

Title	学習者間のインタラクションにおけるコミュニケーションの構築
Author(s)	サベット, メヘラン
Citation	聖学院大学論叢, 23(1) : 23-42
URL	http://serve.seigakuin-univ.ac.jp/repos/modules/xoonips/detail.php?item_id=2248
Rights	

聖学院学術情報発信システム : SERVE

SEigakuin Repository for academic archiVE

〈原著論文〉

Constructing Communication through Peer-to-Peer Interaction

Mehran SABET

学習者間のインタラクションにおけるコミュニケーションの構築

サベット メヘラン

語学学習は、授業中に真のコミュニケーションをとることにより身につきます。しかしながら、多くの学生は、与えられた機会を有効に使用する知識とスキルを持ち合わせていないために、効果的にコミュニケーションをとる方法を知りません。方略的能力を培うために、教員はコミュニケーション方策を導入促進し、どのように、いつ、使うのかを実例説明し、学生に十分な実践機会を与える必要があります。この論文は、学年の初めのスピーキング・クラスにて、学生にコミュニケーション方法を教えた上で、学期中に実践した記録を分析し、一定水準レベルの学生にふさわしい特定の方法を使わせた報告書である。

Key words; コミュニケーション, 方策, 有効的, ペアワーク, 認知度

In recent years, pair and group work activities have become increasingly popular in EFL classes. At the same time, the approach has provided students with ample opportunities to practice and improve their English skills. Given the limited amount of time teachers can spend with each student, especially in large classes, pair and group work is an effective method to improve students' proficiency and in some cases, as a peer-to-peer teaching tool. Although this approach has a large following (Helgesen 2004, Baker 2010, Harmer 1989), there still remain teachers, and students, who are unaware about its effectiveness in the classroom.

In one sense, reservations are understandable if students doubt the possibility of improving their English through peer-to-peer interaction. From students' perspectives, teaching should come from the teacher and they cannot see how their English can improve by simply interacting with their classmates. Teacher-fronted instruction is still common in Japanese high schools, so university students may perceive that learning and practicing English should be done with a teacher.

There are also teachers who argue that only they are qualified to teach and not much learning can take place from one student to another. However, according to Schulz (2001), given that discrepancies in student and teacher belief systems can be detrimental to learning, it is imperative that teachers explore their students' perceptions regarding those factors believed to enhance the learning of a new language and make efforts to deal with potential conflicts between student beliefs and instructional practices. According to Edwards (2004), the pendulum of language learning has swung in recent years towards learner autonomy and student-centered teaching as the most effective means to address the language learning needs of the next generation, and impressive amounts of creativity, free play, spontaneity, learner autonomy, a willingness to make mistakes and learn from them, and intrinsic motivation are already at the heart of the current Japanese educational system. Edwards states that these qualities are usually stressed and established during the six years of elementary school. Molinsky (2000) says that with the proper classroom setting and support, student-centered learning can take place, and a dynamic, motivating learning environment is created. Crib (2000) also encourages learner-centered teaching as it promotes "consciousness raising" and "noticing" techniques so learners can actively participate in their own learning process.

Pair-work and the Zone of Proximal Development

Perhaps we should ask ourselves as teachers why we should use pair and group work in our classes. Helgesen (2004) points out that teachers should use pair-work because it's an efficient way to increase student participation and also because the interaction with partners is motivating. Ohta (1995) supports the use of pair-work by saying that structured pair-work enables learners to acquire language by sharing their strength in the zone of proximal development. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) refers to the gap between what a given child can achieve alone, i. e., their 'potential development as determined by independent problem solving', and what they can achieve 'through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers' (Wood & Wood 1966). According to Vygotsky (1986), the range of skill that can be developed with adult guidance or peer collaboration exceeds what can be attained alone. In research conducted by Hill and Sabet (2009), students who participated in Dynamic Speaking Assessments and were exposed to a group ZPD scored higher in their post-test scores when compared with students who did not participate in this approach.

