed of a distinction between self-initiated repair and other-initiated repair. Self-initiated repair is commenced by the speaker of the trouble source (i.e., item causing problems) who typically produces the repair solution in same turn-constructional unit (Schegloff et al., 1977). By contrast, in other-initiated repair someone else (i.e., a recipient) commences the focus on a problem. However, like self-initiated repair, the party who produced the trouble

source still usually produces the repair solution.

As for repair operations used in self-initiated repair in same TCU, Kitzinger (2013) shows that replacing and inserting are very common repair operations. In addition, she identifies some components of the repair parts: repeats of words around the trouble source; silences and hesitation (e.g., *uh*, *um*); apologies for errors (e.g., *sorry*, *pardon me*); repair prefaces (e.g., *well*, *I mean*); and mutters in a low voice. We shouldn't forget, too, that self-initiated self-repair can happen at transition relevance places, and in "third turns", i.e., after another party has taken a turn.

There are also a variety of formats for other-initiation of repair (Kitzinger, 2013). Open class forms offer little indication of the problems with the preceding talk (e.g., *sorry?*, *pardon?*, *huh?*), question words locate the problems in a particular part of the trouble source (e.g., *who?*), as do repetitions of parts of or the whole of the trouble source turn, while candidate understands offer a formulation of the trouble source for confirmation (e.g., *you mean X*). Dingemanse et al. (2015, p. 5) found that these types of formats for other-initiated repair involve "similar linguistic resources [across languages]: interjections, question marker, prosody, and repetition." Other-initiations of

repair come later than self-initiations of repair, and are often delayed (Schegloff, 2000). In order to secure mutual understanding, it is preferable that the repair activity starts in next-turn position. If other-initiation of repair is delayed, “the trouble source can become difficult to identify and retrieve” (Barnes & Ferguson, 2015, p. 317). Dingemanse, Blythe, and Dirksmeyer (2014) also note that most languages employ formats using gestures of courtesy. Apology-based formats are used for the management of responsibility because repair can be socially sensitive; it indicates something has gone wrong, and who might be implicated in that, while also interrupting ongoing conversation.

Finally, it should also be noted that the recipient of a trouble source can in fact both indicate and solve a problem, i.e., implement other-initiated other-repair. This practice is termed correction (Schegloff et al., 1977), and usually focuses on problems with speaking. When correcting another speaker, the party doing the correction makes relevant some sort of “knowing” status, which can often make relevant some sort of expert, or institutional identity.

1.6 An interactional approach to communication strategies

Considering the contents of the prior two sections, it should be clear that

much of what has been studied in the field of language learning and teaching as communication strategies is addressed in the field of CA as repair. In recent years, there has been an increasing body of research using CA principles focused on interactions between NSs and NNSs of English (Hellerman & Lee, 2014). Much of this work has focused on classroom interaction and the process of language learning (Hall et al., 2011) as well as problematising CA notions of repair for language learning (Hall, 2007). There has also been a reasonable body of work examining the ways that linguistic asymmetry procedurally affects interactional activities between NSs and NNs outside the classroom. I will now review some of those studies in detail.

Kurhila (2001) explores correction in talk between NSs and NNSs of Finnish during a variety of non-paedagogical interactions, including everyday conversations and service encounters. Kurhila (2001) begins with the observation that NSs sometimes correct NNSs' linguistic errors (e.g., phonemic, lexical, grammatical errors), but other times they let them pass. So, this study explores some circumstances in which NSs choose to implement corrections. Rather than focusing on the linguistic status of the error, this study examines the interactional circumstances in which it is implemented. Kurhila (2001) found

that overt other-correction were accomplished through partial repetitions of the prior NNS's turn during question and answer sequences, and after the NNSs demonstrated uncertainty through the design of their own turn. NSs partial repetitions were usually done in the course of responding to actions implemented though the prior talk, whereas correction following uncertainty sparked a small side sequence focused on the correction. Kurhila (2001) also observed that linguistic corrections in NS-NNS talk differed from overt correction between NSs. In talk between NSs, correction is typically mitigated, but this did not occur in corrections in this dataset. Kurhila (2001) argues that this enacts the linguistically superior status of the NSs.

Wong (2000) and Lilja (2014) both focus on other-initiation of repair done by NNSs in everyday interactions. Wong (2000) focuses on the timing of other-initiation of repair. As noted above, other-initiations of repair are typically implemented as close the trouble source as possible, usually in the next turn (Schegloff, 2000). Wong (2000), however, found that NNSs of English substantially delayed other-initiated repair. That is, NNSs frequently initiated repair during conversations with NSs later than next-turn position. This means that the both the NNS and the NS need to implement practices to "retrieve" the

prior talk and context. In addition, Wong (2000) suggests that these sorts of delays might lead to the “non-nativeness” of a NNS becoming relevant in the interaction.

Lilja (2014) explores the use of repetition as a practice for other-initiation of repair by NNSs of Finnish. Following Koshik (2005), Lilja (2014) demonstrates that NNSs use repetitions to initiate repair frequently. Moreover, Lilja found that their repetitions are treated differently than those of NSs. Specifically, “partial repetitions are recurrently treated as actions indicating specific language-related problems of understanding” (Lilja, 2014, p. 98), while the equivalent practice implemented by NSs is typically treated as a challenge to accuracy. With partial repeats of words and phrases, NNSs narrowed in on parts of the prior turn that were highly consequential for the continued progression of the interaction, and the activities currently underway. In response, NSs supplied elaborations of the items targeted, offered synonymous words, and explicitly discussed the meaning of words. NNSs also further pursued the meaning or use of words after they had been addressed through repair. Lilja (2014) argues that these practices represent an important way that language learning (particularly vocabulary learning) is realised in everyday

interaction, with both NSs and NNSs arriving at an understanding that aspects of linguistic knowledge were relevant for the interaction.

Kitajima (2013) focuses on Skype-based interactions involving NSs and NNSs. These interactions were somewhat unique in that they involved native Japanese speakers and native English speakers who were both learning the other language at university-level. He examines patterns of “repair negotiation” in two different kinds of communication task: one where there is an information gap, and one there is a personal information exchange. The informational gap task involved pairs of pictures that were largely the same, but with some subtle differences. Participants were asked to discuss and describe the shared pictures with one another. The personal information exchange task was a largely unstructured, get-to-know-you conversation focused on one another’s hobbies, home towns, jobs, etc. In this study, repair negotiation was defined as “an interactional modification as a result of communication breakdown” which facilitates “comprehensible input through confirmation checks, clarification requests, recasts, lexical cues, and propositional reformulations” (Kitajima, 2013, p. 165). In the information gap task, Kitajima (2013) observed that the NSs tended to control the development of the task, pre-empting communication

problems, and revising their talk when the NNSs displayed possible problems with uptake. He attributed this to the relatively symmetrical distribution of knowledge between the participants (i.e., they both had access to the picture), and the task-focused nature of the communication task. The problems that arose in the personal information exchange task were somewhat different. Kitajima (2013) found that frequent repair activities, and NSs providing NNSs with much space to repair, led to the conversations progressing unevenly, with inconsistent and inapposite turns leading to further repair, and inhibiting accumulation of common ground (see Clark, 1996). This resulted in NNSs implementing strategies like code-switching, restating in alternative forms, using a dictionary, or trying a different approach. As such, Kitajima (2013) concludes that the personal information exchange task may have been more valuable for language learning because it caused the NNSs to pursue alternative communication strategies. He also suggests that tasks focused on information exchange should provide less basis for inference, i.e., should be more asymmetrical in terms of the information states of interactants.

In summary, each of these studies offers detailed empirical specification of the repair-related behaviours in interactions involving NSs and NNSs. That is,

these studies specify the communication strategies that are relevant for interactions involving NSs and NNSs. The findings of these studies also suggest that repair in these interactions makes relevant the linguistic asymmetries between the parties to the interaction. However, at the same time, this also provides language learning opportunities in the course of interactions that are not otherwise paedagogical.

1.7 The present study

Japanese-speaking learners of English need to be effective communicators in English in order to meet local educational targets, and to meet the demands of a globalised world where English is used as a lingua franca. CA holds much potential to elaborate the communication strategies relevant for interactions involving language learners and more linguistically able speakers, i.e., NSs and NNSs. Previous studies have indicated that repair is important for interactions involving NSs and NNSs, repetition is important for naturalistic language learning, and that informational asymmetries may be important for language learning in task-based interactions. As such, the present study investigates features of task-based interactions between Japanese-

speaking learners of English and a native English speaker, with a view to better understanding the communication strategies relevant for effective communication by language learners, and possible avenues for language teaching in the Japanese context.

