

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII LIBRARY

NS-NNS NEGOTIATION AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGY USE IN  
THE HOST FAMILY VERSUS THE STUDY ABROAD CLASSROOM

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES (JAPANESE)

MAY 2003

By

Abigail L. McMeekin

Dissertation Committee

Haruko Cook, Chairperson  
Gabriele Kasper  
Kyoko Hijirida  
Kazue Kanno  
James D. Brown

## ABSTRACT

### **NS-NNS Negotiation and Communication Strategy use in the Host Family versus the Study Abroad Classroom**

While there are many studies of NS-NNS negotiation, there are few studies that have examined and compared negotiation and communication strategy use that occurs in unelicited interactions in the study abroad classroom and host family environment. Through analysis of NS-NNS negotiations from video and audio-taped interactions, this study of five learners of Japanese studying abroad answers the following research questions: 1) How does negotiation and communication strategy use differ in the study abroad classroom and host family setting? 2) What are the implications of these differences for second language acquisition in terms of comprehensible input, modified output, and focus on form? Thus, the present study contributes to the already existing literature on study abroad, negotiation, and communication strategies. Moreover, it shows how NNS participation in the process of negotiation including exposure to and possible uptake of information about the target language is conveyed through negotiation and how this process differs between the classroom and host family setting.

\*NS-NNS (native speaker- non-native speaker)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Figures .....	x
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Overview.....	1
Research Design and Questions.....	8
Outline of Chapters.....	12
Chapter Two: Study abroad, Negotiation, and Communication strategies...15	
Review of Study Abroad Literature.....	16
Review of Negotiation Literature.....	28
Negotiation Provides Comprehensible Input.....	31
Negotiation Promotes Learner Modification of Output.....	36
Negotiation Promotes Focus on Form.....	41
Negotiation and the Quality of Input it Provides.....	43
Negotiation maximizes "saliency" .....	44
Negotiation promotes increased "noticing" .....	45
Negotiation provides positive evidence.....	51
Negotiation provides negative evidence.....	54
Summary of Negotiation Literature.....	41
Review of Communication Strategy Literature.....	60
CS and its role in SLA.....	68
Review of Findings in Negotiation and CS literature.....	71
Learner Proficiency.....	72
Task and Task-related Features.....	76
Concerns for Face.....	97
Factors related to the classroom and non-classroom setting.....	106
Chapter Three: The Study.....	130
The Settings.....	130
The Participants.....	134
The Students.....	135
The Instructors.....	136
The Host Family members.....	137
Data Collection.....	139
Video and Audio-recorded Data.....	142

Journals.....	145
Group Discussions.....	147
Interviews.....	149
Data Analysis.....	149
The Negotiations.....	152
Communication Strategies Within Negotiation.....	155
Conditions Thought to Facilitate SLA.....	162
Factors and Trends in the Data.....	163
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion Part I: Negotiation Frequency and Length.....	165
Negotiation Frequency.....	166
Negotiation Length.....	174
Factors Affecting Negotiation Frequency and Length.....	178
Topic Familiarity.....	180
Student Interest.....	188
Describing Abstract vs. Concrete Entities.....	190
Describing Culturally-based Entities.....	198
Participation Structure.....	205
Individual Factors.....	206
Summary.....	223
Chapter Five: Discussion and Results Part II: Negotiation Trouble Sources.....	225
Trigger Types in the Host Family vs. Classroom Setting.....	226
Undetermined Triggers.....	228
Lexical triggers.....	229
Student-triggered lexical negotiations in the host family and classroom.....	232
Summary of student-triggered lexical negotiations.....	264
NS-triggered lexical negotiations in the host family and classroom.....	266
Summary of NS-triggered lexical negotiations.....	289
Grammatical Triggers .....	290
Grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family.....	293
Grammatically triggered negotiations in the classroom.....	313
Summary of grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family and classroom.....	324

Chapter Six: Discussion and Results Part III: Communication	
Strategy Use in Negotiation.....	327
Frequency and Types of CS Use in the Host Family vs. the Classroom.....	328
CS Use in the Host family Setting.....	330
NS use of request for confirmation and student use of confirmation.....	332
NS use of interpretive summary.....	335
Student use of other repetition as request for clarification and NS use of clarification and rephrasal.....	345
Student use of appeals for help.....	351
NS use of request for clarification and student use of clarification.....	357
NS and student use of codeswitching.....	362
Student use of foreignizing.....	368
NS use of sentence completion.....	373
Student use of circumlocution.....	379
Summary of CS use in the host family.....	386
CS Use in the Classroom.....	393
NS use of request for clarification and student use of clarification and rephrasal.....	394
Student use of other repetition as requests for confirmation and clarification and instructor use of confirmation.....	400
NS use of request for confirmation, other repetition, and student use of confirmation.....	408
Student and NS use of codeswitch.....	415
Student appeals for help.....	420
NS use of prompt and display questions.....	423
Summary of CS use in the classroom.....	427
Summary of CS use in the host family and classroom setting.....	431
Chapter Seven: Results and Discussion Part IV: Negotiation and the SLA in the Host Family and Classroom Setting.....	439
Comprehensible Input.....	440
Comprehensible Input and Positive Evidence in the Host Family and Classroom.....	442

<b>Summary of Comprehensible Input and Positive Evidence     in the Host Family and Classroom.....</b>	<b>459</b>
<b>Production of Modified Output.....</b>	<b>460</b>
<b>Modified Output and Negative Evidence in the Host Family         and classroom.....</b>	<b>465</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>492</b>
<b>Chapter Eight: Summary and Conclusions.....</b>	<b>498</b>
<b>Frequency and Length of Negotiation in the Host Family     vs. Classroom.....</b>	<b>498</b>
<b>Trigger Types in the Host Family vs. Classroom.....</b>	<b>505</b>
<b>CS Use in the Host Family vs. Classroom.....</b>	<b>510</b>
<b>Negotiation in the Host Family vs. Classroom and the Three     Conditions Necessary for SLA.....</b>	<b>518</b>
<b>Appendix.....</b>	<b>523</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>526</b>

## □LIST OF TABLES

<b><u>Table</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
3.1 The participants.....	134
3.2 Transcription conventions.....	151
3.3 Trigger types.....	153
3.4 List of communication strategies.....	156
4.1 <i>Amount of negotiation in host family and classroom setting</i> .....	167
4.2 Number and percentage of peripheral negotiations per class.....	168
4.3 Number of negotiations in the host family per student per recording.....	171
4.4 Number of negotiations per class per 50 minute recording session.....	172
4.5 Negotiation frequencies in the host family versus classroom.....	173
4.6 Number of turns in negotiations in the host family setting.....	175
4.7 Number of turns in negotiation in the classroom setting.....	176
4.8 Number of turns in negotiation in the host family vs. the classroom.....	177
5.1 Trigger types in the host family vs. classroom setting.....	226
5.2 Proficiency & student triggered lexical negotiations - host family.....	237
5.3 Words that triggered student lexical negotiation - host family.....	241
5.4 Percentage of student triggered lexical triggers per class.....	245
5.5 Description of content for all three of Instructor Endo's classes.....	249
5.6 Percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family....	273

5.7	Percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations per class.....	285
5.8	Grammatically triggered negotiations - host family and classroom..	292
5.9	Percent of grammatically triggered negotiations per student in the host family setting.....	305
5.10	Percentage of grammatical triggers per class.....	317
6.1	Frequency of student and NS CS use in the host family and classroom.....	329
6.2	Percentage & types of CS used by students and NSs - host family.....	331
6.3	Percentage & types of CS used by students and NSs - classroom.....	393
7.1	Host family versus classroom clarifications and rephrasals.....	441
7.2	Comparison of modified output in the host family and classroom..	462

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1 Paradigm model.....	9

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

This study examines the negotiations and the use of communication strategies (CS) of five second language learners of Japanese and their Japanese native speaker interlocutors in two study abroad settings: the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family environment. Accordingly, the present study draws from research on study abroad, negotiation, and communication strategies. Although research in these areas has covered a broad range of issues, several components of this study address important issues that have not been previously addressed in the literature. In this section, a brief overview of each of these areas and how they are related to the present research is given, this study's contribution to the current literature is discussed, an outline of the research design and the research questions is provided, and then a brief description of the chapters and their content is included below.

### Overview

The present research is concerned with NS-NNS negotiation through the use of communication strategies (CS). Specifically, when second language learners interact with native speakers, problems often arise in comprehension or production which often need to be negotiated in order for communication to continue. Pica (1994) argues that negotiation is:

...the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility. As they negotiate, they work linguistically to achieve the needed comprehensibility, whether repeating a message verbatim, adjusting its syntax, changing its words, or modifying its form and meaning in a host of other ways. (Pica, 1994, p. 494)

However, because negotiation also occurs due to problems in production, Pica's (1994) original definition has been modified to include difficulties in message production. Thus, the definition of negotiation that is used in this study is:

...the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility or production. (based on Pica, 1994, p. 494)

Typical devices used in identifying participant turns in negotiation include comprehension checks, clarification requests, and confirmation checks. Moreover, as stated in the above definition, negotiation typically occurs due to problems in comprehensibility. On the other hand, communication strategies, another field of research closely linked to research on negotiation are used with problems in comprehensibility and production. Thus, similar to negotiation, CS researchers are interested in describing how participants in an interaction use strategies to compensate for inadequate interlanguage resources in order to overcome difficulties in communication. Communication strategy research also includes the same type of devices that

are typically labeled in negotiation such as confirmation checks, clarification requests etc., but include other devices that are used by learners when experiencing production problems, including circumlocution, foreignization, and word coinage that are not typically labeled in negotiation research (see Dörnyei & Scott, 1997 for comprehensive taxonomies of CS). In the present study, communication strategies (CS) are considered an integral part of the negotiation analysis. This is reflected in the following definition employed in this study, which defines CS as:

...tools used in a joint negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal. (Tarone, 1980, p. 420)

It is precisely this definition of CS as “tools used in a joint negotiation” that allows CS to be analyzed within a negotiation framework. Thus, the integration of negotiation and communication strategy use in this study can best be explained as: negotiation is a type of exchange in which a trouble source causes a communication difficulty and there is a mutual attempt to resolve that difficulty by negotiating through the use of communication strategies.