When done with proper instruction and preparation, peer to peer interaction allows students to

gain enormously and contribute to their classmates' language acquisition. A wealth of research from practitioners suggests that second language acquisition is best supported by the use of clearly structured pair-work or small group work (Clark & Clark, 2009). Long and Porter (1985) argue for a collaborative learning framework since it increases opportunities for language practice, assists in the individualization of instruction, advances the quality and quantity of student talk, encourages a positive effective environment, and increases students' motivation to learn.

Effective Pair-work Strategies

For teachers who use pair-and group work in their classes, it is important to know that not much learning takes place unless students are aware of the tasks involved, have the skills and knowledge to cope with the task, and can reach for the tools that will enable them to complete the task. Helgesen (2004) sees the need for teachers to consider why their students are interacting, what it is that they are exchanging, and how we are making them aware of language and the very nature of the interaction itself. Furthermore, Clark & Clark (2008) suggest that the highly effective language teacher will create conditions in which dyads and groups experience learning relationships typified by positive corrections, positive confirmations, completion of their partner's sentences, and direct clarifying questions. Swain (2009) also states that when students are engaged in their own learning strategies and verbalize what they are doing with their partner(s) as they use the strategies, they make the most progress. When learners are clear about the task and have the necessary tools to complete it, then teachers may witness true peer-to-peer interaction where both learning and teaching take place. The primary goal of the teacher then becomes students who are actively involved in their own learning, while at the same time contributing to their partner's language acquisition. In fact, we may argue that giving our students the skills to confirm, complete, and clarify during interaction may be much more important than the content of the language we are trying to teach. Johnstone (1987) and Tarone (1977) suggest the following Communication Strategies in interaction between L2 learners:

<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Example</u>
1. Approximate	<i>Train conductor = Train driver</i>
2. Paraphrase	<i>He is stingy. = He does not like to spend money.</i>
3. Fillers	<i>Let me see, uh, well, ...</i>
4. Repetition	<i>A: I went snorkelling in Hawaii. B: Sorry, what did you do?</i>

for their students' level and the tasks involved and that students feel comfortable using them. Strategies used by learners can vary, depending on the level of learners' proficiency and the type of activity. Therefore, this paper will examine the following research questions:

1. What strategies do students use to communicate in pair and group work?
2. Do students feel that communication strategies help them improve their communication skills?
3. Does pairing higher and lower students make a difference to the learners?

The Study

Participants

The students who took part in this research were 19 first-year students whose TOEFL equivalency scores ranged from 300-420. These students majored in Euro-American Literature and were placed in the class through their SLEP test scores, taken at the beginning of the school year. There were 7 female and 12 male students in this class which met twice a week, ninety minutes for each session. In terms of their language ability, the students in this class could be divided into two proficiency levels, with one group having TOEFL equivalency score of 400 and above and another group being under 400. 7 students were in the first group and the remaining 12 students were in the second group. The course was called *Speaking*, which meant the focus of the lessons were mainly oral communication and listening. Although students' SLEP scores indicated that their proficiency levels should be about the same, factors such as their characters and learning styles divided them into groups which could be labeled as motivated, extroverted, introverted, or uncooperative.

Procedure

During the second week of classes and before any actual speaking activity took place, students were given the list of Communication Strategies suggested by Johnston (1987) and Tarone (1977) and were asked to use them whenever they engaged in pair or group work. Keeping in mind that the students were freshmen and some were not familiar with pair-and group work activities, time was taken to explain the proper procedure and appropriate use of the strategies. This included examples demonstrated by the teacher, and if needed, role plays with another student. Since this was a speaking course, various tasks and activities that encouraged communication with one or more partner were used in the class. After the completion of each task, students were asked to

check which strategies they used by marking their checklist (See Appendix 1). At the end of the class, the teacher collected the checklists and redistributed them again in the following class. This ensured that students' comments were recorded on an excel sheet every week and that the checklists were all available for students to use in every class. At the end of the semester, a questionnaire was given to the students in order to receive their feedback and opinions in regards to working with classmates whose English ability was higher, lower, or at the same level as theirs (See Appendix 2). Additionally, some pair-work dialogs were tape-recorded in order to decide the type of strategies used while students were engaged in the speaking tasks (See Appendix 4 for samples).