1.7.1 Research questions

1. How do Japanese-speaking learners of English participate in a communication task interaction with a native English speaker?
2. How Japan-speaking learners of English use repetition in a communication task interaction with a native English speaker?

Chapter 2: Method

2.1 Design

This project is descriptive and qualitative, and employs principles and practices from CA. It received ethical approval from Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee (reference: 5201500824), and was conducted in accordance with this approval.

2.2 Participants and recruitment

Participants in the present study were recruited on the basis of their participation in a previous study that I conducted. The aim of the previous study was to examine how Japanese university students transfer politeness strategies into English in foreigner talk discourse (FTD) (Hamamoto, 2015). At the time of their previous recruitment and data collection, forty-three female Japanese students learning English agreed to participate, as did one native English-speaking teacher. All student participants were freshmen majoring in English at Yasuda Women's University, aged 18-19 years. The teacher participant was an American in her 40s, with 18 years of teaching experience. Participants were approached to take part in the present study via announcements made in class

by my colleagues, and via email. All previous participants consented to their data being used in the present study.

2.3 Procedures, data collection, and sampling

In the previous study, participants were asked to complete a communication task. The communication task involved the student participant describing a picture of an object without using its name (e.g., a tool, clothing, household items), and the teacher participant attempting to guess what the object was. An example of this task and its instructions are provided in Appendix A. Each student participant completed this communication task for at least two target objects (with the exception of student participant 7). These sessions were video-recorded in their entirety using a Sony HDR-CX550V video camera.

For the present study, a portion of these video recordings were sampled. Specifically, two samples from the first eight participants were used in the present project. As shown in Table 2.1, completion of the communication task took between 1 and 5 minutes, with most participants completing it in around 2 minutes. It should also be noted that these recordings were not sampled purposively, and this number was selected principally with a view to practical

constraints on the present project. However, it should also be noted that these samples appear broadly consistent with the rest of the corpus, and that “unmotivated” sampling strategies combined with careful analysis of single cases are core methodological practices of CA (see Sidnell, 2013). So, in summary the primary data set of the present study is 15 recordings involving 8 student participants and the same teacher participant, totaling 34 and a half minutes.

2.4 Data analysis

As noted above, this present study employs the analytic techniques of CA. This involves repeatedly viewing video recordings of the communication task, and creating, reviewing, and analysing transcripts of these video recordings. A conversation-analytic approach to transcription was employed (Hepburn & Bolden, 2013). The transcripts depict aspects of speech content, timing, and delivery, and provide a detailed record of the practices used during the communication task interactions. Multimodal conduct was occasionally transcribed, but less methodically, with vocal conduct and interactional timing

Table 2.1 Duration of communication task recordings

Student Participant	Communication Task 1	Communication Task 2
S1	0:51	4:40
S2	1:11	3:00
S3	2:29	3:37
S4	1:43	1:32
S5	2:55	0:41
S6	1:21	4:39
S7	3:17	-
S8	0:44	1:50
Total	34:30	

prioritised. Transcript accuracy was promoted through both me and my research supervisor transcribing portions of the interactions, and then cross-checking transcripts.

Inconsistencies were resolved through consensus discussions. Transcripts and videos were then analysed by initially searching for common patterns between the interactions. During this process, recurrent patterns of repetition were observed. Then, instances where the student participants repeated the teacher participant were then subjected to more detailed coding, focusing on the actions it accomplished. This formed collections of common

actions for analysis and contrast (see Schegloff, 1996). Coding and coding summaries were managed using Microsoft Word, and Microsoft Excel respectively. As with transcription, reliability and validity of analysis was promoted through independent coding followed by cross-checking and consensus discussions.

Chapter 3: Results

3.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on the findings of an analysis of interactions during the communication task. It begins by outlining the overall patterns common to these interactions, and exploring some examples of less and more problematic completion of the communication task. The analysis then focuses on patterns of repetition during the communication task; in particular, instances where a student participant immediately repeated the talk of the teacher participant. We shall see that these student repetitions performed confirming actions and other-initiation of repair. The actions had different consequences for how the communication task interaction progressed.

3.2 Overall patterns in the communication task

In the communication task, the knowledge states of the student participants and the teacher participant were asymmetrical. That is, the students were knowledgeable of the target lexical item. The teacher participant was not, and needed to discover what the item was. This resulted in a distinctive distribution of actions and labour between them over the course of the task. In

addition, because the task was conducted in English, there was a large linguistic asymmetry between the interactants. That is, the teacher participant had more linguistic resources at her disposal than the student participants. These pressures combined to generate clear recurrent patterns in the students' and the teacher's contributions to the communication task interactions. The patterns will be summarised in Sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3.

3.2.1 Contributions of student participants and the teacher participant

As the knowledgeable parties, the student participants regularly commenced and contributed to the communication task interactions through offering assertions. These assertions added information about the target lexical item, either through direct descriptions of the items (e.g., qualities and functions) or to other things associated with them. Examples of student assertions are presented in brief in Extracts 3.1 through 3.4.

Extract 3.1 (S5)

```
1→   S5  <this year i (1.0) i went to: this: <festival. it is
2        °festival.°
3     T  in japan?=
4    S5  =yes. in JAPAN. un (1.0) an:d
```

Extract 3.2 (S8)

```
1→   S8  it is u:sed (0.2) used (1.8) in (1.3) baseball ga[:me   ]
2     T                                                  [uh huh]
```

Extract 3.3 (S1)

```
1→   S1  it's a foo:d.
2        (1.2)
3→       and (2.2) i- (0.5) tis ma:de (1.8) a lot (1.5)
4→       from america.
5        (2.5)
6→       america, (1.8) pro: (0.3) <duct>
```

Extract 3.4 (S7)

```
1→   S7  .hh: (0.6) this is a (0.4) ↑re:d and white. (1.6) um:
2→       (1.0) °this° (2.1) it usually: (0.7) used (1.1) christmas.
3        (0.4)
4     T  uh-huh.
```

On the other hand, the teacher participant was less knowledgeable about the target lexical items. As a consequence, the teacher consistently asked questions that gathered information about the target lexical items, and/or made guesses about the items themselves. This placed student in the position of offering confirming (or disconfirming) responses for significant periods of the communication task. Examples of this are presented in brief in Extracts 3.5 through 3.7.

Extract 3.5 (S2)

```
1→    T  is it a plant?
2        (1.1)
3     S2  °plan:° ah yes yes plan-=
```

```
4→    T   =is it a CACTUS,
```

Extract 3.6 (S5)

```
1         (1.9)
2→    T   do you ↑use it every day?
3         (0.8)
4     S5  no:_
```

Extract 3.7 (S8)

```
1→    T   is it <MEGA↑PHONE?>=
2     S8  =ye:s.
3→    T   mega↑phone?
4     S8  ye:s.
```

In addition, because of the linguistic asymmetries inherent to the interaction, the communication task interactions were characterised by frequent self-initiated and other-initiated repair. As novice English speakers, students employed much self-initiated self-repair as their turns progressed. The teacher participant also implemented self-repair at transition relevance places (and occasionally in third position) when students were displaying difficulty with uptake (Koshik, 2002). Examples of this are presented in brief in Extracts 3.8 through 3.9.

Extract 3.8 (S4)

```
1→   S4  uh:↓ (4.5) th- (1.2) °th-° (0.2) >this is:< ↑ah (0.8)
2→       this °is° .hh: (3.5) °m-° mov↑ing or (1.6) sur↑prise an:d
3→       (0.8) >oh my ↑god< an(d) (0.5) °wha-° what (1.0) an(d)
4→       (0.2) what do °y-° (0.6) .h (1.0) what do
```

Extract 3.9 (S1)

```
1     T   is i::t ↑corn?
2         (1.3)
3→    T   is it a f↑oo::d? ↓or ingredient.
4         (3.1)
5→    T   [hh huh huh huh [.HHH] like is it an agricultural:=
6     S1  [par- =pardon?  [eheh]
```

Both the student participants and the teacher participant made frequent use of other-initiations of repair. Examples of this are presented in brief in Extracts 3.10 through 3.11.