The role of negotiation in second language acquisition is a primary focus of this research. Specifically, does negotiation promote the conditions for second language acquisition and if so how? Typically, negotiation researchers have explored negotiation and second language acquisition using

the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1980) as a point of departure, specifically noting how negotiation provides learners with comprehensible target language input (Long, 1980). Found to be a necessary but insufficient condition for facilitating SLA, comprehensible input is now one of three theoretical perspectives from which researchers of negotiation look at the relationship between negotiation and its role in SLA. These three perspectives are discussed by Long (1996) and Pica (1994) in their review articles on negotiation. They outline the theoretical arguments negotiation researchers use to strengthen the claim that negotiation plays an important role in SLA. Specifically, negotiation researchers maintain that negotiation maximizes (a) comprehensible input (b) opportunities for learners to produce modified output and (c) focus on form (Long, 1996; Pica, 1994). While there are several studies that show negotiation does indeed facilitate these three conditions (see Long, 1996, and Pica, 1994 for a review), critics cite a lack of evidence in the literature directly linking participation in negotiation to subsequent language learning. Although difficult to demonstrate conclusively, there are some studies that have shown empirical evidence to support a direct relationship between negotiation and SLA (Doughty, 1988 - relative clauses; Loschky, 1989 - locatives; Silver, 1999 - English question formation). Using these three perspectives as a departure, this study examines negotiation and the role it plays in facilitating the conditions for SLA.

The factors that affect negotiation and communication strategy use are also important to identify in order to ascertain what the best conditions are for promoting negotiation. To date, several variables have been investigated as to their affect on negotiation and the use of communication strategies. These include participant factors such as proficiency level and language choice, interactional factors such as face and participant roles, and factors related to the setting such as task and task related factors, topic, as well as goals and expectations. However, because of the majority of negotiation and CS studies differ in design, elicitation method, and participant factors, conclusions made about these variables and the role they play in negotiation and CS use are only tentative and need to be substantiated with more research. Thus, one of the goals of this study is to contribute to the knowledge of how each of these variables may differentially affect negotiation and communication strategy use in a classroom and non-classroom setting.

In sum, the present study contributes to the already existing literature on study abroad, negotiation, and communication strategies. Moreover, although research in these three areas has covered a broad range of issues, several components of this study address important issues that have not been previously addressed in the literature.

First, there are only a handful of studies have specifically looked at negotiation or communication strategy use by students in the study abroad setting (DeKeyser, 1991; Lafford, 1995; Raupach, 1983; Ridley, 1991). While

Raupach (1983) and Ridley (1991) looked at students use of communication strategies before and after participation in study abroad, DeKeyser (1991) and Lafford (1995) examined the differences in communication strategy use between those students who spent time abroad with students who remained in their home country. Thus, to date, no studies have devoted their inquiry to comparing students' experiences in a formal study abroad classroom with informal study abroad environments (e.g., host family settings), noting the differences in opportunities for learners to engage in negotiation and communication strategy use in both settings.

Second, all the above mentioned research studies on study abroad have utilized different elicitation methods including formal interviews, communication tasks, and OPI role plays. Accordingly, we know little of the types of difficulties students are confronted with in unelicited, naturally occurring interactions with native speakers and how these difficulties are mutually solved through negotiation and communication strategy use. This issue concerning methodology also extends to research on negotiation and communication strategies. While some studies have used less structured interaction closely approximating 'informal conversation' to elicit data on CS and negotiation (Donato, 1994; Haastrop & Philipson, 1983; Gass & Varonis, 1985; Labarca & Khanji, 1986; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989; Raupach, 1983; Wagner & Firth, 1997; Williams, Inscoc, & Tasker, 1997), much of the literature is based on data obtained through the use of elicitation

methods such as picture reconstruction or object descriptions (Bialystok, 1983; Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Doughty, 1988; Erlich, Avery, & Yorio, 1989; Kellerman et al., 1990; Pica & Shortreed, 1993; Silver, 1999; Varonis & Gass, 1985; Yule & Tarone, 1990). In contrast, this study explores unelicited negotiation and the use of CS in what may be considered "free conversation" or naturally occurring instances of conversation. Moreover, while some studies have included students' retrospective comments about communication strategy use (Poulisse et al., 1987; Ridley, 1991), these studies are few and far between. However, retrospective journal entries and comments from group discussions contribute to the validity of the present study by incorporating the perspective of the second language learner as part of the overall study of negotiation. Thus, by analyzing unelicited negotiation and CS use along with the learners' retrospective comments, this study offers a look at the typical linguistic hurdles learners of Japanese and their NS interlocutors are routinely confronted with in the target country, which ultimately has implications toward second language acquisition.

Lastly, SLA researchers have long been interested in the role of interaction in second language acquisition. Negotiation researchers in particular argue that interaction in the form of negotiation maximizes opportunities for linguistic development by promoting the conditions that are thought to be required for SLA; exposure to comprehensible input,

opportunities for output modification, and focus on form. This study analyzes these three features of negotiation and their role in SLA and looks at the various factors that may affect the learning opportunities available to students in both the study abroad classroom and host family setting.

To summarize, the purpose of this study is to provide a deeper understanding of negotiation by including learners' retrospective comments and examining negotiation and communication strategy use in naturally occurring instances rather than through tasks that use controlled elicitation methods. Moreover, this study strengthens the findings on negotiation and how it promotes the conditions necessary for SLA by looking at whether negotiation promotes comprehensible input, modified output, and focus on form as well as how different individual and contextual variables affect negotiation and communication strategy use. Accordingly, a comparison of negotiation and CS use in the study abroad classroom and in the host family setting contributes to our understanding of the differences in negotiation in both settings and may have implications toward SLA.

### **Research Design and Questions**

In researching negotiation as an interactional phenomenon, I chose to first identify the different components that make up negotiation and then determined how these components fit together in a model to explain or create negotiation. Such a model is called a "paradigm model" (below) and is

often used in qualitative research to illustrate the main components in the interactive phenomenon under investigation and is used as a base from which to generate research questions (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

<p><b>(A) Causal conditions</b>          1. Trouble source causes problem in communication          a) Lexical          b) Grammatical          c) Pragmatic          d) Sociolinguistic          e) Undetermined</p>	<p><b>(B) Phenomenon</b>          Negotiation</p>	<p><b>(C) Context</b>          Indirect/peripheral interaction w/ NS in:          1. Study abroad classroom          2. Host family setting</p>
<p><b>(D) Intervening conditions</b>          1. Task &amp; task related factors          2. Topic          3. Face          4. Participant roles          5. Proficiency level          6. Goals and expectations          7. NS language choice (e.g., Foreigner talk etc.)          8. Other variables not yet identified</p>	<p><b>(E) Action/Interaction strategies</b>          1. Negotiation          a) CS</p>	<p><b>(F) Consequences</b>          Local: Gap negotiated with/w/o success          Global: Conditions for SLA created:          a) Comprehensible input          b) Modification of output          c) Focus on form</p>

(Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 99)

**Figure 1.1. Paradigm model**

For the present study the above “paradigm model” was used before the data collection to identify the different components in negotiation and the relationship between the component and to generate the research questions. According to the paradigm model, negotiation is triggered by a “trouble source” that ultimately leads to a problem in communication. The “trouble” may stem from the student’s inadequate lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, or sociolinguistic knowledge and may be productive (as when a learner tries to

say something that sh/he does not know how to say in Japanese) or receptive (as when a learner or their NS interlocutor experiences difficulty understanding something that has been said). In a resultant attempt to solve the communication problem, both interlocutors engage in negotiation. For this study, negotiations were limited to those that occurred in the context of the Japanese study abroad classroom and the host family setting. Moreover, only those negotiations that occurred directly or peripherally between Japanese NSs and second language learners were included. Thus, learner-learner negotiation was not considered in this study. Variables that may affect the process of NS - NNS negotiation are noted under "intervening conditions" and include such things as the linguistic resources available to the participants (i.e., a NNS with an advanced level of Japanese or a NS who knows and chooses to speak English) Most of the intervening conditions noted here have been mentioned to some extent in the negotiation and CS literature (see the literature review - Chapter Two). However, note that #8 in the "intervening conditions" states "other variables not yet identified", leaving room for the identification of other variables that have not been looked at in the negotiation or CS literature. The "action/interaction strategies" identify negotiation and communication strategies as actions employed by interlocutors in an attempt to solve communication problems. This leads to the "consequences" or outcomes of negotiation, which are two-tiered. Most apparent is that the negotiation is either successful or

unsuccessful in terms of solving the communication problem. Less apparent is the global effect of negotiation on the learner. Specifically, does negotiation facilitate the conditions that are thought to facilitate SLA? It is this point that brings us to the research questions, which are at the same time illustrated by and generated by the above paradigm model. They are:

I. What are the similarities and differences in negotiation in the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family contexts in terms of:

a) The frequency and length of NS -NNS negotiation and the \*factors that affect them.

b) The types of trouble sources that trigger negotiation and the \*factors that affect them.

c) The frequency and types of communication strategies used by the participants and the \*factors that affect that use.

\*The following factors will be considered for the above three research questions.

- 1) Task and task related factors
- 2) Learner proficiency level
- 3) Goals and expectations
- 4) Participant roles
- 5) Participant structure
- 6) Face
- 7) Topic
- 8) NS language choice (foreigner talk etc.)
- 9) Variables as yet unidentified

II. What are the similarities and differences in negotiation in the classroom and in the host family setting and how does this affect learners' chances for SLA in terms of the three conditions thought to facilitate SLA?

- a. Comprehensible input
- b. Modified output
- c. Focus on form

Research question #1 addresses negotiation basics. The focus is on the extent to which learners engage in negotiation in the classroom and host family setting, what types of trouble sources trigger the negotiations, how negotiations are carried out in terms of the types of communication strategies that are utilized, and what and how different variables affect the process of negotiation and communication strategy use. Research question #2 focuses more on the broadened issue of SLA and how negotiation promotes the three conditions thought to facilitate SLA as well as what the differences are in student opportunities for SLA in the classroom versus the host family environment. The answers to these questions ultimately enhance our understanding of SLA through NS-NNS negotiation and CS use in the two settings indicated here, the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family environment. This is done by examining the different components of negotiation and how negotiation and CS use in the classroom and host family setting affect opportunities for language acquisition.

### **Outline of Chapters**

This section briefly describes the contents of each chapter. Chapter One is the overview of the study. This chapter provides an introduction to the study, a basic overview, a description of the research design, the research questions, and an outline of all the chapters. Chapter Two focuses on the previous literature on study abroad, negotiation, and communication

strategies. It is a systematic review of the relevant studies on study-abroad, negotiation, and communication strategies. Specifically, this chapter discusses the main concepts of negotiation and communication strategies and how both of these play an important role in SLA. It also includes operational definitions of the terms used in this study and a detailed discussion of each of the variables found to affect negotiation and communication strategy use. Chapter Three is a detailed description of the study. It describes the methods used in the study, the setting, the participants, and how the data was collected and analyzed. The results and discussions section is divided into four chapters. Each chapter reports and discusses the results of the four research questions (see above). Chapter Four (part I) reports and discusses the results of the first research question on the number and length of negotiations that occurred in the host family versus classroom setting. Moreover, it incorporates a discussion of the findings with regard to the different variables thought to have affected the frequency and length of negotiation in both settings. Chapter Five discusses the frequency and types of trouble sources found to have triggered negotiation in both settings. It also discusses how different variables may have played a role in the types of negotiations that were triggered. Chapter Six reports and discusses the findings on communication strategy use in the host family and classroom settings. It focuses on the differences and similarities of CS used in both settings and discusses the variables thought to have influenced CS use. Chapter Seven

addresses the similarities and differences in negotiation in the classroom and in the host family setting and how negotiation is thought to affect SLA in terms of providing the learner with comprehensible input, opportunities for modified output, and focus on form. The last Chapter (Chapter Eight) summarizes the findings, draws final conclusions, discusses implications for SLA as well as makes suggestions for future research.