Results (Communication Strategies)

As stated before, the students were asked to record the types of strategies they used after completion of each speaking task. At the end of the semester, the students' data was gathered, tabulated, and the following observations were made (See Table 1):

The Interlingual Strategies were used most often (e. g., *mochi, anko, oyadaka*) and close second were the Telegraphic Strategies (e. g., *I ..., go ... Shibuya ...*). Third on the list were Fillers (e. g., *ah, oh, hmm*) while Paraphrase was the least used strategy. On the other hand, among students with the TOEFL equivalency of 400 or above, the most commonly used strategies were Telegraphic Strategies and Interlingual Strategies respectively. Repair Strategy was last, but Paraphrase and Repetition Strategies were also used less than other strategies. Among the students

Table 1 (The most commonly used strategies)

Strategies	All Students	400 or above	Less than 400
#1	Interlingual Strategies	Telegraphic Strategies	Interlingual Strategies
#2	Telegraphic Strategies	Interlingual Strategies	Fillers
#3	Fillers	Non-linguistic Strategies	Telegraphic Strategies
#4	Approximate	Fillers	Cooperative Learning
#5	Cooperative Learning	Cooperative Learning	Approximate
#6	Non-linguistic Strategies	Clarification Strategy	Repair Strategy
#7	Repair Strategy	Approximate	Repetition
#8	Repetition	Paraphrase	Non-linguistic Strategies
#9	Clarification Strategy	Repetition	Clarification Strategy
#10	Paraphrase	Repair Strategy	Paraphrase

with the TOEFL equivalency of below 400, Interlingual Strategies and Fillers were first and second, with Paraphrase coming last. Table 1 shows the most frequently used strategies in descending order for all the students as well as the ones among higher (400 or above) and lower level learners (Less than 400).

Analysis

A closer look at the strategies used by the learners indicates that Interlingual Strategies, Telegraphic Strategies, and Fillers were the most commonly used strategies by the participants in this study. Cooperative Learning and Approximate were also used frequently. On the other hand, Paraphrase, Repetition, and Clarification Strategy were at the bottom of the list. However, Clarification Strategy was ranked number six among the higher level students, but number nine overall and among the lower level learners. To this writer's surprise, Repair Strategy was ranked last among the higher level learners contradicting this writer's assumption that more proficient learners try to "repair" their partners' sentences when they make mistakes. However, this does not seem to be the case here. Is it possible to assume that this could be the result of cultural influence since Japanese do not usually point out people's fault or mistakes? Or do students view Repair Strategy as a form of negative feedback? The same principle may apply to Clarification Strategy since it was almost at the bottom of the list. Another explanation for less than frequent use of Clarification Strategy could be that the students did not know or did not use vocabulary that was beyond their levels so there was little reason to use this strategy.

By looking at the top three or four strategies, it is obvious that students' use of mother language or gestures made up the majority of strategies utilized in this study. But in general and in terms of using the target language to convey messages or meaning, students need to become more aware of the tools available to them. For example, Fillers are often used by native speakers and this strategy was also frequently used by the students.

On the other hand, when at the end of the term the students were asked to rank the strategies that they thought were most useful to them, they ranked Cooperative Learning as their top choice, with Approximate being second (See Table 2). Repetition and Repair Strategies were tied for third. Considering that the students ranked the usefulness of the strategies at the end of the semester, it is safe to assume that the learners had a clear picture of which strategies were most useful or appropriate for them and therefore, should be given careful consideration when teachers introduce similar speaking tasks or activities in their classes. Furthermore, a closer examination of

the strategies in Table 1 reveals that the most frequently used strategies were easier when compared with the least frequently used strategies at the bottom of the chart. This can be an indication of types of strategies employed by language learners at certain fluency level.