Extract 3.10 (S3)

```
1     S3  [hah hah]
2     T   [     is] it a ↑chestnut?
3         (1.1)
4→    S3  uh:: (0.2) °chestnut¿°=
5     T   =do they <ROA:ST it?
```

Extract 3.11 (S4)

```
1     T   ah (0.3) is it a situ↑ation? (0.2) you mean¿
2         (0.3)
3     S4  situa(tion) ↓yeah
4→    T   like an emer↑gency¿
5         (1.3)
6     S4  ↓no (0.4) .hh: (3.1) °mo:ve° .h
7         (0.8)
8→    T   ↓ah: everything is mov↑ing? like an earthquake?
```

Finally, the teacher participant implemented actions that demonstrated her status as the more linguistically competent party. This included correcting actions and informing actions. Examples of this are presented in brief in

Extracts 3.12 through 3.14.

Extract 3.12 (S5)

```
1    S5  ↓ah my mother (1.3) °don't use it°=
2→    T  =doesn't use it.
3    S5  >yeah ↓ah so< ↑doesn't use it=↑but (1.7) i:m (1.4)
```

Extract 3.13 (S2)

```
1    S2  =cactus,
2→    T  um (0.7) cactus is a plant and grows in the desert,
3    S2  ah (yeah)=
4→    T  =and has very (0.3)
5    S2  ↑ah y[eah
6→    T       [PAINFUL SPIKES:=
```

Extract 3.14 (S7)

```
1    S7  °yes° (0.4) san- (0.7) ta: claus ↑wear it.
2        (1.4)
3→    T  santa ↑claus wears the: (0.9) red and white cos↑tume
4        (0.8)
5    S7  so:: costu:me (0.3) >part of cos↑tume<
```

We shall now examine how this distribution of interactional labour was enacted in more detail, exploring both minimised and expanded completion of the communication task.

3.2.2 Minimised completion of the communication task

Extract 3.15 provides an example of a student participant and the teacher participant carrying out the communication task successfully and

efficiently. As we shall see, there is little indication of problems with mutual understanding, and the interactants proceed quickly to the target lexical item. The target lexical item is “firework.”

Extract 3.15 (S5)

```
 1    S5  this year (0.5) i (1.0) i went to: (1.1) this: festival.
 2        (1.2)
 3    S5  it is °festival.°
 4        (0.8)
 5     T  in japan?=
 6    S5  =yes. in JAPAN. un (1.0) °yes° an:d (0.6)
 7     T  when is it held.
 8        (0.5)
 9    S5  uh:: (.) SUMMER¿
10     T  mm hm,
11        (1.0)
12    S5  an:d (2.5) in japan (1.1) every ye↑ar ho::ld (0.9) this
13        festival in °summer?°
14        (0.7)
15     T  <near> the water¿
16    S5  YES::
17     T  is it fire[works?]
18    S5            [AH::  ] ↑yes ↑yes ↑yes ↑yes,
19     T  ↑firework festival¿=
20    S5  =yes::.
```

The extract begins with S5 offering the clue “this year I went to this festival” at line 1. T asks “in Japan?” and S5 answers yes. T then asks “when is that held?” and S5 responds with a single word “SUMMER” in loud voice, which T receipts with a response token. At line 12-13, S5 successively provides her assertion that in Japan this festival is held in summer every year. T asks another question “near the water?” and S5 says yes. Finally, T guesses at the target item

“firework”, which S5 quickly confirms with multiple “yes” tokens, before further confirming her reference to the firework festival.

We can see in Extract 3.15 that S5 and T quickly arrive at the target lexical item. We can see the efficient patterns T and S5 create; S5 makes an assertion, T asks a question, and then this is followed by a relevant answer from S5. This culminates in a correct guess from T, and swift confirmation from S5.

In Extract 3.16, the target lexical item is “megaphone.” S8 begins by highlighting its use in sports games. She asserts that “it is used in baseball game” at line 1 and then highlights another sport (i.e., “soccer game”) at line 4.

Extract 3.16 (S8)

```
 1    S8  it is u:sed (0.2) used (1.8) in (1.3) baseball ga[:me   ]
 2     T                                                  [uh huh]
 3         (1.4)
 4    S8  °soccer ga:me°
 5         (0.3)
 6     T  uh huh
 7         (1.4)
 8    S8  °°and so on.°°
 9         (2.9)
10    S8  we ca:n (1.3) >we can< (0.6) sa:y (1.6) .h (1.0) e-to (uh)
11         (0.5)
12     T  to (0.4) ↓to: anno↑unce (0.3) infor↑mation?=or to=
13    S8  =.HH no:_
14         (0.6)
15    S8  to: (1.2) °e-to (uh)° (0.5) ch- cheer¿=
16     T  =to ↑cheer=
17    S8  =°cheer.°
18     T  for the ↑team
19    S8  ye:s.
20         (1.2)
21     T  u:se it to make your voice (0.4) [↑louder ↑louder, ]
22    S8                                  [loudly uh louder.]
23         (0.7)
24     T  is it <MEGA↑PHONE?>=
```

```
25    S8  =ye:s.
26     T  mega↑phone?
27    S8  ye:s.
```

T receipts these assertions about sports with the continuer “uh huh” at line 2 and line 6. S8 then adds “and so on”, before beginning another turn. This turn slowly progresses, and she eventually reaches “we can say” and indicates a word search using the Japanese word “e-to”. T produces the elliptical utterance “to announce information?” at line 12, pointing back towards S8’s use of the verb “say”. S8 responds to this question in a disconfirming way, nominating “cheer” as an alternative to “announce”. T then other-initiates repair, narrowing in on “cheer”, and S8 promptly repeats this word in low voice at line 17. T builds on this common ground, adding that this cheering is “for the team”, and that the item is used to “make your voice louder”. T and S8 overlap in their productions of “louder”. T then attempts to guess the target word, asking “is it MEGAPHONE?”. S8 answers with a falling “yes”, and T offers a further confirmation check “megaphone?”, which S8 confirms.

Like Extract 3.15 above, we can see that S8 and T move systematically towards identifying the target lexical item. S8’s initiating assertions are receipted by T, and this provides a basis for S8’s talk at 10 and 15 to contribute strongly to

common ground. T's questions target distinctive aspects of the function of the target object, they receive prompt, fitted answers from S8, and this culminates in a successful guess.

3.2.3 Expanded completion of the communication task

In Extract 3.17, S4 encounters substantial difficulty securing uptake from T, and T has problems analysing S4's talk. This example is punctuated by long periods of silence, and repetitive contributions from S4. Here, the target lexical item is "panic."

Extract 3.17 (S4)

```
 1    S4  o:key (0.9) an:d (0.4) °and° (3.1) sur↑prise .hh: oh my
 2        ↑god (1.0) .hh: (3.0) (hah) >surprise an:d oh my god< (7.7)
 3        ↑eh (0.7) an:d (1.1) uh (1.2) .hh (3.1) this i- ↑ah::
 4        (hah) >sur↑prise an:d:< (0.8) >oh my god an:d:< (1.5)
 5        °wha-° what shall we do .hh: (0.9)
 6     T  ah (0.3) is it a situ↑ation? (0.2) you mean¿
 7        (0.3)
 8    S4  situa(tion) ↓yeah
 9     T  like an emer↑gency¿
10        (1.3)
11    S4  ↓no (0.4) .hh: (3.1) °mo:ve° .h
12        (0.8)
13     T  ↓ah: everything is mov↑ing? like an earthquake?
14        (0.6)
15    S4  .hh:: (0.8) .h (1.0) [↑e-to (uh) hah]
16     T                       [hah hah       ]
17    S4  uh:↓ (4.5) th- (1.2) °th-° (0.2) >this is:< ↑ah (0.8)
18        this °is° .hh: (3.5) °m-° mov↑ing or (1.6) sur↑prise an:d
19        (0.8) >oh my ↑god< an(d) (0.5) °wha-° what (1.0) an(d)
20        (0.2) what do °y-° (0.6) .h  (1.0) what do
21        (3.2)
22     T  so (0.2) you are ↑panicking,
23        (0.3)
24    S4  [YEAH hah PANIC [hah
25     T  [is it panic?   [↑panic ok.=
```

```
26    S4   =.HHH ↑panic hah .HH ↑thank you .hh panic.
```

Between 1 and 4, S4 repeatedly says “surprise” and “oh my God” interspersed with long (sometimes extremely long) periods of silence. During this turn, T does not respond vocally. After S4 says “what shall we do”, T finally contributes to the interaction, asking if it is a “situation”. S4 answers with a repeat of “situation” and “yeah”. T then asks whether it is “like an emergency”, but S4 rejects it and, after another long silence, produces the word “move”. T initiates repair, formulating this as “everything is moving” and guesses at “an earthquake” at line 13. A delay ensues, and then both T and S4 laugh together, seemingly orienting to their mutual difficulty with the task. S4 then begins another long, slow turn. The key lexical components are “moving”, “surprise” and “oh my God”, and she adds “what do”. After a long silence of 3.2 seconds, T makes a guess “you are panicking” and S4 say loudly “YEAH hah PANIC” at line 24. T seeks confirmation by asking “is that panic?”, and S4 confirms.