## CHAPTER TWO

### STUDY ABROAD, NEGOTIATION, AND COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

In NS-NNS interactions, interlocutors are frequently faced with production and comprehension problems stemming from the learner's imperfect command of the target language. It is no surprise then that second language researchers have been especially interested in exploring how NS and NNS are able to overcome breakdowns in interaction in order to communicate successfully with each other. Two related strands of research that focus on this type of phenomenon are studies on negotiation and communication strategies (henceforth CS). Both of these areas of inquiry investigate potential or actual breakdowns in communication and how interlocutors avoid or overcome these breakdowns in order to communicate successfully. Although similar in focus, these two areas of research are separated by their conceptual frameworks, their analysis, and their classification of the phenomena they observe. They look at a similar type of phenomenon from different perspectives and observe and define different aspects of it. Thus, negotiation and CS studies contribute significantly albeit differently to our understanding of how interlocutors overcome trouble in conversation. This study also falls under the umbrella of another group of studies that focuses on the type of interactions and input that students are exposed to in a study abroad situation. Therefore, in order to establish a foundation, this chapter will provide an account of these areas of research in

terms of how they are relevant to the present study. Accordingly, this chapter first begins with a brief review of the relevant study abroad literature and an explanation of where the present study fits into and contributes to knowledge about the quality and quantity of L2 input that learners are exposed to when they participate in a study abroad program. Second is a review of the negotiation literature, which focuses on a discussion of the conditions created by negotiation that are thought to facilitate SLA. Third is a review of the communication strategy literature and a discussion of what role CS plays in negotiation and in SLA in general. Lastly, a discussion of the factors thought to influence negotiation and communication strategy use is presented.

### **Review of Study Abroad Literature**

In the last decade there have been several SLA studies that have looked at different aspects of study abroad, all having essentially addressed the answers to the following inquiries: (a) does study abroad provide students with more benefits compared to those students who stay home? and (b) does informal non-classroom interaction during study abroad lead to successful SLA compared to formal classroom instruction? and if so, what are these benefits? (see Freed, 1995 for a review).

The general assumption about study abroad is that time spent abroad greatly benefits students in terms of fluency and mastery of the target language. However, criticism leveled at these findings suggest that these

conclusions are weak and unfounded because they are based on unaccepted measurements and do not show a strong correlation between study abroad and linguistic gains (Carroll, 1967; Martin, 1980; Meara, 1994). Other studies, which are though to have used more accepted measures, including the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview or Foreign Service Institute oral interviews, found that students who had studied abroad scored higher than students who had stayed at home (Brecht, Davidson, & Ginsberg, 1995; Freed, 1995b; Guntermann, 1995; Huebner, 1995; Liskin-Gasparro, 1984 as mentioned in Freed, 1995a; Magnan, 1986; Veguez, 1984 as mentioned in Freed, 1995a). Still other studies suggest that findings on study abroad gains are a mixed bag, with students who study abroad showing gains in global fluency but not improving in terms of frequency of grammatical mistakes or syntactic complexity (Moehle, 1984). A study by DeKeyser (1991) showed similar mixed results. DeKeyser (1991) found that compared to students who remained at home, students who had spend a semester of study abroad in Spain showed improvement in fluency and vocabulary but did not show any significant gains in grammar or oral proficiency. This suggested that informal, non-classroom contact may not benefit students as much as previously thought. Similarly, Freed's (1990) study about a study abroad situation which combined formal instruction with out-of-class contact, found that intermediate students whose classroom instruction focused on both grammar and communication benefitted most from non-classroom interaction. However, for more

advanced students, she found that non-interactive sources of the target language such as reading and watching television were actually more beneficial for SLA than informal non-classroom interaction. The only finding that is agreed upon in several of these studies is that there are a lot of individual differences that affect study abroad students' progress in various areas of the L2 (DeKeyser, 1991; Freed, 1995b; Guntermann, 1995; Huebner, 1995). In general then, most of these studies indicate that researchers are unable to clearly determine one way or the other whether informal, non-classroom interaction of the study abroad type is more beneficial to students than formal classroom instruction or not. Their findings also suggest that different factors such as the learner's proficiency level as well as the type of out-of-class interaction students participate in may affect whether informal, out-of-class contact is beneficial to students.

As in the case of the present study, there are also several studies that looked specifically at study abroad in Japan (Enomoto & Marriott, 1994; Hashimoto, 1993; Huebner, 1995; Iino, 1996; Marriott, 1995; Siegal, 1994). These studies generally examined the effect of study abroad on students' sociolinguistic competence instead of focusing on fluency and grammatical competence (Enomoto & Marriott, 1994; Hashimoto, 1993; Marriott, 1995; Siegal, 1994). Both Enomoto and Marriott (1994) and Marriott (1995) found that there was a lot of variation in students' sociolinguistic competence specifically with regard to politeness and that students' competence did not improve

much with informal contact in the target culture. Siegal (1994) found that although there were opportunities to improve sociolinguistic competence through interactions in the target culture, students were ultimately reluctant and sometimes declined to incorporate certain sociolinguistic norms into their interlanguage because the norms conflicted with their self image. Hashimoto's (1993) case study found that rather than incorporating politeness variables into her speech while in a Japan study abroad program, the subject did not start to use them until she returned home. Thus, there is some important but not altogether conclusive evidence about whether students studying in Japan are able to acquire sociolinguistic norms successfully and what the factors may be that influence acquisition. The other two studies, Huebner (1995) and Iino (1996) did not focus on sociolinguistic norms but contributed important information about study abroad in Japan. Starting with Huebner (1995), his study compared students with no prior exposure to Japanese in an intensive study abroad program in Japan with an intensive course conducted in the United States. An important thing to note about this study is that all of the classes were coordinated so that both classes (the study abroad and in-home-country classes) did the exact same type of instruction on the same day. The only major difference between the two groups was that the study abroad group had regular informal out-of-class contact with Japanese native speakers and the stay-at-home group did not. Huebner's (1995) study focused on three inquiries, (a) whether students with no prior exposure could

progress more in an intensive study abroad program than in the exact same course at their home university, (b) whether study abroad data could be used to examine language universals, specifically the acquisition of zero anaphora for full noun phrases in Japanese, and (c) what factors affected the differences in progress (if any) between the two groups. Using several different quantitative and qualitative measures, Huebner (1995) found that the study abroad group generally outperformed the stay-at-home group in OPI gains, in listening comprehension, and in reading comprehension (not statistically significant though). However, there was no difference between the two groups in the substitution of zero anaphora for full noun phrases. For his last inquiry about which factors affected the learning experiences of both groups, Huebner (1995) relied on comments in students' journal entries. From these comments, he concluded that students in the study abroad group may have outperformed the stay-at-home group in the reading comprehension test because the study abroad group was more motivated to learn hiragana, katakana, and kanji because they were constantly exposed to it in the target culture. Similarly, gains in the OPI and listening comprehension may have been because the study abroad students were exposed to daily opportunities to have out-of-class contact with NSs in the target language. Therefore, Huebner (1995) concluded that study abroad did indeed prove to benefit students with no prior exposure to the L2 mainly because the informal out-of-class contact provided the study abroad students with motivation to communicate, learn reading and writing

skills, and provided a variety of input and interaction from out-of-class interactions with NSs that may have promoted L2 development.

While the above review provides some idea of the types of studies that looked at the effect of study abroad on students' interlanguage, studies particularly relevant to the present study are those that examined input, negotiation, and communication strategies in the study abroad setting (Iino, 1996; DeKeyser, 1991; Lafford, 1995; Marriott, 1995; Raupach, 1983; Ridley, 1991). A study by Ridley (1991) compared the use of communication strategies in a formal interview of four learners before they left for a study abroad in France and after they returned to their home country. Besides focusing on the types of strategies the students used, Ridley (1991) also examined the learners' individual ways of dealing with breakdowns in communication and whether they were able to recall and provide introspective comments on the breakdowns they experienced during the interviews. During the study abroad, the students lived with a French family and took care of their children. Therefore, there was no formal classroom study of French but all informal, out-of-class contact. The comparison first revealed that three out of four of the students had improved in their use of achievement strategies, strategies that were used to overcome problems in production (such as circumlocution, word coinage etc.). The improvement included the increased use of more L2-based strategies such as paraphrase as well as an increased range of communication strategy use. The findings also revealed that the learners' individual

communicative styles may have caused some students to pick up certain ways of coping with breakdowns such as the frequent use of repetition or the use of native-like fillers to gain time to plan utterances (Ridley, 1991). She also found that all three of the students who increased their use of communication strategies were able to provide detailed retrospective comments on the breakdowns that occurred during the interview as well as on the strategies they used to try to compensate for them. However, Student #3 whose communication strategy use did not improve as a result of her stay abroad, was barely able to comment on breakdowns and her use of strategies in the interview. Ridley (1991) maintained that this was possibly because Student #3 was not as proficient as the other students and this limited her ability to use communication strategies or because, as an individual, she simply lacked an global metalinguistic awareness of the breakdowns she encountered in the L2. Ridley (1991) concluded that in general, the learners' stay abroad did lead to better use of communication strategies but that individual differences played a major role in the types of strategies they adopted and whether they were able to comment retrospectively on their use of said strategies. However, the low number of subjects in this study precludes any generalizability.

DeKeyser's (1991) study also focused on learners' use of communication strategies. However, unlike Ridley's (1991) study, DeKeyser focused on comparing the use of communication strategies and the monitoring behavior of learners who studied abroad versus those who remained home. As for the

monitoring behavior, DeKeyser focused on the use of two Spanish forms *ser* and *estar* and whether students were able to use these forms in communication tasks. He found that there was no difference in the use of these two forms between the study abroad group and the stay-at-home group. He made similar conclusions for the use of communication strategies, commenting that the students' stay abroad did not change their use of communication strategies. However, like Ridley (1991), he noted that there were some individual differences in the communication strategies employed by the students in the study abroad group.