When considering which strategies to teach or focus on, taking the level of students participating in this research into account and based on the results, Cooperative Learning, Approximate, Repetition and Repair Strategy seem to be the most appropriate tools. Strategies such as Interlingual Strategies, Non-linguistic Strategies and Telegraphic Strategy are not the types that can be taught actively in the classroom since students usually use them inadvertently and mainly due to their lack of language ability. Learners should be reminded that although it is acceptable to use such strategies, in order to communicate more effectively and intelligently, they should acquire and master strategies that go beyond gesture and telepathy.

Results: Peer-to-Peer (Zone of Proximal Development)

At the end of the semester, a questionnaire was administered in order to receive some feedback from the students in regards to the types of strategies they preferred and how they viewed the pair-work tasks they performed with their partners (See Appendix 2).

In answer to the first question of whether the students felt that the strategies helped improve their communication ability (See Appendix 3 for the questionnaire results), the majority answered "Yes, a lot" or "Yes, a little." However, only 1 student in the higher group stated that the strategies helped him/her a lot while 7 students in the lower level believed that they were very helpful.

In answer to Q2, the majority of the students believed that their English could improve a lot by speaking with someone whose English level was higher than theirs. Likewise, students answered similarly to Q4; the majority thought their English could improve if they worked with a partner with the same language ability. On the other hand, most of the students thought that their English could not improve when doing pair-work with someone whose level was lower than theirs. This was reflected in answers to Q3. In answers to Q5, all the students indicated that they preferred to do pair-work with a student whose English ability was higher than theirs and no one chose answers D (Yes, only once in a while) and E (No). The same type of response was given to Q7 when asked if they preferred to work with someone whose English level was the same as theirs. Interestingly, and to confirm responses to Qs 5 and 7, students did not wish to be paired with a student whose level was below theirs as 11 students circled D and E in answers to Q6.

Table 2
(Which of the Communication Strategies do you think are most useful for you?)

All Students	400 or above	Less than 400
Cooperative Learning (1)	Paraphrase (1)	Cooperative Learning (1)
Approximate (2)	Cooperative Learning (1)	Approximate (2)
Repetition (3)	Clarification Strategy (1)	Repetition (3)
Repair Strategy (3)	Repetition (2)	Repair Strategy (3)
Non-linguistic Strategies (3)	Repair Strategy (2)	Fillers (3)
Paraphrase (4)	Non-linguistic Strategies (2)	Telegraphic Strategies (3)
Clarification Strategy (4)	Interlingual Strategies (2)	Interlingual Strategies (3)
Interlingual Strategies (4)	Approximate (2)	Non-linguistic Strategies (3)
Fillers (5)	Fillers (3)	Clarification Strategy (4)
Telegraphic Strategies (5)	Telegraphic Strategies (3)	Paraphrase (4)

There seems to be some level of stress and anxiety when students work with a partner whose level is higher as most of the respondents said that they felt nervous when working with more proficient learners. Only two students said that they did not feel nervous. In terms of assisting their lower level partners to form questions or make sentences, 16 students stated that they “always” or “sometimes” did it while only three students said that they did not.

And finally, as to which strategies the students found most useful (Table 2), Cooperative Learning had the highest ranking and next was Approximate. The strategies that the students did not find very useful were Fillers and Telegraphic Strategy. On the other hand and when broken into separate groups, for the higher level learners, Paraphrase, Cooperative Learning, and Clarification Strategy were the top choices, where for the lower level students they were Cooperative Learning, Approximate, and Repetition. Interestingly, Paraphrase was one of the top choices for the top students, but ranked last for the less proficient learners.