We can see in Extract 3.17 that the interactants progress slowly and inconsistently towards the target word. S4’s fragmented and repetitive contributions do not receive prompt uptake from T, and long silences ensue within and between their turns. In addition, T must make large inferences from

the semantically strong items in S4's turn. They do not build methodically towards the target item, with the eventually correct guess relying largely on T's inferences.

3.3 Repetition in the communication task

As we have seen so far, the communication task required the student participants and the teacher participant to arrive at a shared understanding of the target lexical item, but the intrinsic knowledge and linguistic asymmetries can make that challenging. As we have also seen, next-turn repetition was a prominent feature of interactions in the communication task (Robinson, 2010). In particular, there were many instances where: the student participants repeated the immediately prior talk of the teacher participant; the repeated items were the only or main items in the turn; and the words repeated had strong lexical-semantic content. We shall now focus on the functions of these instances of repetition in the communication task, which are summarised in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. Table 3.1 shows that the students used repetition for various types of confirming responses and, less commonly, other-initiation of repair.

Table 3.1 Frequency of action types for repeating turns

Action	Sub-type	Count
Confirmation	-	49
	agreement	*19*
	answer	*15*
	repair solution	*15*
Other-initiation of repair	-	15
Total	-	64

Table 3.2 Frequency of single word and phrase repetition

Repeated item	Count
Single word	52
Phrase	12
Total	64

Table 3.2 shows that, overwhelmingly, the repetitions reproduced single words from the prior turn. The next section will elaborate the functions of this next-turn repetition by students. Moreover, it will demonstrate that these repeating turns were important for completing the communication task, and that they also generated language learning opportunities for the students.

3.3.1 Confirming repeats

In Extract 3.18, S4 and T have just begun a communication task where the target lexical item is a one-way street sign. The analysis that follows will demonstrate that S4 used repetition to implement a variety of confirming responses. The extract commences with S4 offering an assertion that provides key semantic information; primarily, “go straight” and “road rule”.

Extract 3.18 (S4)

```
 1     S4   first, (1.5) go straight (1.4) an:d (1.1) this is ah: (1.2)
 2          <road.
 3          (2.1)
 4          an:d (3.7) RULE (0.7) road rule an(d) (0.9) go straight.
 5          (2.1)
 6      T   °.hh °h[uh°
 7     S4         [huh .H[H
 8→     T                 [is it a SIGN?
 9          (0.4)
10»    S4   si(gn) yeah.
11          (.)
12      T   a sign on a road?
13     S4   yeah.=
14→     T   =that says go strai:ght?
15          (1.1)
16»    S4   go straight (0.4) to yeah.=
17→     T   =you can’t turn, you mean?
18»    S4   no turn.
19      T   no turn¿=
20     S4   =yeah.
21          (2.5)
22      T   ↓so is it (0.6) straight go straight road sign.
23          (1.5)
24      T   it’s not a signal¿ not a light¿
25     S4   °n-° no. .hh ↑uh:: (0.3) go straight. uh: (0.4)
26      T   like one way street? you me↑an?
27     S4   YEAH.
28→     T   one way street?=
29»    S4   =one way. yeah.=
30      T   =okay. huh hhh
31          (1.0)
32      T   is that it?
```

```
33          (0.3)
34→     T   one way street sign¿
35          (0.2)
36»    S4   yeah one way.
```

After some laughter from both parties, T asks a question, “is it a sign?”. S4 answers with a repeat of the final item in the turn “sign”. T then adds a further declarative question, asking whether the sign is “on the road”, which S4 answers with “yeah”. T then builds on this line of questioning further, drawing on words used by S4 in her prior assertion. She focuses on whether the sign “says go straight”, and S4 responds once again by repeating “go straight”. T then initiates repair, querying whether “go straight” means “you can’t turn”. S4 confirms this with another repeating response “no turn”. T eventually offers the formulation “one-way street” at line 26. S4 responds with a loud “yeah”. T pursues confirmation twice, which both solicit repeating responses from S4.

In Extract 3.18, S4 uses repetition to provide confirming responses to questions, repair initiations, and confirmation checks. These repeating responses strongly confirm the propositions advanced by T’s turns, and allow them to build common ground, moving from it being a “sign”, to a “road sign”, to a road sign with a direction to “go straight”, and then eventually to the target item, a “one-way” street sign. It is worth noting, however, that S4’s repetitions of

“one-way” do not immediately close the communication task. It seems likely that this is attributable to the equivocal nature of her “yeah” response at 27 and her repetition at 29. That is, her “yeah” at 27 may indicate that the target lexical item is only “like” a one-way street, and her repetition at 29 may indicate that the target is “one-way street” rather than “one-way street sign”.

Further confirming uses of repetition are presented in Extract 3.19. Here, we shall see that S5 repeats elements of T’s turn in order to answer and agree with T’s actions; particularly, guesses at the target lexical item. In Extract 3.19, S5 must convey the target lexical item of “measuring spoon”. Earlier in this interaction, S5 starts with the clue “cooking” and then T asks “what kind of cooking?” and together they establish that it can be used for “all food”. S5 then gives other clues, including the words “water” and “three sizes”.

Extract 3.19 (S5)

```
 1          (1.9)
 2     T    do you ↑use it every day?
 3          (0.8)
 4     S5   no:_
 5          (0.3)
 6     S5   ↓ah my mother (1.3) °don’t use it°=
 7     T    =doesn’t use it.
 8     S5   >yeah ↓ah so< ↑doesn’t use it=↑but (1.7) i’:m (1.4)
 9          °i° (1.6) i (0.8) i ca:n’t coo::k (0.8) °any foo::d°
10          (2.0) .h (0.4) e:to (uh) (0.4) °don- don’t use it° (1.4)
11          becau::se (3.0) i (0.8) do:n’t (1.4) °°cook (1.1) many
12          times¿°° (1.1) EH? HAH HAH UM: (0.5) um
13          (0.6)
```

```
14→    T   is it .h used for <mea↑suring?> or it's used [for ↑mixing?
15»    S5                                               [>measure.
16»        measure. measure. measure. [measure.<]
17→    T                              [used for ] mea↑suring¿=
18»    S5  =yes. [so >measure. measure.< [measuring.]
19     T         [measuring,             [measuring ] ↑water? or=
20     S5  =UN (0.2) [(O:R)]
21     T             [ meas]uring flo↑ur¿ [or measuring sugar¿ ]
22     S5                                 [↑AH >so so so so (ye]s yes yes
23         yes) yes yes yes.<
24     T   is it measuring CUP?
25         (1.4)
26→    T   or measuring ↑spoo:n=
27»    S5  =°>spoon. spoon.<°=
28     T   =measuring spoon?
29     S5  °un.°
```

After a long silence of 1.9 seconds, T asks a question "Do you use it every day?" at line 2. S5 responds "no" and says "my mother don't use it." T promptly makes a correction to a grammatical mistake at line 7. S5 repairs her previous comment at line 8. S5 then produces a lengthy turn, asserting that she doesn't use it because she cooks far less often. T does not promptly respond to this assertion and, at line 12, S5 laughs loudly while looking away, which, we might speculate, is prompted by her difficulties securing a response from T. After further silence, T asks an alternative question focused on the function of the object; whether it was used for "measuring" or "mixing." Then S5 repeats the word "measure" multiple times. T responds with a confirmation request (and perhaps an embedded correction) "used for measuring" at line 17, which is an other-initiation of repair. S5 responds affirmatively, producing "yes", further

repetitions of “measure”, and then “measuring”. T continues guessing about the target lexical item, proffering functions of “measuring water,” “measuring flour,” and “measuring sugar,”, before suggesting the possible item “measuring cup” and “measuring spoon”. S5 meets the function guesses with multiple “yes” responses. However, she does not respond vocally to the guess “measuring cup”. She responds to the “measuring spoon” guess with two repeats of “spoon”.