In yet another twist on the study of communication strategies and study abroad, Lafford, (1995) used an OPI role play to simulate a simple survival situation in the L2 in order to compare the use communication strategies, channel openings, channel closings, and negotiation by three groups of students, a study abroad group in Spain, another study abroad group in Mexico, and then a stay-at-home group in the U.S.. As for the use of channel openers and closers, Lafford (1995) found that while the stay-at-home group didn't use any channel openers, the students in study abroad group all used channel openers, used them more frequently, and moreover used a wider variety of channel closers. The use of communication strategies between the three groups was more varied however. Specifically, the communication strategies she looked at were fillers, connectors, backchannel signals, repairs/repeats, and the addition of information, most of which are not

usually included in traditional communication strategy taxonomies. The findings revealed that English fillers were used more frequently by the study abroad group, but that the study abroad group also used appropriate L2 fillers, which were not used at all by the stay-at-home group. The study abroad group also used more connectors and backchannel signals while the stay-at-home group used more self repetition. As for self-repair, the findings revealed that the study abroad group and the stay-at-home group had similar frequencies of self-repair, but the study abroad group had less correct self-repairs. Lafford (1995) surmised that this may have been because the study abroad groups' focus during the OPI role play may have been on communication rather than grammatical accuracy. The findings also indicated that the study abroad students added more questions and comments during the role play to facilitate a real communicative situation, while the stay-at-home group did not add on extra questions and comments. Lafford also looked at the strategies students' used when they negotiated for meaning and found there was not a lot of negotiation in the OPI role play for either the stay-at-home or study abroad groups. However, in the negotiation that did occur, the study abroad group seemed to know the vocabulary necessary to successfully complete the role play and therefore did not have to use a lot of strategies to compensate, while the stay-at-home group had to resort to various strategies to overcome their lack of vocabulary. Lafford (1995) noted that lower proficiency learners in the stay-at-home group tended to use L1-based strategies like codeswitching, while

there was only one instance of this in the study abroad group. Approximation and circumlocution as well as overgeneralization strategies were used only by the stay-at-home group and they also produced the majority of indirect appeals for help, however, message abandonment only occurred in the stay-at-home group while confirmation checks were more frequent in the study abroad group. Lafford (1995) summarized the data on strategy use in negotiation by saying that when there was a problem in production or reception, the stay-at-home group tended to resort to using a wide range of strategies while the study abroad groups tended to use confirmation checks to get feedback from their NS interlocutors. Thus, considering just the findings on strategies, the study abroad group increased in their frequency and range of strategy use in terms of fillers, connectors, backchannels etc. compared to the stay-at-home group. However, the study abroad group did not need to use a lot of negotiation strategies such as circumlocution or codeswitching simply because they already were familiar with the vocabulary necessary to complete the role play. On the other hand, the stay-at-home group was not as familiar with the necessary vocabulary and had to compensate for this by using a variety of strategies in negotiation.

Raupach's (1983) study also contributes to the corpus of data on communication strategies in a study abroad situation. He examined L2 learners of French and their command of grammatical structures as well as their use of communication strategies in an interview at the beginning and at

the end of a study abroad. He found that although there were no gains in the students' command of grammatical structures, there was a notable difference in their use of communication strategies, although he does not elaborate on this except to say that one student improved in her use of time-gaining fillers.

Finally, the last two studies that will be briefly mentioned here and discussed more in depth later in this chapter are Iino (1996) and Marriott (1995). These studies are also relevant to the present study because they examine Japanese study abroad situations and the type of input that students are exposed to in out-of-class interactions. The primary focus of Iino's (1996) study was on describing the actual language use in interactions between students and their Japanese host family members and the beliefs and expectations that motivated that language use. He found that host family members had different expectations of how their host students should speak and behave as well as how they, the host family, should speak and behave towards the student. For these reasons the host family members tended to speak a "gaijinized" version of Japanese, Japanese language adapted to foreigners, that often compromised the quality of the target language input that students received (discussed more in detail later in this chapter). Marriott's (1995) primary focus was on students' acquisition of sociolinguistic norms, namely politeness, but she also described to some extent the factors in the informal, out-of-class input that she believes may have affected students' acquisition of politeness norms. Marriott's (1995) observations about out-of-

class input are similar to Iino's in that she comes to the conclusion that the reason students did not make a lot of progress in their use of politeness norms was because the target language input they were exposed to was compromised in terms of quality and quantity. Thus, both studies looked at the Japanese study abroad setting and the input that students were exposed to and came to similar conclusions about the inadequate quality of that input.

Thus, the bulk of the study abroad studies have compared and contrasted formal study at home with some sort of immersion experience in the target country. Although not always the case, most study abroad experiences combine formal study with some form of informal, non-classroom contact. A distinction often drawn upon here is that formal study promotes language learning and out-of-class interaction promotes language acquisition. Although the combination of formal and informal exposure in the target language is thought to provide the best learning opportunities for students, to date no studies have examined and described the interactions and language use that students and NSs engage in in these two study abroad settings. It is in this area that the present study's contribution to the literature on study abroad may be found. By examining the similarities and differences between NS-NNS negotiation and the use of communication strategies in the host family setting and in study abroad classroom, this study provides insight into features of the L2 input that students are exposed to in formal classroom and informal non-classroom interactions with native speakers. While this

study does not make use of recognized measurements (e.g., OPI) to substantiate claims of increased proficiency as a result of study abroad, it does look at how NS-NNS negotiation promotes the conditions necessary for second language acquisition and examines how communication strategies are used by both the participants to overcome communication breakdowns. Moreover, in contrast to the studies reviewed above that looked at communication strategies and examined input in the study abroad setting, this study does not use elicitation methods such as interviews, role plays, or story retellings. Rather it compares and contrasts unelicited negotiations in interactions in the host family setting and the study abroad classroom.

### **Review of Negotiation Literature**

A basic concept central to the study of negotiation is interaction and the role interaction plays in SLA. The person who first emphasized the importance of interaction in language acquisition was Hatch (1978). In a departure from the then widely accepted perspective of language acquisition, Hatch (1978) proposed that rather than communicative use of language occurring as a result of first learning L2 structure, communicative use of language leads to the learning of L2 structure. Her suggestion that interaction leads to second language development led other researchers to investigate in detail the relationship between interaction and second language acquisition. It is from within this interactionist framework that negotiation research found

its beginning. In her review article on negotiation, Pica (1992) points out that within the field of SLA, "negotiation" as a term has been given various definitions and is often used interchangeably with other terms such as "interactional modification", "input modification", "negotiated input", and "negotiation of meaning" (see Long, 1996; Pica, 1992; and Pica, 1994 for a review). For the purpose of this study, "negotiation" is the term that will be used throughout this paper to refer to an interactional exchange that exemplifies the following definition;

...the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility or production. (based on Pica, 1994, p. 494)

According to this definition, central concepts in negotiation include problematicity, input and output modification, comprehensibility, and interaction.

Fundamental to the study of negotiation is that negotiation researchers not only believe that interaction in general promotes the conditions that lead to SLA, but that "negotiation" as a specific type of interaction optimizes conditions in such a way as to maximize the possibilities for language acquisition (Foster, 1998; Gass & Varonis, 1985a; Long, 1980, 1981, 1983, 1985a, 1985b, 1996; Pica, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1994; Pica et al., 1986, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993; Porter, 1986; Varonis & Gass, 1982, 1985a, 1985b). Support for the notion that

negotiation is an elevated form of interaction that provides a myriad of opportunities for SLA is born out of several different perspectives from which researchers have explored negotiation. Two review articles in particular discuss the role of interaction and specifically the role of negotiation in SLA in depth; Long's (1996) article about the role of linguistic environment in SLA and Pica's (1994) review article of negotiation and second language learning. From positive evidence to comprehensible input to the role of modified output in SLA, both Pica's (1994) and Long's (1996) articles provides a thorough review of the literature and discuss those features of the linguistic environment that are thought to contribute to SLA. Both articles essentially outline the three most important theoretical perspectives from which negotiation researchers approach the study of negotiation. Each perspective is born out of slightly different view on how negotiation promotes the conditions that are thought to be necessary for successful SLA, namely that negotiation (a) makes input comprehensible for the learner, (b) provides opportunities for learners to actively modify their output, and (c) focuses learners' attention on form. These three theoretical perspectives provide the underlying assumptions of the relationship between negotiation and second language learning. Accordingly, they are integral to the following review of the literature on negotiation, where the findings with regard to these three perspectives are discussed in detail below.

### **Negotiation Provides Comprehensible Input**

The first perspective finds its source in Krashen's Input Hypothesis, the contention that input must not only be made available to learners, but that it must also be comprehensible to promote SLA (Long, 1996; Krashen, 1980). This hypothesis was supported by experimental evidence that showed that learners comprehended pre-modified input (input linguistically modified to be more comprehensible) significantly better than unmodified input. (Blau, 1982; Chaudron, 1983; Johnson, 1981; Long, 1985). However, some SLA researchers have questioned whether comprehensible input actually results in language learning. Færch and Kasper (1986) for example, maintain that learners may infer or comprehend input by using contextual and schematic knowledge, which results in comprehension but not acquisition. They contend that for acquisition to occur, learners must notice linguistic forms in the input and compare their own output with that of their interlocutors to realize where their interlanguage falls short and then restructure their output accordingly. As it were, some studies provide evidence that even with significant exposure to comprehensible input learners still display an inadequate command of the target language and fail to pick up target language structures. Usually cited here are the Canadian French Immersion studies, where learners who live in the L2 environment and who have had prolonged exposure to comprehensible input still fail to achieve a high level of L2 competence in terms of grammatical accuracy (For a review of these studies

see Long, 1996 and Swain, 1991). Thus, the Input Hypothesis has been criticized for its lack of a theoretical link between the learner's comprehension of input and the subsequent incorporation of that input into their interlanguage system for use in later communication (Chaudron, 1985; Faerch & Kasper, 1987; Gass, 1988 Long, 1983, 1985). For this reason, comprehensible input has been deemed a necessary but in itself an insufficient condition for SLA (Long, 1983, 1985).