Questionnaire Results Analysis

Many students in the lower level felt that the communication strategies were helpful in improving their communication skills, especially when compared with the higher level learners. Responses from this group may indicate that the higher level students were already equipped with the skills or strategies. It may also imply that higher level learners had the language ability to communicate their messages without relying on the strategies.

Since the majority of the students stated that they preferred to work with partners whose English was at the same or higher level, the question is what to do with learners whose language ability is below the rest of the students in the classroom. Many universities with English majors stream their students into levels by administering placement tests. This ensures that materials and tasks presented in the class suit the majority of the students at any given level. However, the issue becomes complicated in non-English-major language classes where placing the students in appropriate levels and based on their proficiency is not feasible. How can teachers use pair-work effectively and convince their students that it is possible for them to improve their English regardless of whether their partners' language skills are higher or lower than theirs? This may require the introduction of communication strategies, demonstrating when and how to use them, and more importantly, letting students know that improvement in language proficiency does not solely depend on the English level of the person they are communicating with. The questionnaire also did not find any differences in terms of nervousness and anxiety among the students in both the higher and the lower levels.

And finally, when comparing the types of strategies that the students used during pair work (See Table 1) and the ones they selected as being most useful (See Table 2), some major differences can be observed. For example, Cooperative Strategies are ranked #5 in Table 1, but they are rated as the top choice among all the participants in Table 2. Similarly, Approximate is second on the list in Table 2 for all the students and the higher level learners, but it is fourth overall and even lower among the more proficient learners in Table 1. On the other hand, having Telegraphic Strategies, Fillers, and Interlingual Strategies at the bottom of the list in Table 2 is an indication that the students were aware of the importance of more difficult strategies and thought that they would be useful to master. However, one interesting observation that can be made is that the Paraphrase and Clarification Strategy were at the top of the list for "400 or above" students, but were ranked last for "Less than 400" group. One explanation for this contrast can be that the students in the lower level found the strategy too difficult and beyond their ability to master. Another possible explanation is that the students in this group felt that they could communicate their message without the need for the mentioned strategies.

Discussion

In answer to research question #1 "What strategies do students use to communicate in pair and group work?", based on the data recorded by the students, Interlingual Strategies, Telegraphic

Strategies, and Fillers were used the most often. In addition, according to two transcribed pair-work dialogs recorded in the classroom (See Appendix 4), Interlingual Strategies and Fillers were strategies used most by the participants. However, teachers should consider the introduction and use of strategies that rely on the use of language itself, not sign or body language. For example, after introducing the target language and how to use it correctly, learners can be reminded to pay attention to possible mistakes that they or their partners may make. This is called “noticing” and some drills and practice before each task should enable the students to focus on the proper use of the language. Furthermore, since the students ranked Cooperative Learning and Approximate as some of their top choices, these strategies should be introduced and practiced until learners feel comfortable using them.

In answer to question #2 “Do students feel that communication strategies help them improve their communication skills?” and according to the data, the lower level students answered more positively than the higher level learners. But when referring to the actual use of the strategies, both groups used them almost at the same rate. The fact that more lower level students stated that these strategies were helpful, indicates that these skills should be introduced at the beginning of the term so that learners are equipped with the necessary skills to communicate effectively with their classmates. Attention should be paid to the level of learners, activities involved, and the types of strategies needed when designing tasks.

And in answer to the question #3 “Does pairing higher and lower students make a difference to the learners?”, the majority in this study stated that they preferred to be paired with a learner who was at the same level or higher. Obviously, in a class of mixed abilities, this may not always be possible. Perhaps if teachers point out to their students that language output is associated with production and the more students speak, the better the chances of improving their communication ability, learners may realize that it is not who they are talking to, but what they are saying and how much exchange is taking place. Language acquisition and proficiency does not solely depend on interacting with native speakers or speakers who are fluent in English. It also depends on how learners transfer the receptive skills they have acquired into productive skills.