In summary, Extract 3.19 shows that S5 uses repetition of T’s turn to provide confirming answers and agreements, which ratify elements of T’s talk. With these repeats, S5 establishes with T key pieces of common ground, which T then uses to build subsequent guesses. At lines 15-16 and 18, S5 strongly establishes that “measuring” is a key function of the target item, confirming T’s guesses. Her repetition of “spoon” strongly and effectively confirms T’s guess, and closes the activity. That is, T treats this repetition as signaling that S5 has adequately understood her turn, that she has aligned with action and presuppositions.

Extract 3.20 offers an example of repetition being used to implement a strong repair solution, and close a period of persistent problems with uptake. In

this example, the target lexical item is “stapler”. S1 begin the communication task by offering an assessment of the item as “difficult”, before slowly producing an assertion that it is sold in a particular shop nearby (i.e., the “Y shop”). T receipts this assertion with “okay”, and S1 the claims that she uses it.

Extract 3.20 (S1)

```
 1     S1  uh: (2.2) eh:¿ (2.7) difficult huh eh: (1.9) ↑i:t: is: (2.0)
 2         ah: (4.6) it: is: (4.8) >it is sell< so:ld: (0.4) in (2.9)
 3         Y sho- (0.6) p:
 4         (0.6)
 5      T  okay?
 6         (0.4)
 7     S1  °a:nd° (4.0) >↑i u:< i use it:
 8         (4.8)
 9     S1  um i often use it
10         (1.1)
11     S1  °e::to°
12         (5.0)
13     S1  um (2.0) i- (2.2) >it is:< (2.3) um (1.4) <studen:t: (1.0)
14         often use it.
15         (1.8)
16     S1  °e::to°
17         (1.1)
18     S1  for example (1.6) student: (2.1) ↑wri:te report: (3.4) °>write
19         repor:t<° (3.7) repor::t (2.1) finished (0.7) °>student it<°
20         (0.4)  >student use it< (0.7)
21→    T   students use it when they ↑finish wri[ting?
22»    S1                                       [finish wri[ting.
23     T                                                  [finish
24         writing¿
25         (0.3)
26     T   .hhhh (0.8) mm::.
27         (.)
28     T   so it’s not a pe:n¿
29         (0.5)
30     S1  n[o.  ]
31     T    [it’s] not a notebook.
```

After a long silence of almost 5 seconds, S1 continues her assertion about

when she uses it before running into more turn construction problems. After further long silences she changes the shape of her turn, and begins with “it is”. She changes again, and eventually arrives that the assertions “students often use it” and “student write report”. This does not receive a response from T. S1 then produce “write report” and “report” once again, and then adds the word “finished”, as well as “student it” and “students use it”. At this point, T finally intervenes. She initiates repair, and formulates S’s turn as “students use it when they finish writing?”. S1 overlaps with T to produce a repetition of these final turn elements, “finish writing”. At line 28, T then begins to rule out items, presumably because they are used during the process of writing a report, such as a “pen” and a “notebook”, and the communication task continues.

This extract, like Extract 3.20/S1 above, demonstrates how confirming repetition can be used as a strong repair solution. Here, S1 displayed significant difficulty arriving at an assertion that would secure substantial uptake from T. Her repetition of T’s other-initiation strongly ratified T’s formulation of S1’s prior talk, and provided a basis for more substantial guesses from T (even if it was only to rule out possible items).

A final, extended example of confirming repetition is presented in Extract

3.21. Here, the target lexical item is “lottery ticket”. In the initial parts of Extract 3.21, S6 and T establish that it is something that one would purchase, and then kind of place one would buy it. At the very beginning, S6 has difficulty creating her turn, and eventually produces the account “it’s difficult.” She then produces some talk interspersed with long silences, saying “we buy it … one thousand yen or … two thousand yen.” T asks S6 “where do you buy it” at line 6 and S6 begins to respond, saying “We usually buy …”, but then a very long silence of 8 seconds emerges.

Extract 3.21 (S6)

```
 1    S6  we::: (4.0) hh: it’s diffi↑cult hah hah hh: (4.2) <↓we::
 2        buy (1.0) the::se (1.4) pa↑per> (1.2) an:d (3.1) we::
 3        (1.9) we: bu::y i↑t, (1.1) uh (4.7) um:: (1.2)  °>one
 4        thousand ↑ye:n<° o:r (4.2) >two thousand< ye:n=>two
 5        thousand ↑yen< (0.7) eh:
 6     T  whe:re do you buy it.
 7    S6  ah: (5.2) we it (0.9) um: (0.5) we: bu- (0.4) >we
 8        usually< bu::y (8.0)
 9     T  do you buy it. at a ↑shop? (0.4) or a de↑partment
10        store? or a supermarket?
11        (0.5)
12    S6  sh- ↑shop
13        (1.1)
14→    T  a special shop¿=
15»   S6  °=special shop¿°
16        (2.3)
17→    T  it’s pa↑per=
18»   S6  =[pap(er)]
19     T   [you    ] buy one thousand yen or two thousand yen,
20        (1.3)
21     T  [↑for] each paper,
22    S6  [hh: ]
23        (3.9)
24    S6  yeah: .hh: we:: (3.5)
25     T  ↓why do you buy it.
26        (1.5)
```

```
27    S6  ↑why? hah hah
28        (1.1)
29     T  do you ↑buy it <as a GIFT¿ >for other ↑people?<
30        (0.3)
31    S6  no:_
32        (0.4)
33     T  or do you buy it ↑becau:se you [want to] ↑use it?
34    S6                                 [because]
35        (3.4)
36    S6  <we wan:(t) (0.7) hh to (1.2) °so:me (0.4) big money:°
37        (0.2)
38→    T  o:kay:. so it's a ↑lottery ticket.
39        (1.1)
40»   S6  lottery=↑yeah [yes yes ye:s     ]
41     T                [a lottery ticket.]
42        (0.5)
43     T  is that right?
44    S6  ri:ght
```

T breaks the silence at line 9, and asks additional questions “do you buy it at a shop? or a department store? or a supermarket?” When S6 responds with “shop,” T then questions the type of shop (i.e., “a special shop?”). S6 repeats T’s turn of “special shop” quietly, and latched to T’s turn. T returns to the item itself, asserting that “it’s paper” and S6 repeats T’s final word “paper.” T then asks about the reason one buys it at line 25. After the long silence of 1.5 seconds, S6 repeats “why?” with rising intonation and laughs. T then offers a candidate reason for buying it, i.e., “do you buy it as a GIFT for other people?” S6 says no at line 31. T presses on with this questioning, asking “do you buy it because you want to use it?” at line 33. After a long silence of 3.4 seconds at line 35, she builds her answer “because we want (to) some big money.” T then

guesses, or effectively asserts the target lexical item by saying “okay. so it's a lottery ticket.” A long silence of 1.1 seconds follows. S6 then repeats “lottery”, before adding a series of “yes” and “yeah” tokens. There is partial overlap between S6’s multiple “yes” and T’s answer “a lottery ticket.” Then T seeks confirmation by asking the question “is that right?”. S6 responds with “right”, confirming T’s guess.

We can see in Extract 3.21 that S6 repeats words from T’s turn in line 40 and line 44. At 40, her turn beginning with repetition of the word “lottery” comes to agrees with S6’s assertion about the candidate lexical item, validating her guess. However, the long silence at 39 seems to indicate to T that S6’s confirmation is somewhat ambiguous, and she seeks further confirmation at 41 and 43. S6 then strongly endorses T’s guess by repeating “right” at 44. So, we can see that, while repetition can be used to strongly confirm aspects of the prior turn, it can also be weakened by other signals, such as a long inter-turn silence.

3.3.2 Other-initiating repeats

In Extract 3.22, the target lexical item is “cactus”. We shall see here that

S2 uses repetition for a substantially different action, i.e., other-initiation of repair (Curl, 2005). Prior to the extract, S2 has conveyed that it is something from the desert, that “vegetarian can eat ... steak”, and that it might be painful to touch. This leads to T asking whether it is a plant. At line 5, T then makes a guess at the target lexical item, asking “is that a CACTUS?”.