Although deemed necessary but insufficient, the idea that comprehensible input is still an important part of language learning prompted negotiation researchers to examine whether or not negotiation provided learners with comprehensible input (see Pica, 1994 for a review). Pica, Doughty, and Young (1986) and Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) investigated comprehensible input from an interactive perspective to find out whether negotiation provided learners with comprehensible input. Their studies followed similar experimental designs which involved setting up two treatment groups where students were exposed to either pre-modified input, or actively negotiated unmodified input (Pica, Doughty, & Young, 1986; Pica, Young, & Doughty 1987). In both studies, they found that the negotiation group's comprehension was significantly better than the non-negotiation group's. In addition to this, they noted two other findings: (a) that the negotiated input contained significantly more rephrasings and repetitions and (b) that sentence length or complexity of the text was not reduced or altered by

the negotiation when compared with the NS baseline text. Loschky (1989, 1994) also looked at negotiation and its role in facilitating comprehensible input. In a comparison of three experimental groups: (a) unmodified input, (b) pre-modified input, and (c) negotiated input, Loschky's findings showed that the negotiated input group showed significantly better comprehension than the other two treatment groups. In a similar experiment, Gass and Varonis (1994) compared learners' comprehension on four input conditions: (a) modified input, (b) unmodified input, (c) modified input-negotiated, and (d) unmodified input-negotiated. Their findings not only revealed that learners' comprehension was significantly better when exposed to modified input as compared to unmodified input, but that the negotiated input condition was found to facilitate comprehension significantly better than either of the two non-negotiated conditions of modified or unmodified input. In another study that looked specifically at classroom interaction, negotiation, and comprehension, Pica (1992) compared three input groups who were exposed to (a) negotiated input (self-generated), (b) negotiated input (other-generated), and (c) text modified to reflect the types of modifications generated by the above actual negotiations (repetitions, redundancies etc.). The findings revealed that there was no significant difference between the three treatment groups for comprehension, but surprisingly indicated that even indirect or peripheral involvement in negotiation was enough to facilitate students' comprehension. Other studies not using an interactionist approach have

found similar results with regard to benefits of peripheral participation. For example, Donato's (1994) study of collective scaffolding in second language learning found that participants who were only peripherally exposed to scaffolded help were found to use the scaffolded form correctly later in the interaction. Similarly, Ohta (1995a, 1995b, 1997, 1999, 2001), who used a socio-cultural framework, where peripheral participation in interaction is considered a significant part of language development, looked at legitimate peripheral participation in the L2 classroom and its affect on language learning. She found that legitimate peripheral participation in teacher-fronted activities had a strongly facilitative effect on learners' subsequent use of the language they were exposed to. Even though the interactionist perspective that negotiation researchers espouse tends to dismiss any type of participation except direct participation in interaction, the findings on legitimate peripheral participation from other research perspectives provides some evidence that is particularly meaningful with regard to peripheral negotiation. To put it into perspective, the fact that learners benefit from peripheral participation in negotiation as much as they do from direct participation considerably strengthens the argument that negotiation promotes the conditions for SLA. This is particularly good news for teachers in the classroom who obviously have little time to engage in negotiation with each individual student. Thus, Ohta's study (2001) is particularly insightful on the subject of legitimate peripheral participation in the classroom. Looking at interaction in the

classroom, Ohta (2001) found an instance where a learner involved in a role play did not notice an error he made in his own speech, but was able to notice the same error produced by another student in a presentation of the role play to the whole class. Through observing students' use of private speech, such as whispering the correct response to themselves, or their subsequent use of a corrected form later in the interaction, Ohta concluded that learners were able to get valuable input even though they only participated peripherally. She maintained that when learners were actively attending to the talk around them, they were able to get indirect feedback through hearing another learner use a correct or incorrect form, noticing teacher's corrective feedback addressed to other learners as a peripheral participant, and participating in choral responses. In fact, Ohta (2001) maintained that even when students did not produce audible private speech indicating uptake, there was still evidence to indicate that they noticed and made use of feedback that they heard even though they had not directly participated in the interaction. Ohta's (2001) findings, along with Pica (1992) and Donato's (1994), provide clear evidence that learners do not have to directly participate in interactions to benefit from them. It is for these reasons that the present study has included analysis of classroom negotiations that learners not only directly but also peripherally participate in.

To reiterate the main points of this section, studies showing that pre-modified input facilitates comprehension better than original, unmodified

input. Moreover, although some studies provided positive evidence of the impact of comprehensible input on comprehension (Blau, 1982; Chaudron, 1983; Gass and Varonis, 1994; Johnson, 1981; Long, 1985), comprehensible input was found in and of itself to be an insufficient but necessary condition for SLA. Nevertheless, negotiation researchers who focused on the importance of comprehensible input in interaction found that engaging in negotiation facilitates comprehension considerably more than exposure to pre-modified input, even when exposure to that negotiation is only peripheral (Pica, 1992; Pica, Doughty & Young, 1986; Pica, Young & Doughty 1987). It follows that if direct and peripheral participation in negotiation has been shown to facilitate comprehension, which is a necessary component of language learning, then negotiation itself may also be important in language learning.

### **Negotiation Promotes Learner Modification of Output**

The second theoretical hypothesis is called the Comprehensible Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985). Long (1996) noted that even though learners may be exposed to comprehensible input, some learners never successfully incorporate difficult lexical items and grammatical forms into their interlanguage. Therefore, it isn't enough for learners to be exposed to comprehensible input, they have to be given opportunities to modify their interlanguage output, which forces them to analyze the correctness of their

interlanguage. In support of this argument, Swain (1985, 1995) maintains that the kind of cognitive processing learners engage in during language production is different from the kind of processing necessary for comprehension. She suggests that the processes used in production are those that play a significant role in the development of syntax and morphology. Hence, learner production, specifically in the form of modified output (when a student modifies her/his original utterance), is a necessary condition of SLA (Swain, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1994). In support of this hypothesis, she claims that there are three functions of output in SLA: (a) output promotes "noticing" (b) output may promote learning through hypothesis testing, and (c) output can serve a metalinguistic function that enables learners to control and internalize linguistic knowledge. Only the second function will be addressed in this section. The noticing and the metalinguistic functions will be discussed in the next section about focus on form.

Swain (1995) claims that one of the functions of modified output is that output facilitates learning through hypothesis testing. She suggests that through production learners are able to test their hypotheses on the comprehensibility and accuracy of their interlanguage. Moreover, through negative feedback from interlocutors, learners have the opportunity to adjust their hypotheses and modify their output to make it closer to the target norm. Swain (1995) argues that existence of hypothesis testing is found in negotiation research, where learners are found to modify their utterances when given

feedback by interlocutors on the comprehensibility of their message (Pica, 1987, Pica et al., 1991; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989). For example, in their study on NNS-NNS interaction, Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, and Linnell (1996) found that learners modified their utterances up to 58% of the time in one task in response to signals from other learners. In another study, Pica (1987) found that in response to NSs' signals of noncomprehension, in which there was immediate follow-up by the learner, learners modified their utterances 48% of the time to be more target-like. Pica and her colleagues (1989) also looked at learner modification of output with task type as a factor and found that learners modified their output as much as 47% in some tasks in response to NSs' signals. Pica (1992) found similar results in her analysis of negotiation and learner modification of output. She found that learners modified their utterances up to 60% of the time in response to NSs' open signals (requests for clarification etc.), but only modified their utterances 25 to 32% of the time when NSs reformulated the learners' unclear utterance and modeled the corrected utterance back to them for confirmation. This finding has been noted in other studies as well. For example, Lyster and Ranta (1997) looked at immersion classrooms and found that learners modified their utterances 88% of the time in response to teacher requests for clarification, but modified only 31% of their utterances in response to teacher recasts (i.e., confirmation checks). Swain (1995) uses this type of evidence of learner output of modification to suggest that learners would not modify their

utterances after feedback if they weren't engaged in testing hypotheses.

Similarly, Pica et al. (1989) notes that when learners modify their output, "they test hypotheses about the second language, experiment with new structures and forms, and expand and exploit their interlanguage resources in creative ways." (p. 64).

What remains to be seen is whether learner production of modified output actually promotes SLA. There are a few studies that suggest that this is indeed the case. For example, Ohta (2001) looked at peer collaboration in the L2 classroom and found that when peers used a variety of signals to indicate that their partner's utterance was not understood or was incorrect, the partner often responded by modifying the original utterance. Overall, Ohta noted that peer interaction increased accuracy partly because learners were able to catch each other's errors, provide immediate feedback, and subsequently correct the errors by modifying their output. In a study on vocabulary using a post test, Van den Branden (1997) found that children who participated in a two-way communicative task and who were pushed to modify their output produced significantly more output and had a greater range of vocabulary in a similar task performed later than did children who were not pushed to modify their output. Another more recent study suggests that negotiation in which subjects are pushed to modify their output might have a sustained effect on acquisition. In another study, Silver (1999) looked at the immediate, delayed, and sustained learning effects of three treatment conditions on ESL question

formation: (a) comprehensible input only, (b) interactive output (role plays where subjects were not required to modify their output), and (c) negotiation (where subjects may be "pushed" to modify output). Using a pre-test, post test, and a delayed post test, she found that negotiation where subjects may be pushed to modify their output had a greater positive effect on ESL question formation than either of the other two conditions. Moreover, a delayed post test (5 weeks after treatment) revealed that there was a sustained positive effect on their question formation for 100% of subjects in the negotiation treatment.

To conclude, while few in number, there are studies that suggest that a positive relationship exists between modified output and second language learning. Silver's (1999) study in particular makes an important observation; for her subjects, negotiation, over mere production of output and exposure to comprehensible input, resulted in sustained positive effects in second language learning. However, Long (1996) argues that as in the case of comprehensible input, production of comprehensible output is perhaps a necessary but not sufficient condition for learning. He explains his position by noting that even when learners are actively engaged in producing and modifying output in response to feedback, there are still instances where learners fail to notice difficult forms etc. and therefore never modify their output or incorporate these forms into their interlanguage. Therefore, while modification of output may be one of the conditions that need to be met to

facilitate SLA, the role of focus on form is also important and must not be overlooked.

### **Negotiation Promotes Focus on Form**

This brings us to the third theoretical motivation, that negotiation serves to focus learners' attention to form. The underlying assumption here is that learners must have a conscious awareness of L2 form in order to extract the forms from an array of L2 input to be able to store them in long term memory (Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Long, 1996; Schmidt 1990, 1994, 1996). The notion that negotiation promotes focus on form coincides with Swain's (1995) view that the third function of modified output in second language learning is the metalinguistic function. She maintains that metalinguistic output, when learners produce output to reflect on language use or to "negotiate form", is an important function of output in learning. She describes this metalinguistic function as "output-as-the-hypothesis-itself," when learners explicitly "reflect on, question, and otherwise negotiate their hypotheses about language form in their output and through the production of output" (Swain, 1995, p. 132). She notes that negotiation of form is best examined within interaction where the focus is on communication rather than on form and the negotiation itself is about form for the purpose of using it to communicate a particular message.

What remains to be demonstrated, however, is the link between focus on form and second language learning. Such learning is perhaps most apparent when a learner tests a hypothesis in interaction by negotiating a form with an interlocutor and subsequently incorporates the form gleaned from that negotiation into their interlanguage. Findings from a few negotiation studies suggest that such learning through focus on form does occur. One noteworthy study that has explored the metalinguistic aspect of output and language learning is Donato (1994). Donato's (1994) study focuses mainly on negotiation of form in learner-learner collective scaffolding to determine whether or not learners are capable of providing each other with the supportive conditions that exert influence on each other's interlanguage. He found that students were indeed capable of providing each other with support through scaffolding and that of the 32 cases of negotiation of form that were solved correctly in the planning task, 75% of these forms were used correctly one week later in the actual task (Donato, 1994). This study provides some empirical support for a positive relationship between negotiation of form and second language learning. Swain and Lapkin's (1998) study also showed that when learners jointly negotiated linguistic problems in the context of a communicative task, they were later found to give correct or incorrect solutions on a test according to whether they correctly or incorrectly solved the problem during the previous negotiation. This suggests then that when linguistic problems are solved correctly through negotiation, learners are able

to later use the linguistic form, structure etc. successfully. Another study by Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) indirectly indicates that learners who are pushed to modify their output show immediate improved performance as well as greater accuracy over time. In their study, Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) distinguish between two types of acquisition that may occur as a result of pushed output: (a) acquiring new forms that are subsequently incorporated or (b) developing increased control over forms already existing in the interlanguage. They claim their findings support the increased control over forms type of acquisition. One note of caution here though, the small sample size in this study precludes any claims of generalizability. Thus, although some of these studies may have limitations, one could reasonably argue that the findings suggest that negotiation promotes focus on form, which in turn has a positive affect on SLA.