Conclusion

Strategies used in this research are only a few samples of what native and non-native speakers use to communicate. When assigning communicative tasks in the class, the outcome can be much more effective if learners have the tools and knowledge to convey their messages with ease and

efficiency. Furthermore, if students know when and how to use appropriate communication strategies, working with higher or lower level learners may not make much difference, especially when the participants realize that completing a task depends on the quality, not the quantity of the language produced.

References

- Baker, J. (2010). Is Working Together Worthwhile? Retrieved 6/28/2010. http://esl.about.com/cs/teachingtechnique/a/bl_baker4.htm
- Clark, C. & Clark I. (2008). *The Essential Teacher*. Volume 5, Issue 3, September 2008.
- Crib, M. (2000). Learner intervention in the language classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 24 (10), 9-12.
- Edwards, N. (2004). Rediscovering the creative heart of Japanese education: Fostering intrinsic motivation through a love of language. *The Language Teacher*, 28 (1), 19-23.
- Harmer, J. (1989). *The Practice of Language Teaching*. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Helgesen, M. (2004). Not just two folks talking: Interpretations of pair-work. Retrieved 5/20/2010 Internet: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/jul/helgesen.html>
- Johnstone, R. (1989). Communicative Interaction. Retrieved from the Internet: <http://www.tesolgreece.com/nl/73/7308.html>. London: CILT
- Long, M. & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
- Molinsky, S. (2000). Using active communication to enhance learning. *The Language Teacher*, 24 (7), 16-17.
- Ohta, A. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 93-121.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 129-158.
- Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*. Volume 85, Issue 2. Pages: 244-258.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain (M). (2009). Language and second/foreign language learning. *The Language Teacher*, 33 (7).
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. Cited in Scattergood: Encouraging the Use of Strategies to Improve Communication in the EFL Classroom. *Language Learning June 2003*.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Wood, D., Wood, H. (1966). Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934). Retrieved from the Internet on 1/9/2010. <http://starfsfolk.khi.is/solrunb/vygotsky.htm>

Appendix 1

Communication Construction through Peer-to-Peer Interaction

Strategy	Example										
1. Approximate	<i>principal = president</i> <i>train conductor = train driver</i>										
2. Paraphrase	<i>He is stingy and tight with his money. = He does not like to spend money.</i>										
3. Fillers	<i>Let me see, uh, well, let me think, give me a second ...</i>										
4. Repetition	A: <i>I went snorkeling in Hawaii.</i> B: <i>Sorry, what did you do?</i>										
5. Cooperative Learning	<i>How do you say ... in English?</i>										
6. Repair Strategy	A: <i>I go shopping last night.</i> B: <i>You WENT shopping last night.</i> A: <i>That's right. I went shopping.</i>										
7. Clarification Strategy	A: <i>My mother is a house maker.</i> B: <i>What do you mean by a "house maker?"</i> A: <i>She stays home and cooks.</i> B: <i>You mean a "homemaker."</i> A: <i>That's right, a homemaker.</i>										
8. Non-linguistic Strategies	<i>Use gestures, mime, and sound imitations to help you convey your message.</i>										
9. Telegraphic Strategy	<i>Make yourself understood by using broken or incomplete sentences.</i> <i>Example: I, ..., go Shibuya, ... yesterday nigh, ... fun, ... very late home, ...</i>										
10. Interlingual Strategies	<i>I am work at a departo.</i> <i>I am arubito.</i> <i>I want to be a yochien teacher.</i>										

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Partner's name | 6. Partner's name |
| 2. Partner's name | 7. Partner's name |
| 3. Partner's name | 8. Partner's name |
| 4. Partner's name | 9. Partner's name |
| 5. Partner's name | 10. Partner's name |

Appendix 2

Questionnaire

1. Did the list of Communication Strategies help you improve your communication ability?
- A. Yes, a lot. B. Yes, a little. C. No.