Extract 3.22 (S2)

```
 1     S2   [hurt.]
 2      T   is it a plant?
 3          (1.1)
 4     S2   °plan:° ah yes yes plan-=
 5→     T   =is it a CACTUS,
 6          (1.4)
 7→     T   cactus.=
 8»    S2   =cactus,
 9      T   um (0.7) cactus is a plant and grows in the desert,
10     S2   ah (yeah)=
11      T   =and has very (0.3)
12     S2   ↑ah y[eah
13      T        [PAINFUL SPIKES:=
14     S2   =↑ye:s [yes yeah
15      T          [coming out.=<↑is that right?
16     S2   °yeah°=
17      T   =°yea[h.°
18     S2        [and colour is uh (1.9) green.
```

T’s question does not get an immediate response. It is followed by a long silence of 1.4 seconds. During this time, S2 tilts her head. This is indicative of problems with uptake, and that a dispreferred or disconfirming response may follow. T resolves this lack of uptake by repeating the final word in her turn, and

the guess at the target lexical item. S2 responds to T's repetition with one of her own, also repeating the word "cactus" with final rising intonation. S2 looks around for help from the researcher, who is also in the room. T's response to S2's repetition at line 9 shows that she analysed this turn as an other-initiation of repair. That is, rather than treating it as confirmation of her guess, T begins to define the word "cactus", noting that it "is a plant and grows in the desert". This definition links back to the previous common ground they established. She proceeds with defining cactus, and S2 responds with multiple "yes" tokens. However, T continues to pursue confirmation that she has in fact reached the targeted lexical item with the question "is that right?". This may be because S2's response is ambiguous as to whether she is displaying recognition of the meaning of "cactus", or also confirming that it is the target. S2 confirms that it is the target at line 16, and adds the assertion that the "colour is ... green". The task is then closed.

In summary, in Extract 3.22, we can see that S2 uses repetition of T's turn to other-initiate repair. T treats this repetition as signaling problems with understanding the word "cactus", and she responds by defining its meaning in a way that invokes their prior talk. S2's other-initiation temporarily interrupts

progress towards the completion of the communication task, but eventually leads to strong confirmation of the target, while also explicitly describing the meaning of the target lexical item.

Extract 3.23 provides further examples of other-initiation of repair involving repetition. We shall see, though, that T responds to these other-initiations in quite a different way. Here, the target lexical item is “chestnut”. Prior to Extract 3.23, they have established that it is food one eats in autumn. S3 has also described the object, asserting that the color of the object is brown on the outside and inside, and it is sweet.

Extract 3.23 (S3)

```
 1→    T   ↑the outside (1.5) S: (.) PIKY?
 2         (0.8)
 3»   S3   °s:piky¿°
 4          (0.7)
 5→    T   or FLA:T. (0.4) is it SM:OOTH? (0.3) or BUMPY.
 6         (0.6)
 7»   S3   °bumpy.°
 8         (0.3)
 9     T   °°bumpy.°°
10         (1.1)
11    S3   [hah hah]
12→    T   [     is] it a ↑chestnut?
13         (1.1)
14»   S3   uh:: (0.2) °chestnut¿°=
15     T   =do they <ROA:ST it?
16         (1.2)
17     T   a:t the in front of the sta↑tion do they cook it
18         (.)
19     T   in a roa:ster?
20         (0.6)
21    S3   ye:s.=
22     T   =HEA:T. (0.2) >heat it ↑up and you ↑pee:l it and e:at
23         the inside¿<
```

```
24     S3   <°°ye::s:.°°>
25          (0.2)
26→    T    chestnuts.
27          (0.3)
28»    S3   °chestnu:ts°
29     T    ↓uh-huh.
30          (1.3)
31     T    ↓in japanese you'd say ku:ri. right¿
32          (0.4)
33     S3   ye:s.
```

At line 1, T looks for more clues, and asks “the outside SPIKY?”. S3 repeats the final word “spiky” quietly, with a rising terminal intonation. T responds by putting forward some related words, i.e., flat, smooth, and bumpy. S3 answers by selecting “bumpy”, and T confirms receipt by repeating the word. At line 12, T produces a candidate guess at the target lexical item, i.e., “is it a chestnut?”. Instead of confirming or disconfirming this guess, S3 produces a non-lexical object “uh”, and then says “chestnut” quietly with rising terminal intonation and tilts her head. T responds by returning to asking questions about the target, i.e., “do they roast it?”. S3 does not respond vocally, and after a long silence T adds an increment to her question (“at the front of the station”), before revising the question by replacing the verb (“do they cook it”), and then adding another increment when S3 does not respond promptly (“in a roaster?”). S3 answers using “yes”, and T changes tack, describing how to cook and how to eat chestnuts at lines 22-23. S3 again offers a quiet “yes” in response. T then says

“chestnuts”, effectively affirming her own guess. S3 repeats “chestnuts” quietly, and T receipts with “uh huh”, before offering the cognate word in Japanese, which is “kuri”.

In this extract S3 uses repetition for a variety of actions, but we shall focus on line 3 and line 14 where she uses it to other-initiate repair. With these repetitions, she locates a particular aspect of the prior turn as problematic, and delays the action that was projected for that sequential position, i.e., answering a question, and confirming a guess. We can also see some common features between these instances. Both are produced after a substantial silence, both have rising terminal intonation, and both are produced quietly. In addition, it is interesting to note how T responds to these other-initiations of repair. Rather than directly addressing the word that S3 has narrowed in on, she defines it somewhat indirectly by offering antonymous and synonymous words in the case of the other-initiation at line 5, and focusing on how chestnuts are prepared in the case of the other-initiation at line 14. As above, with each other-initiation, S3 delays and extends the communication task, and prevents them from reaching consensus on the target lexical item. However, in doing so, she creates opportunities for T to contribute to their common ground, and solicits words and

descriptions from T relate to the words and concepts targeted with repair.

Chapter 4: Discussion and conclusion

4.1 Summary of findings

The asymmetrical nature of the communication task produced a variety of distinctive interactional patterns. In some cases, the participants progressed unproblematically in the communication task, with student assertions, teacher questions, and their respective responses quickly contributing to common ground (see Clark, 1996), and culminating in a successful guess at the target lexical item from the teacher participant. However, in many cases, the communication task interactions proceeded unevenly, with the student's limited linguistic resources implicating periods of problems with mutual understanding and repair, undermining the teacher participant's ability to formulate a successful guess at the target lexical item. Student participants' next-turn repetitions of words and phrases from the teacher participant's turn functioned in important ways during the communication task. They confirmed aspects of the teacher participant's prior talk. This immediately built common ground, and encouraged progression in the communication task. On the other hand, these repetitions were also used to other-initiate repair. This interrupted the immediate progression of common ground and the communication task, preventing the

participants from reaching consensus on the target lexical item, and soliciting further actions from the teacher. However, the teacher participant's responses to these other-initiations of repair provided further words, descriptions, definitions, and questions that contributed to common ground in the task. She also offered both explicit and implicit expositions of the words targeted with repair.

4.2 Repetition in interaction as a communication strategy

The findings of this study add to the information available about the communication strategies implemented by NNSs when interacting with NSs. In particular, they offer further empirical evidence of the role of repetition in solving communication problems, i.e., as (confirming) repair solutions. However, the findings of this study have also shown that next-turn repetition can be an important communication strategy when problems have *not* explicitly arisen. That is, it has highlighted that repetition can be useful for NNSs as a strong way of responding to an assertion or a question. Repetition-based responses to questions and assertions claim knowledge and expertise in a way this is stronger than more minimal tokens (see Heritage and Raymond, 2005; 2012).

Hence, NNSs can use repetition to promote common ground, and assert their own “agency” in the interaction (Heritage and Raymond, 2012). So, the present study contributes to the body of conversation-analytic research specifying the abilities and practices of language learners (see Hellerman and Lee, 2014). It specifies the nature of communication strategies relevant for managing communication problems, and for managing interaction more generally, in the absence of communication problems.

The findings of this study are also consistent with Lilja (2014), who found that NNSs used repetition for other-initiation of repair in everyday conversation (rather than a communication task, as in the present study). It supports her finding that repeating a word can generate language learning opportunities in the course of interactions that are not explicitly paedagogical (see also Kurhila, 2001). As we saw, the teacher participant responded to these other-initiations by either directly defining words, or contrasting it with other relevant vocabulary (e.g., spiky vs. flat vs. bumpy vs. smooth). So, NNSs, such as the student participants in the present study, are able to draw on this practice to dynamically engage in learning while having a great variety of interactions with NSs. This reflects the robust, likely universal features of other-initiation of repair in human

communication (see Dingemanse et al., 2015). However, it is also clear that these actions can bring forth orientation to the “non-nativeness” of NNSs (see Wong, 2000). This might not be desirable on some occasions.