### **Negotiation and the Quality of Input it Provides**

After having reviewed the findings that negotiation promotes focus on form, the next question to be addressed seems fairly evident, what is it about negotiation that promotes focus on form? Long (1996) proposes that certain characteristics of the input that negotiation provides promote focus on form. First, negotiation researchers espouse the idea that certain features of the L2 input are made more salient in negotiation and that saliency leads to noticing which leads to learning (Long, 1996; Pica, 1994). The other two input

characteristics that researchers believe negotiation provides are positive evidence (grammatically acceptable models of L2 speech) and negative evidence, which is evidence that points to utterances that are ungrammatical (Long, 1996). These characteristics, increased saliency, noticing, and the availability of positive evidence and negative evidence are thought to be maximized by negotiation and are also thought to be necessary components in promoting focus on form and will be discussed below.

**Negotiation maximizes saliency.**

Negotiation is thought to maximize the saliency of various features of the target language and consequently makes these features more noticeable. For example, the negotiation literature suggests that there is increased saliency in negotiation in terms of increased frequency. As cited above, Pica et al.'s studies (1986, 1987) found that negotiated input generated significantly more repetitions, redundancies, and words per direction than in their baseline and premodified input conditions. Long (1996) has also identified similar characteristics in foreigner talk discourse that suggest increased saliency. He maintains that NS sometimes help NNS out by "slowing their rate of delivery, using left-dislocation, stressing or highlighting key-bearing words, and pausing before or after them." (Long, 1996, p. 420). This, as well as some foreigner talk traits such as fore-fronting of topics, marking for present tense, here-and-now orientation, paraphrase, lexical repetitions etc. may all serve to

increase saliency (Long, 1996). Whether these are all present in NS-NNS negotiation at any given time is likely to depend on several different factors, but Long (1996) sums it up best in his updated version of the Interaction Hypothesis, arguing that:

Negotiation for meaning by definition involves denser than usual frequencies of semantically contingent speech of various kinds (i.e., utterances by a competent speaker, such as repetitions, extensions, reformulations, rephrasings, expansions, and recasts), which immediately follow learner utterances and maintain reference to their meaning (for review, see Snow, 1988). Such semantically related talk is important for acquisition for a number of reasons. The frequencies of target forms in the reformulation tends to be higher, as negotiation involves recycling related items while a problem is resolved, which should increase their saliency and the likelihood of their being noticed by the learner. Many input modifications, such as stress of key words, partial repetition, lexical switches and decomposition, involved in (the) reformulations can also serve to make target forms salient independent of increased frequency in the input, for example, by moving them to initial or final position in an utterance and through the addition of stress and pauses before and after key forms, once more increasing the likelihood of their being noticed. (p. 452)

It is clear from Long's (1996) perspective that negotiation maximizes the saliency of target language input for the learner in a multitude of ways. In turn, increased saliency is likely to promote increased noticing, which is considered a necessary condition for SLA.

**Negotiation promotes increased noticing.**

Noticing is one of Swain's (1995) proposed functions for modification of output. The claim that noticing is a necessary and sufficient condition for

converting input to intake comes from Schmidt (1990). Swain (1985, 1995) takes this claim a bit further by maintaining that if learners are made to modify their output, then they will be prompted to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language. She bases this on Schmidt and Frota's (1986) "notice the gap principle", which states that a learner will acquire an L2 form only if the learner consciously notices it. This "noticing" can lead to incorporation of new forms or solidify knowledge that already exists in the learner's interlanguage (Swain, 1985; Swain, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1994). The fact that learners notice problems in their production has been consistently shown in communication strategy research, where the focus is on how learners self-repair mistakes in their own production (Bialystok, 1990; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Kellerman, 1991). On the other hand, making a direct connection between noticing and language learning is a bit more difficult. However, there have been some studies that do suggest this. For example, Alanen (1992) found that students who noticed forms acquired them, while those who did not notice the forms didn't acquire them. Gass and Varonis (1994) also offer some support of the effect of negotiation on increased noticing and as a result, increased accuracy. In their study, "accuracy" meant the NS's correct placement of objects in a picture that was described to them by the NNS. Looking at two similar tasks, they found that learners exhibited a statistically significant increase in accuracy in their descriptions if they had been allowed to negotiate with their NS interlocutor on the first task

compared with those who were not allowed to negotiate on the first task. Although they point out that this was probably a "preceding interaction" effect and that the main contribution negotiation made to the increase in accuracy was to increase the learners' attention on the forms that the learners subsequently used in the second task (Gass & Varonis, 1994). Swain and Lapkin's (1994) think-aloud protocol study also provides some indirect evidence for learning. They examined learners' think-aloud episodes in which learners talked about language problems that they were having while engaged in writing an article in the target language. They found that not only did learners notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge, but they also engaged in those cognitive processes such as "extending first language knowledge to second language contexts, extending second language knowledge to new target language contexts, and formulating and testing hypotheses about linguistic forms and functions" that are thought to play an important role in second language learning (Swain, 1995, p. 130). Though not conclusive, this evidence provides some support for the role of modification of output in noticing and the role of noticing in SLA.

What remains to be shown is that negotiation provides opportunities to notice forms. VanPatten (1988) maintains that it is difficult for (especially) beginning learners to attend to form when they are focusing on meaning and vice versa. Ellis (1999) argues that this is where negotiation comes in. Essentially negotiation gives the learner time to attend to form and still

process the message. Attending to form also has a lot to do with the type of feedback (i.e. positive or negative evidence) provided by the interlocutor, and whether learners use this feedback to modify their utterances. As Schmidt and Frota (1986) point out, learners don't always notice their non-target like interlanguage unless it is pointed out to them. The negotiation literature shows that NS and NNS give various types of feedback to NNS about the comprehensibility of their interlanguage generally in form of requests for repetition, clarification, and confirmation, which Pica (1994) calls "signals". Indirect evidence comes from transcripts of negotiation data, which clearly show that interlocutors often attempt to clarify or confirm their understanding of NNSs' messages, and in response, NNSs will, not always but sometimes, modify their utterances (Gass & Varonis, 1989; Pica, 1987; Pica, 1992; Pica et al., 1996; Pica et al., 1991; Pica, Holliday, and Lewis, 1990; Pica et al., 1989). Pica et al. (1989) noted that NSs gave two types of basic feedback to NNSs on the comprehensibility of their message. Some feedback was in the form of "open signals" such as requests for clarification. For the most part, such requests for clarification are a form of negative evidence. Other feedback fell into the "model" category, where NSs would seek confirmation from the NNSs, giving them an accurate, appropriately phrased target language model in the process (i.e., positive evidence). Pica (1987) and Pica et al. (1989) found that NNSs were more likely to modify their utterances in response to open signals (negative evidence), as opposed to the model utterance signals

(positive evidence). Similarly, Pica et al. (1991) found that NNSs modified their output 60% of the time in response to NS open signals, but when the signal was a repetition, modification, or elaboration of the NNS's utterance, NNSs only modified their utterance 25-32% of the time. That learners modify their utterances in response to feedback holds true not only in NS-NNS but in learner-learner negotiation as well. In a comparison of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS negotiation, Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Parinos, and Linnell (1996) found that on certain tasks, learners modified their utterances up to 58% of the time in response to signals from other learners. Although using a socio-cultural framework, Ohta (2001) also looked at peer-interaction and found that when corrective feedback in the form of recasts were given, seventy-five percent of the learners made immediate use of the feedback by incorporating it into their next turn. She also noted that even when students participated peripherally in interactions in the classroom, "noticing" was evident in their private speech, such as when they whispered a correct response to themselves. However, she questions the notion that immediate uptake of corrective feedback and private speech are the only evidence of noticing. She explains that in the classroom, the absence of immediate, overt uptake does not mean that the learner did not notice the feedback. She illustrates this by pointing out that even when students did not immediately incorporate corrective feedback in their next turn, later in the interaction it was evident that they had indeed noticed it. In fact, in some cases where there was no overt display of either uptake or

noticing, the student was found to use the feedback correctly later in the class. Therefore, Ohta (2001) argues that immediate uptake in the form of modification of output either overtly rendered or in private speech is not the only indication that a student has noticed a form. Accordingly, she suggests that studies on corrective feedback, noticing, and uptake should consider broadening and redefining what constitutes evidence of noticing.

In sum, negotiation is thought to increase learners' "noticing" of form and therefore facilitate SLA. This is precisely because negotiation provides timely, salient input as well as opportunities for students to modify their output. Essentially, student modification of output provides evidence that they notice feedback on forms in negotiations and are able to make use of that feedback to modify their utterances. However, students seem to respond to certain types of feedback differently. Students were found to be more likely to modify their output and show that they'd noticed a form when the NS requested clarification of an unclear utterance, a *form of negative feedback*. If instead, a NS responded to a student's unclear utterance by modeling or elaborating the utterance (*positive evidence*) then students were less likely to modify their output in response (Pica, 1987; Pica et al., 1989). Thus, even within negotiation, certain types of signals can encourage modification of output and focus on form over other signals. However, even if a student does not immediately modify their utterance or provide evidence of immediate

uptake, that does not necessarily indicate that they have not “noticed” it, but that evidence of noticing may be shown over time (Ohta, 2001).