2. Did you think your English can improve, when doing pair-work with a student whose English ability is better than yours?
A. Yes, a lot. B. Yes, a little. C. No.

3. Did you think your English can improve, when doing pair-work with a student whose English ability is lower than yours?
A. Yes, a lot. B. Yes, a little. C. No.

4. Did you think your English can improve best, when doing pair-work with a student whose English ability is at the same level as yours?
A. Yes, a lot. B. Yes, a little. C. No.

5. Do you prefer to do pair-work with someone whose English is better than yours?
A. Yes, always. B. Yes, most of the times. C. Yes, sometimes.
D. Yes, but only once in a while. E. No.

6. Do you prefer to do pair-work with someone whose English is lower than yours?
A. Yes, always. B. Yes, most of the times. C. Yes, sometimes.
D. Yes, but only once in a while. E. No.

7. Do you prefer to do pair-work with someone whose English is about the same level as yours?
A. Yes, always. B. Yes, most of the times. C. Yes, sometimes.
D. Yes, but only once in a while. E. No.

8. Do you feel anxious or pressured when doing pair-work with someone whose English is better than yours?
A. Yes, always. B. Yes, sometimes. C. No.

9. If your partner's English is lower than yours, do you try to help him/her to make sentences or ask questions?
A. Yes, always. B. Yes, sometimes. C. No.

10. Which of the Communication Strategies do you think are most useful for you? Choose from the list.

.....,,,,,,,,

Appendix 3 (Questionnaire Results)

All

Q1	A	B	C								TOTAL
	8	10	1								19
Q2	A	B	C								
	12	5	2								19
Q3	A	B	C								
	2	8	9								19
Q4	A	B	C								
	9	9	1								19
Q5	A	B	C	D	E						
	2	11	6	0	0						19
Q6	A	B	C	D	E						
	0	5	3	6	5						19
Q7	A	B	C	D	E						
	3	8	7	1	0						19
Q8	A	B	C								
	7	8	4								19
Q9	A	B	C								
	5	11	3								19
Q10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	11	8	7	9	14	9	8	9	7	8	

400 or over

Q1	A	B	C								TOTAL
	1	5	1								7
Q2	A	B	C								
	4	3	0								7
Q3	A	B	C								
	1	3	3								7
Q4	A	B	C								
	2	4	1								7

Q5	A	B	C	D	E						
	0	5	2	0	0						7
Q6	A	B	C	D	E						
	0	1	2	3	1						7
Q7	A	B	C	D	E						
	2	2	3	0	0						7
Q8	A	B	C								
	2	3	2								7
Q9	A	B	C								
	1	5	1								7
Q10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	3	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	

Less than 400

Q1	A	B	C								TOTAL
	7	5	0								12
Q2	A	B	C								
	8	2	2								12
Q3	A	B	C								
	1	5	6								12
Q4	A	B	C								
	7	5	0								12
Q5	A	B	C	D	E						
	2	6	4	0	0						12
Q6	A	B	C	D	E						
	0	4	1	3	4						12
Q7	A	B	C	D	E						
	1	6	4	1	0						12
Q8	A	B	C								
	5	5	2								12
Q9	A	B	C								
	4	6	2								12
Q10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	8	4	5	6	10	6	4	6	5	5	

Appendix 4 (Pair-work Scripts)

K: So, ... hmm (Strategy #3: Fillers). Do you think living in Tokyo is more convenient than living in Saitama?

T: Yes, ... oh (Strategy #3: Fillers), ... Because, ... Tokyo has ... many ... convenience stores and if I live in Tokyo, ... I can ... shopping Ah ... many places ... Tokyo. How about you?

K: I think living in Tokyo is more convenient because Tokyo is, is a big town, big city. I think ... there are a lot of ... convenience store, department stores, shopping, enjoy yourself, ... (Strategy #3: Fillers)

T: What is the highest mountain you have ever climbed?

K: I never climbed mountain, but I want to ... to climb Fuji, ...Mount Fuji what about you?