4.3 Implications for English language teaching in Japan

Language learning and language teaching are challenging undertakings in a variety of ways. In the Japanese context, the institutional objectives of MEXT (as outlined in Chapter 1) make for a difficult, but potentially exciting outlook for English language learning for young people in Japan. This study has demonstrated how a perspective focused on communicative uses of English, and an ELF-based conceptualisation of language and communicative competence (see House, 2012) can provide important information for language learners and teachers in Japan. The (admittedly small) practices of repetition outlined here offer an example of the possible benefits of using findings about the organisation of interaction into language teaching (Hellerman & Lee, 2014). For example, with more explicit awareness of the function of other-initiating repetition, students might be able to mediate their own language learning opportunities more actively or confidently. Adding information about

communication and interaction into curricula might help with ensuring that Japan's young people are well equipped to meet the challenges of a globalised, ELF-oriented world (Block & Cameron, 2002; House, 2012).

It is also worth noting that the patterns discovered in the communication task interactions seem consistent with the conclusions reached by Kitajima (2013). That is, task-based interactions with strong knowledge asymmetries may provide better structured learning opportunities for language learners than tasks where knowledge is distributed more evenly, and the need/motivation to communicate is lessened.

4.4 Study limitations and future investigation

This study has a number of substantial limitations that merit discussion, and amendation in any future studies. First, the claims about the actions implemented by repeating turns could have been enhanced through systematic comparison with alternative practices (e.g., non-vocal responses, yes/no tokens, unrelated clausal responses) and through more detailed comparison of the repeating responses themselves (e.g., timing, intonation). As it stands, the current study has offered a starting outline focused on action and sequential

position, as well as previous conversation-analytic findings. Second, analysis of multimodal conduct would have provided a better picture of how the student participants combined their talk with other semiotic resources, and improved the account of the differences between the actions identified here (i.e., confirmation and other-initiation of repair). Finally, following Kitajima (2013), the present study's restriction to one communication task and one teacher participant may have affected the diversity of practices observed. A wider variety of communication tasks and NSs would have provided a richer picture of the functions of the practiced analysed.

4.5 Conclusion

This study has conducted an initial exploration of some communication strategies used by Japanese-speaking learners of English while completing a communication task with a native English speaker. It has highlighted the value of a communicative and interactional approach to language learning, which might have substantial utility for English language learning and teaching in Japan.

References

Barnes, S., & Ferguson, A. (2015). Conversation partner responses to problematic talk produced by people with aphasia: Some alternatives to initiating, completing, or pursuing repair. *Aphasiology, 29*, 315–336.

Block, D., & Cameron, D. (2002). *Globalization and language teaching*. London: Routledge.

Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Curl, T. (2005). Practices in other-initiated repair resolution: The phonetic differentiation of ‘repetitions’. *Discourse Processes, 39*, 1–43.

Dingemanse, M., Blythe, J., & Dirksmeyer, T. (2014). Formats for other-initiation of repair across languages: An exercise in pragmatic typology. *Studies in Language, 38*, 5–43.

Dingemanse, M., & Floyd, S. (2014). Conversation across cultures. In N. J. Enfield, P. Kockelman, & J. Sidnell, (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 447-480). Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.

Dingemanse, M., et al. (2015). Universal principles in the repair of communication problems. *PLoS ONE 10*(9), e0136100. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone. 0136100.

Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning, 47*, 173–210.

Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. *ELT Journal, 45*, 16–23.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.

Hall, J. K. (2007). Redressing the roles of correction and repair in research on second and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 511–526.

Hall, J. K., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek-Doehler, S. (2011). *L2 interactional competence and development*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Hamamoto, S. (2015, July). *Politeness strategies transferred by Japanese*

university students in FTD. Paper presented at the International Pragmatics Association Conference, Antwerp, Belgium.

Hellermann, J., & Lee, Y. (2014). Members and their competencies: Contributions of ethnomethodological conversation analysis to a multilingual turn in second language acquisition. *System, 44*, 54–65.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers, (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*, 15–38.

Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2012). Navigating epistemic landscapes: Acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions. In J. P. de Rutier (Ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives* (pp. 179-192). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C.

Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language* (pp. 73–89). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

House. J. (2012). English as a global lingua franca: A threat to multilingual communication and translation? *Language Teaching, 47*, 363–376.

House. J. (2013). Developing pragmatic competence in English as a lingua franca: Using discourse markers to express (inter)subjectivity and connectivity. *Journal of Pragmatics, 59*, 57–67.

English skills of Japanese students fail to meet government targets. (2016, February 2). *The Japan Times*. Retrieved from http://www.japantimes.co.jp

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Kitajima, R. (2013). Interactional features of repair negotiation in NS–NNS interaction on two task types: Information gap and personal information exchange. *Linguistics and Education 24*, 165–178.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers, (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229–256). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on*

Language and Social Interaction, 35, 277–309.

Koshik, I. (2005). *Beyond rhetorical questions: Assertive questions in everyday interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kurhila, S. (2001). Correction in talk between native and non-native speaker. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 1083–1110.

Lilja, N. (2014). Partial repetitions as other-initiations of repair in second language talk: Re-establishing understanding and doing learning. *Journal of Pragmatics 71*, 98–116.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. *On TESOL, 82*, 207–225.

70-80% of third-year junior high schools fail to reach level 3 in English exam: MEXT. (2016, February 3). *The Mainichi*. Retrieved from http://mainichi.jp

McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*, 79–103.

Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse: The new critical idiom*. London: Routledge.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 76–91.

Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *Modern Language Journal, 94*, 116–136.

Nickerson, C. (2015). The death of the non-native speaker? English as a lingua franca in business communication: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 48*, 390–404.

Poulisse, N. (1990). *The use of compensatory strategies by Dutch learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Rabab'ah, G. (2015). The effect of communication strategy training on the development of EFL learners' strategic competence and oral communicative ability. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 44*, 1–27.

Robinson, J. (2010) Using full repeats to initiate repair on others' questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 43*, 232-259.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*, 361–382.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *The American Journal of Sociology, 102*, 161–216.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When ‘others’ initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 205–243.

Schegloff, E. A. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction* (pp. 70–96). London: Berg.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 59*, 339–341.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory*. London: Bloomsbury.

Swain, M. (2013). The inseparability of cognition and emotion in second language learning. *Language Teaching, 46*, 195–207.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 244–267.

Appendix A:

Communication task materials

Communication task instructions and materials

Participants were told that the aim of the task for the teacher participant to name an object or concept depicted on a picture card. However, only the student participants were shown the card, and they were told not to use its name. After the researcher showed the student participants the picture card, the task began. All pictures were collected from free materials on the internet. Examples cards (for cactus, measuring spoon, and desert) are shown below.

サボテン

計量スプーン

砂漠

Appendix B:

Ethical approval and participant forms

MACQUARIE University

Scott Barnes <scott.barnes@mq.edu.au>

RE: HS Ethics Application - Approved (5201500824)(Con/Met)

Fhs Ethics <fhs.ethics@mq.edu.au> 20 November 2015 at 13:02
To: Dr Scott Barnes <scott.barnes@mq.edu.au>
Cc: Ms Satoko Nishimura <satoko.nishimura@students.mq.edu.au>

Dear Dr Barnes,

Re: "Communication strategies in interactions involving language learners"(5201500824)

Thank you very much for your response. Your response has addressed the issues raised by the Faculty of Human Sciences Human Research Ethics Sub-Committee and approval has been granted, effective 20th November 2015. This email constitutes ethical approval only.

This research meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). The National Statement is available at the following web site:

http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72.pdf.

The following personnel are authorised to conduct this research:

Dr Scott Barnes
Ms Satoko Nishimura

Please note the following standard requirements of approval:

1. The approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007).

2. Approval will be for a period of five (5) years subject to the provision of annual reports.

Progress Report 1 Due: 20th November 2016
Progress Report 2 Due: 20th November 2017
Progress Report 3 Due: 20th November 2018
Progress Report 4 Due: 20th November 2019
Final Report Due: 20th November 2020

NB. If you complete the work earlier than you had planned you must submit a Final Report as soon as the work is completed. If the project has been discontinued or not commenced for any reason, you are also required to submit a Final Report for the project.