**Negotiation provides positive evidence.**

The notion behind this theoretical perspective is that if learners are provided with systematic evidence of grammatically acceptable L2 speech they will have the chance to incorporate correct forms into their interlanguage (Long, 1996). The implication is that without positive evidence, learners would have no accurate or appropriate models of the target language to develop their interlanguage from. Thus, it is important to determine whether or not negotiation provides learners with target-like positive evidence. It could be argued that in order to prove negotiation provides learners with positive evidence, one would only have to point out that in the negotiation data NSs speak well formed utterances. Perhaps a more sound means of showing this, however, would be to look at the literature on foreigner talk, where inquiries have been made as to whether or not NS speech to NNS is grammatically well formulated. Things do get a bit more complicated in this area though, because so many factors affect whether or not NSs speak grammatically correctly to NNSs. However, Long (1981) reviewed 40 studies and found that most studies reported FT to be a reduced or simplified form of speech, but only sometimes ungrammatical. From his review of the studies, he mapped out four relevant factors to the grammaticality of NS speech to

NNS; "1) the NNS has very low or no proficiency in the language of communication 2) The NS is, or thinks s/he is of higher NS status than the NNS, 3) the NS has considerable prior FT experience, but of a very limited kind, and 4) the conversation occurs spontaneously" (Long, 1981, p. 126). He contends that no single factor is sufficient, but that when factors 1, 2, and 4 are present, the result is ungrammatical FT. Thus, one could indirectly assume, upon the absence of most of these factors in a negotiation setting, that NS speech would most likely be grammatically well formed. Other evidence that negotiation does not compromise the quality of the target language speech is indicated by Long (1996). He notes that negotiation "produce(s) longer texts, in which mean utterance or sentence length and syntactic complexity are maintained or even increased." (p. 421, 422). This is supported in Pica, Young, and Doughty (1987) and Pica, Doughty, and Young's (1986) studies, where the effect of three input treatments: (a) baseline-unmodified, (b) premodified, and (c) negotiated unmodified was observed on comprehension. They found that negotiation not only resulted in an increase of the mean complexity of the input, but that in terms of quantity of input, the negotiation generated significantly more repetitions, redundancies, and words per direction than the baseline and premodified input. Another study, that directly links positive evidence in negotiation with focus on form is Pica's (1996) study of NS-NNS dyads and their performance on a communication task. Pica (1996) found that the positive input of forms and features the NSs provided during negotiation

served to focus the NNSs' attention on form. Specifically, she looked at the way NSs responded to NNSs' signals of incomplete comprehension and whether the NSs modified their utterances in such a way as to highlight form and its relationship to meaning. She found that NSs modified their input to students by segmenting, manipulating, and moving words and forms as well as by providing descriptors, examples and explanations. She concluded that all of these modifications served to not only make the message more comprehensible to the student but also drew students' attention to L2 form-meaning relationships. Thus, it could be argued that negotiation seems to generate more than its fair share of positive evidence in terms of quality and quantity. Moreover, the modification of output that NSs provide in negotiation may be such that draws learners' attention to the linguistic features of words, forms, and relationships between form and meaning. Although all of this may suggest that negotiation provides learners with an abundance of positive evidence, one must be cautious with respect to claims of SLA. As Long (1996) argues, positive evidence, although necessary, is an insufficient condition for SLA. He maintains that this is because some linguistic forms are difficult to detect through mere exposure to positive evidence alone and that negative evidence is also needed to draw learner's attention to what is ungrammatical in the L2.

### Negotiation provides negative evidence.

Long (1996) argues that positive evidence is simply not enough to guarantee acquisition and that there are examples of learners who have been exposed to abundant positive input, but whose interlanguage remains at a low level. He maintains that learners need to be made aware of the gaps between their interlanguage and the L2 through the presence of negative evidence, evidence that points to what is ungrammatical. Accordingly, White (1989) argues that either direct or indirect negative evidence should be present in input to help learners recognize or get feedback on incorrect forms in their interlanguage. Long (1996) describes direct negative evidence as “grammatical explanations or overt error correction” and indirect evidence as “failure to understand, incidental error correction in a response, communication breakdowns, confirmation checks...” (p. 413). It is mostly the indirect type of negative evidence that is generally found in negotiation, in the form of communication breakdowns, confirmation checks, clarification checks, and failure to understand etc.. The negotiation literature clearly shows that NSs and NNSs alike give various types of indirect negative feedback to NNSs about the comprehensibility of their interlanguage in the form of requests for repetition, clarification, and confirmation ( Gass & Varonis, 1989; Pica, 1992; Pica, 1987; Pica et al., 1996; Pica et al., 1991; Pica, Holliday, and Lewis, 1990; Pica et al. 1989). These signals can indicate to learners that their message has not been understood in some way. Pica and her colleagues found that NSs used

two different types of indirect feedback with NNSs on the comprehensibility of their message. Some feedback was in the form of "open signals" such as requests for clarification. Other feedback fell into the "model" category, where NSs would give NNSs an accurate target language model to confirm (Pica et al., 1989; Pica et al., 1991). Such language models are often called recasts, "utterances that rephrase a learner's utterance by changing one or more sentence components (subject, verb or object) while still referring to its central meanings" (Long, 1996, p. 435). Ellis (1999) points out that what some researchers label "recasts" often cannot be distinguished from what negotiation researchers label "confirmation checks" or "requests for confirmation". As such, research on recasts is particularly relevant to our understanding of negotiation and negative evidence because it sheds light on moves found in negotiation and how they affect language learning. Several studies have investigated recasts and how they are used in NS-NNS interaction. In particular, Richardson (1993) found that NSs were less likely to recast ungrammatical utterances that involved multiple corrections and more likely to recast those that involved easier corrections. Moreover, NNSs were more likely to imitate corrective recasts as opposed to non-corrective recasts. The effects of such recasts on language learning have also been investigated to a limited extent. Mito's (1993) study looked at two experimental conditions and their effect on the learning of two Japanese grammatical patterns. In the first condition, the researcher provided a model of the two grammatical

constructions in the context of a communicative activity. In the second condition the researcher provided recasts of the grammatical structures. The findings indicated that no learning occurred as a result of the modeling condition, but that students in the recast condition showed small but statistically significant gains. In contrast, Long, Inagaki, and Ortega (1998) looked at the same two Japanese grammatical constructions and some Spanish constructions and found that recasts were not more effective than modeling in terms of learning outcomes for the Japanese grammatical patterns, but did prove effective for one particular Spanish construction. In another study, Mackey and Philps (1998) looked at language development in two groups of adult learners, advanced and less advanced learners. In one condition, the learners were given modified input through negotiation and in the other condition students were exposed to intensive recasts. They found that the recasts had a stronger effect than the negotiation condition for the advanced learners but not for the less advanced learners. They concluded that positive learning effects of recasts may be contingent on learners being at a stage in their interlanguage development where they are able to process the recasts and the feedback provided in them. In yet another study on negotiated input, Pica (1996) looked at negotiation and how NSs provided negative feedback on students' unclear utterances. Specifically she noted how NSs signalled to the NNSs that their utterances were not comprehensible by either requesting clarification (e.g., what?) or by repeating or reformulating all or some of the

NNS's utterance into a more acceptable target-like form. Pica (1996) maintains that both the requests for clarifications and the reformulations offered the learners negative feedback on their unclear utterances and opportunities to modify their utterances to make them more target like. However, the reformulations in particular gave the learners opportunities to hear their original unclear utterance corrected and repeated back to them. As a result, learners could notice the difference between their interlanguage forms and the actual target-like forms and have an opportunity to modify their output accordingly. However, previous studies have shown that learners do not modify their output as much in response to reformulations and models as they do in response to requests for clarification (Pica, 1992). This suggests that modeling, recasts, and confirmation checks aside, simply the presence of negative evidence is no guarantee that learners will notice the feedback and be able to benefit from it.

Another field of inquiry that looks at negative evidence in interaction is the study of corrective feedback. Long (1996) points out that most studies done on corrective feedback have been classroom studies where negative evidence has been in the direct form of error correction and grammatical explanations (see Chaudron, 1988). These studies have typically found that students notice corrective feedback and that it has positive short-term effects on their interlanguage (Chaudron, 1988). In contrast, Chun et al.'s (1982) study on informal non-classroom conversations found that NSs rarely overtly

corrected NNSs' errors because doing so would take the focus off the main goal of communication and at the same time be face threatening to the NNS. Similarly, Crookes and Rulon (1988) found that NSs gave more corrective feedback and negotiated with NNSs more when they were engaged in a problem-solving task (that involved a lot of new vocabulary) than when they were engaged in free conversation. Studies on informal conversation and the lack of direct corrective feedback that characterizes it seems to support Long's (1996) assumption that free conversation is a poor stimulus for SLA.

However, this view is often contested because the presence or absence of negative evidence in any interaction is undoubtedly complex and may be more a reflection of the different features of the interaction such as one-way versus two-way exchange of information or a reflection of individuals factors, such as the difference in status between interlocutors, or as suggested in Crookes and Rulon's study, where new vocabulary was thought to be a factor in increasing negotiation and corrective feedback.

To review, negative input is thought to give learners important feedback on the status of their interlanguage. The presence of negative evidence in negotiations is found in the failure to understand, overt corrections, and often signalled by NSs' requests for confirmation and clarification. These particular moves in negotiation prompt students to notice the differences between their interlanguage and the target language and possibly modify their output accordingly. There is some question, however, as

to whether informal conversation provides learners with enough negative evidence to promote SLA, but this conclusion is premature considering all the different factors that may promote negotiation in informal conversation, such as a one-way versus two-way exchange of information or the introduction of new vocabulary.

### **Summary of Negotiation Literature**

The discussion in this section of the role that negotiation plays in SLA outlines the basic framework for the present paper. Given the evidence, one could reasonably argue that negotiation not only facilitates comprehensible input, learner modification of output, and focus on form, but also meets all of the input conditions thought to be essential in promoting focus on form; saliency, noticing, positive evidence, and negative evidence. Although there still remains a lot of work to do on establishing more evidence on the direct relationship between negotiation and SLA, what has been presented is a body of theoretical arguments and studies that state convincingly that negotiation not only promotes but maximizes the conditions for SLA by encouraging learners to actively engage in interaction that exposes them to comprehensible input, gives them opportunities to focus on form and "notice the gap" as well as modify their own interlanguage output, all of which have been deemed necessary for SLA (Pica, 1994). That negotiation promotes these conditions unaffected by any intervening factors may seem to have been overlooked in

this section because of the absence of any studies that examine the many factors that affect negotiation including task type, participant roles, and proficiency level to name a few. Factors such as these and others undoubtedly affect the extent to which negotiation is able to promote each of these conditions and findings indicating thus will be discussed later in this chapter. In view of this, it is perhaps safe to conclude this section by noting that studies have shown that negotiation promotes the conditions thought to be necessary for SLA, but that intervening factors may affect the extent to which these conditions are created in any given interaction.

### **Review of Communication Strategy Literature**

Selinker's (1972) reference to "strategies" used by learners in an attempt to overcome problems in communication spawned a lot of interest in describing how L2 learners make up for their interlanguage deficiencies. Commonly known as communication strategy (CS) research, this area of study originated out of the need to explain how second language learners, despite limitations in the L2, were able to extend their interlanguage to deal with problems in communication (see Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Faerch & Kasper, 1983, and Kasper & Kellerman, 1997 for a review). Since its beginning, a lot of early CS research focused on defining and identifying CSs, developing taxonomies, and classifying CSs within the taxonomies (Bialystok, 1984; Bialystok & Kellerman, 1987; Paribakht, 1985; Tarone, 1984; Yule & Tarone, 1990).