T: Oh, ... I have never too. Hmm...

K: Ok, Ok, same case. Right? OK. OK.

T:

K:

T: Oh, ... ah, I think ... ah. Okinawa? (Strategy #3: Fillers)

K: Why?

T: Okinawa is very warm. ... Warm ... is happy.

K: What kind of ... what kind of ...

T: Ah ... ah ... For example, Okinawa is has many many delicious, delicious food. And they have many great place. For example, ocean, beautiful ocean view, people, people are very kind.

K: Oh, it is a good point. Great.

T: How about you?

K: Me? oh I think ... hmmm Kyoto

T: Kyoto?

K: Kyoto is a good place. Interesting place because you know in Tokyo ah

T: Tokyo? (Strategy #6: Repair)

K: I'm sorry. Kyoto. Kyoto. In Kyoto we can find ah. How can say? The Japanese culture, ah... You know?

T: Japanese culture? (Strategy #7: Clarification)

K: Japanese culture. Tradition.

T: Tradition?

K: Japanese tradition.

T: Tradition? Oh, yes.

K: You know?

T: Huhuhu ... yes

K: If I come to Kyoto, Big temples

T: Temples, Buddha

K: Yes

T: Shika (deer) (Strategy #10: Interlingual)

K: Yes, yes, deer

T: Great Place.

K: Maybe if I go in the spring. ... very beautiful

T: Yes, do you know yatsushashi?

K: No.

T: Yastushashi very delicious. In Kyoto?

K: What kind of ... chicken, meat ...

T: Dessert.

K: Oh, I see.

T: Japanese mochi.

K: Mochi? (Strategy #10: Interlingual)

T: Anko. (Strategy #10: Interlingual)

K: Oh, yes. I know. I know.

K: Do you think that people in the country. Friendlier. Friendlier (confirming) than people in the city?

T: oh. Ah ... I think ah ... the people in the country Are ... friendlier. (Strategy #3: Fillers)

K: Oh, Ok

T: Country people

K: Aha

T: Kind.

K: Kind?

T: Kind. Japanese "odayaka", kind (Strategy #10: Interlingual)

K: Oh, yes, kind.

T: So, ah ... city people are very busy. Ah ... ah ...

K: Yes, city people do not have time. They have to go to work.

T: Take it easy. How about you?

K: I have the same opinion. You are right.

Mak: Do you think freeways should be free?

Mah: Freeways? What do you mean? Mr. Sabet. What is freeway? (Strategy 7: Clarification)

Teacher: Freeway. It means highway.

Mah: Oh, I see. Freeways I think no.

Mak: Why?

Mah: Because if freeways is all free, many many people ah ... very use, very use. OK?

Mak: OK.

Mah: Very use ... and But in holiday, many family can drive ... travel. But maybe no. How about you?

Mak: I do not know about it because I am not interested in driving. Next question, OK?

Mah: OK. Do you think high school students do not need to wear uniform?

Mak: Do not need to wear uniform? No, I do not.

Mah: No, I do not?

Mak: No, because when I was high school student I liked my school uniform.

Mah: Really?

Mak: Yes, my school uniform is ... is ... (Strategy #5: Cooperative)

Mah: Pretty.

Mak: Yes, my school uniform was pretty. A little cute. So I want to wear school uniform. How about you?

Mah: I do not know, but if high school students do not need to wear uniform ... ah. High school students ... high school students ah Nante iyono. Nante iyuno.

Mak: What?

Mah: High school students do not ... ah, so

Mak: What?

Mah: Ah ... How do you say "nokoru"? (Strategy #5: Cooperative)

Mak: Nokoru?

Mao: Nokoru. Kyokoni nokoru

Mak: Memorize.

Mao: Memorize

Mak: Wakaranai

Mao: High school uniform is memory.

Mak: Ah, yes, yes.

Mao: Memory for us.

Mak: I think so.