Progress reports and Final Reports are available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/current_research_staff/human_research_ethics/application_resources

3. If the project has run for more than five (5) years you cannot renew approval for the project. You will need to complete and submit a Final Report and submit a new application for the project. (The five year limit on renewal of approvals allows the Sub-Committee to fully re-review research in an environment where legislation, guidelines and requirements are continually changing, for example, new child protection and privacy laws).

4. All amendments to the project must be reviewed and approved by the Sub-Committee before implementation. Please complete and submit a Request for Amendment Form available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/current_research_staff/human_research_ethics/managing_approved_research_projects

5. Please notify the Sub-Committee immediately in the event of any adverse effects on participants or of any unforeseen events that affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

6. At all times you are responsible for the ethical conduct of your research in accordance with the guidelines established by the University. This information is available at the following websites:

http://www.mq.edu.au/policy

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/policy

If you will be applying for or have applied for internal or external funding for the above project it is your responsibility to provide the Macquarie University's Research Grants Management Assistant with a copy of this email as soon as possible. Internal and External funding agencies will not be informed that you have approval for your project and funds will not be released until the Research Grants Management Assistant has received a copy of this email.

If you need to provide a hard copy letter of approval to an external organisation as evidence that you have approval, please do not hesitate to contact the Ethics Secretariat at the address below.

Please retain a copy of this email as this is your official notification of ethics approval.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Anthony Miller
Chair
Faculty of Human Sciences
Human Research Ethics Sub-Committee

Faculty of Human Sciences - Ethics
Research Office
Level 3, Research HUB, Building C5C
Macquarie University
NSW 2109

Ph: +61 2 9850 4197
Email: fhs.ethics@mq.edu.au
http://www.research.mq.edu.au/

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
Macquarie University
Sydney, Australia

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

Project title
"Communication strategies in interactions involving language learners"

Purpose of the research
You are invited to participate in a study about communication strategies used by language learners. The purpose of this study is to better understand how native speakers of English (NS) and non-native speakers of English (NNS) communicate with one another. The researchers will analyse the features of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies used by native and non-native speakers, focusing on how communication problems are resolved. The findings of this study will help develop ideas about language, communication, and language learning and teaching.

The study is being conducted by Nishimura Satoko, for the degree of Master of Research. Her supervisor is Dr Scott Barnes, from the Department of Linguistics at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.

Requirements of the research
You have been contacted about this study because you participated in a previous study conducted by Nishimura Satoko. If you choose to participate in the present study, all you will need to do is consent to the researchers using the video recordings collected during the previous study. You will **NOT** be asked to do any new tasks for the present study.

Protection of personal information
Research data are confidential. Members of the research team will be the only parties who have access to your research data. When your video recordings and any other identifying information are no longer being used for research, they will be permanently deleted.

Once the study is complete, a summary of the results will be made available to you, if you request it. This will be sent to you via email. The results of this research will also be published in academic journals, and presented at academic conferences, and professional workshops. Transcripts of video recordings presented in written

publications will not include any of your personal details. You can choose to allow your videos to be show in research presentations and teaching, but this is not compulsory.

Withdrawing from the research

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. In addition, if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason and without any consequences.

For further details about this study, please contact Nishimura Satoko using the information at the listed at the bottom of this form.[1]

Contact details

Nishimura Satoko (082) 878-9781
shamamot@yasuda-u.ac.jp

Scott Barnes +61 9850 7960
scott.barnes@mq.edu.au

[1] The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about any ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Committee through the Director, Research Ethics (telephone (02) 9850 7854; email ethics@mq.edu.au). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
Macquarie University
Sydney, Australia

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Project title
"Communication strategies in interactions involving language learners"

I,_____ have read and understood the Participant Information Statement for this study, and any questions I have about the study have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I can withdraw at any time without consequence. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

I would like feedback regarding the results of the study once it is complete.

NO ☐ **YES** ☐

If "yes", please provide your preferred email address:_____

I consent to excerpts of the video recordings being used at academic conferences and for teaching purposes (e.g., shown in a lecture).

NO ☐ **YES** ☐

I consent to my research data being used in future related studies conducted by Nishimura Satoko, and her collaborators (e.g., research students).

NO ☐ **YES** ☐

Participant's Name _____

Participant's Signature _____ Date: _____

Investigator's Name _____

Investigator's Signature _____ Date: _____

PARTICIPANT'S COPY / INVESTIGATOR'S COPY (circle one) [1]

Contact details

Nishimura Satoko (082) 878-9781
shamamot@yasuda-u.ac.jp

Scott Barnes +61 9850 7960
scott.barnes@mq.edu.au

[1] The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about any ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Committee through the Director, Research Ethics (telephone (02) 9850 7854; email ethics@mq.edu.au). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
Macquarie University
Sydney, Australia

研究対象者の方への説明文書

研究計画名
"Communication strategies in interactions involving language learners"

研究の目的
言語学習者が使用するコミュニケーション・ストラテジーに関する研究に、ご協力いただきますようお願いいたします。この研究の目的は、どのように英語のネイティブスピーカー(NS)と非ネイティブスピーカー(NNS)がお互いのコミュニケーションを図るかを、よりよく理解することにあります。どのようにコミュニケーションの問題が解決されるかに焦点を当てて、英語のネイティブスピーカーと非ネイティブスピーカーによって使用される、言語及び非言語コミュニケーション・ストラテジーの特徴を分析します。この研究結果は、言語・コミュニケーション・言語教育においてアイディアを発展させる上で役立つでしょう。

この研究は MRES 学位取得のため、西村サト子によって実施されます。彼女の指導教官は、オーストラリアのシドニーに位置する Macquarie University で言語学科に所属している Scott Barnes 博士です。

研究の条件
西村サト子によって実施された、先の研究に参加してくださった方々に、この研究についてご連絡を差し上げています。もしよろしければ、先の研究で収集したビデオ録画を、この研究において使用することに同意をいただきたいと存じます。この研究で、新たなタスクを実行するようお願いすることは**ございません**。

個人情報の保護
研究により得られたデータは極秘扱いにいたします。研究関係者のみが、データにアクセスできます。ビデオ録画や研究対象者の特定可能な情報は完全に削除されます。

研究が達成された際には、要請に応じて、研究結果の要旨をご提供いたします。要旨はメールで送付させていただきます。また、研究結果は、学術雑誌に掲載され、学術会議や専門的ワークショップで発表されます。出版物に使用されるビデオ録画の記録は、研究対象者の個人的な詳細を一切含みません。研究発表や教育目的で、ビデオ録画を見せる許可をお願いするかもしれませんが、強制的なものではございません。

研究からの撤退

この研究の参加者は全員がボランティアです。なお、研究承諾書（同意書）提出後でも、事由の釈明や責任を負うことなく、いつでも研究に対する同意を取り消すことができます。

研究の詳細に関しましては、下記の連絡先をご覧いただき、西村サト子までご一報いただきますようよろしくお願いいたします。

連絡先

Nishimura Satoko (082) 878-9781
shamamot@yasuda-u.ac.jp

Scott Barnes +61 9850 7960
scott.barnes@mq.edu.au

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Human Sciences
Macquarie University
Sydney, Australia

研究承諾書（同意書）

研究計画名

"Communication strategies in interactions involving language learners"

私こと＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿は、研究者によって該当研究の説明が文書と口頭で行われ、また、研究者が私の質問への回答を行った後に、私は自由意志によって当研究に参加したことを表明します。なお、研究承諾書（同意書）提出後でも、研究に対する同意を取り消すことができます。研究承諾書（同意書）のコピーを受領しました。

研究が達成されたら、その結果に関するフィードバックを要望します。

NO ☐ **YES** ☐

"YES"の場合：連絡先メールアドレス＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

学術会議で、あるいは教育目的（講義など）のために、ビデオ録画の抜粋が使用されることに同意します。

NO ☐ **YES** ☐

研究データが、研究者である西村サト子とその共同研究者（研究生など）によって今後の研究に使用されることに同意します。

NO ☐ **YES** ☐

参加者の名前　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

参加者の署名　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　日付：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

研究者の名前　＿＿＿西村サト子＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

研究者の署名　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　日付：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

参加者用コピー / 研究者用コピー (どちらかに○を付ける) [1]

連絡先

Nishimura Satoko　(082) 878-9781
shamamot@yasuda-u.ac.jp

Scott Barnes　+61 9850 7960
scott.barnes@mq.edu.au

[1] The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about any ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Committee through the Director, Research Ethics (telephone (02) 9850 7854; email ethics@mq.edu.au). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.