However, two different theoretical perspectives in CS research have yielded little agreement in terms of the definition of CS, how CS data should be interpreted, what devices should be considered CSs, and what types of elicitation methods are best for the study of CSs. The main difference in the two perspectives can be attributed to a focus on describing either the intra- or interindividual use of communication strategies.

The intraindividual, psycholinguistic view of CS asserts that CSs are employed by the individual language learner as a way for the learner to solve a "problem" in their interlanguage production (Bongaerts, Kellerman & Bentlage, 1987; Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Faerch & Kasper, 1980, 1983; Kellerman, 1991; Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997; Poulisse, 1987; Poulisse & Schils, 1989; Poulisse et al., 1984). An example of this is when a learner faced with a production difficulty, such as conveying a word that they do not know in the L2, attempts to convey the word using a communication strategy such as circumlocution or word coinage. Essentially, this perspective is not interested in interlocutor-effects, but sees CS as located in the individual language learner. The definition that best exemplifies this view is the following:

CS are mental plans implemented by the second language learner in response to an internal signal of an imminent problem, a form of self-help that does not have to engage the interlocutor's support for resolution. (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997, p. 2)

As noted in the definition, concepts central to this view are problematcity, self-help, and mental plans. Thus, the intraindividual, psycholinguistic perspective distinguishes CSs from devices that are used to solve problems only after a problem has occurred, or that involve eliciting the help of an interlocutor to solve difficulties. Specifically it excludes devices typically found in repair or negotiation (e.g., requests for clarification and appeals for help) because the focus is on how learners use CSs to overcome their own production problems, as opposed to describing how CSs are used by learners during interaction in an attempt to understand their interlocutor or how they are used by the interlocutor as an attempt to jointly resolve any problems. For this reason, elicitation methods used in studies that espouse this view often involve learners performing tasks in isolation without a listener/addressee present. This perspective is also jointly labeled psycholinguistic because proponents stress the idea that instances of CS use should be psychologically plausible and their use should be consistent with and be explained by models of speech production or speech processing (Bialystok, 1990, Poulisse, 1993). Thus, researchers who subscribe to this view are not interested in the linguistic form of the CSs that learners use, but in the underlying psychological processes in use when a learner achieves reference (Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Bongaerts, Kellerman, & Bentlage, 1987; Faerch & Kasper, 1980, 1983; Kellerman, 1991; Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997; Poulisse, 1987; Poulisse et al., 1984; Poulisse & Schils, 1989). This is also reflected in their

taxonomies, where CSs are categorized in terms of the psychological processes they reflect rather than by their surface linguistic forms.

In contrast, the interindividual perspective is the one that is compatible with the interactionist view of second language acquisition. Here, CS use is situated within interaction and used as a means to overcome problems in communication with another interlocutor (Rost & Ross, 1991; Tarone, 1980; Wagner & Firth, 1997; Yule & Tarone, 1991). Different from the intraindividual perspective where the focus is on identifying the mental processes underlying the use of CSs, in this view, surface linguistic form is most important and this is reflected in the labeling of CSs as well as how taxonomies are arranged. Moreover, in this approach, the presence of an interlocutor in experimental design is important because it is seen to significantly affect the learner's CS output. Because the interindividual view brings CS research and negotiation research closer together, it is the definition used in this research. This view defines CS as the following:

..tools used in a joint negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal. (Tarone, 1980, p. 420)

Thus, the above definition was important in CS research because it defined CSs in terms of their use in interaction and opened the door for the inclusion of devices from negotiation and repair research including requests for clarification and confirmation and appeals for help to name a few. It

essentially helped pave the way for CS research to be linked to other fields, including negotiation, repair, and foreigner talk research. This meant that findings related to these fields could contribute to our understanding of how CSs are used in interaction.

Recent research and a broadened definition of CSs has continued to widen the perspective from which CSs are analyzed. Specifically, some studies have looked at CSs from a sociolinguistic perspective that considers CS use within a socially situated interaction (Williams, Inscoc, & Tasker, 1997; Trosset, 1986; Rampton, 1995; Wagner & Firth, 1997; Aston, 1993). These studies look at CS use in a variety of social and institutional contexts and examine the socially defined variables that affect how CSs are used. Using an interactional approach to the analyze participants' use of CSs in a work environment, Wagner and Firth (1997) best describe the interactional approach they use as, "...the essence of the interactional approach - (the approach we are espousing here) - investigates how communication is accomplished as a situated, contingent, 'locally managed' achievement." and that, "an interactional perspective looks at CS primarily as elements in the ongoing and contingent meaning-creating process of communication." (p. 325).

It is this perspective of CS from an interactional perspective that allows CS to be analyzed within social interaction and to look at variables such as identity and how CS are used on a social level rather than just to solve

comprehension difficulties. For example, Williams, Inscoc, and Tasker (1997) look at the use of communication strategies between international teaching assistants that are not native speakers of English with their students who are native speakers of English. They found that social aspects of the interaction such as the roles of teaching assistant and student, the institutional setting, and the goal of the task at hand affected the use of communication strategies and the way problems were negotiated. In another study focusing on social context, Aston (1993) looked at interpersonal rapport and shared understanding between two interlocutors and found that strategy use was not only about knowledge, but also about solidarity and support especially in cross-cultural interaction. He also looked at the way in which language learner status, or lack of shared background can be a resource rather than a "problem", which interlocutors may utilize to their advantage. Trosset (1986) went a step further in describing the socio-cultural context and its effect on the way language learners use "strategic behavior". He looked at Welsh language learners who pretended to be native only to avoid certain undesirable behaviors from native speakers. Rampton (1997) commented that this use of strategic behavior on the part of the learners could not be accounted for by typical definitions of CS. Indeed, other strategic behavior such as resistance toward a dominant language, hostile silence, and the like were more in line with language learner identity that related to the socio-cultural context. He argued that the scope of CS could be expanded to include different types of

strategic behavior that are not related only to gaps in knowledge. He went on to discuss his own study (Rampton, 1995) and the strategic use of codeswitching to demonstrate solidarity and groupings among children in a UK neighborhood. He maintained that the L2 status played an important role in the use of these strategies and that the strategies were used as a part of social group rituals.

Lastly, Wagner and Firth (1997) looked at the socially and contextually contingent use of CS in a work situation and found that aspects of interaction generally labeled "problematic" needed to be reassessed from a perspective of communication as a locally managed achievement. They also looked at how "flagged" (hesitations, false-starts etc.) CSs actually cued the interlocutor of impending "trouble" in the upcoming talk, essentially signalling the listener to pay more attention and to use their inferencing skills as well as any other resources at hand. Another finding is that interlocutors could agree on or ignore linguistic items that are non-target-like because they were not immediately crucial to the communication at hand but they served to create a temporary bridge for shared meaning. These non-target-like items were generally not flagged in the conversation because they were not considered to be problematic as far as comprehension was concerned. It was only later, when they became relevant to the meaning that there may have been a need for their negotiation.

Thus, these studies went beyond the level of reference to look at strategies and negotiation from a standpoint of social interaction. Especially salient in the discussion in this section is the constant assertion that CSs, as they are currently defined in the literature, cannot account for a lot of the strategic behavior noted above and that their use with respect to social issues has yet to find a stable place in CS research. Another concern in these studies is how the traditional definition of CS use relates to "problematicity" and that CS use does not always flag "problems" per se, but can be used to index identity, create a "working code" or a "blind spot", or alert interlocutors to gather their resources for upcoming difficulties.

To summarize, the difference in the two main views of CS can be attributed to a focus on describing either the intra- or inter-individual use of CS. Intra-individual views assert that CS use is located in the individual language learner and used as a way for the learner to solve a "problem" in their interlanguage. The inter-individual view is consistent with Tarone's (1980) interactional definition of CS, "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors..." (p. 420) and is the perspective that the present study espouses. Differences are also reflective of a focus on describing the underlying psychological processes versus a focus on the linguistic form as a clue to the underlying processes. The most recent sociolinguistic perspective is distinct from the other two views in that it seeks to go a step further and explain negotiation and CS use from the standpoint of social interaction.

### CS and its Role in SLA

Like negotiation researchers, communication strategy researchers have also hypothesized about the role CS play in SLA and have found different perspectives that support a positive relationship between the two. The most obvious relationship between CS and language learning is exactly what negotiation researchers claim, that learners' use of interactional (negotiation) CSs, such as clarification and confirmation requests, elicit comprehensible input. Thus, if a student is able to request confirmation or clarification of a lexical item or of a particular sentence structure she does not know, and it is provided to her by the interlocutor, it has become "comprehensible input", which Krashen (1980) maintains is one of the necessary prerequisites for language acquisition. There is a chance the item may be incorporated into the learners' interlanguage system, however, one is reminded that input does not always mean intake, and that the connection between interactional CS and intake has only been observed in a few negotiation studies thus far (see Pica, 1994 for a review).

Another suggested connection between CS and language learning is that those CSs which are primarily focused on how words are formed, such as through use of prefixes and suffixes, are related to how learners actually analyze their L2 lexical content in their interlanguage (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). This suggests that by using CS related to word formation, learners might actually be facilitating their L2 lexical acquisition through an analyzed use of

lexical content.

From the intra-individual, psycholinguistic view, both CS and negotiation can be placed in Bialystok's model of language proficiency. Although not the view of CS espoused by the present study, this model may be applied to negotiation as well, to show how both CS and negotiation are similar to each other even in terms of mental processing. There are two cognitive components in this model that describe processes that act upon mental representations, analysis of knowledge, and control of processing (Bialystok, 1990). As Kellerman and Bialystok (1997) state below:

The processing components are responsible for advances in language proficiency because they lead to changes in the mental representations constituting knowledge of domain. (p. 32)

The analysis of knowledge component is about analyzing knowledge until it becomes more structured and organized so that it may be accessible in even non-routine contexts (Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997). The control of processing component indicates that in any activity, one's ability to control what one pays attention to determines how much can be processed. Gradually one is able to pay attention to several aspects at once, having developed a high control of processing. Both of these processes can describe mental representations behind CS and negotiation. Certain strategies can be mapped onto each of these components. CS involves the examination and manipulation of the concept of the referent (analysis of knowledge) and the

extent to which one can be successful in this is determined by the amount of knowledge that is organized and therefore accessible. To illustrate, CS also involves the manipulation of the form of expression. One example is 'code switching', in which the form of expression has been manipulated by using a different language. Both the analysis and control components interact for processing to occur, however the use of CSs occurs because the processes in one area, either control or analysis, are more limited than the other, therefore CS use is characterized by the reliance on one component over the other. This model can also be applied to negotiation. By giving a learner feedback and comprehensible input and drawing their attention to form, negotiation helps facilitate the development of these two processes, control of processing and analysis of form. Thus both CS and negotiation are psychologically plausible and can be mapped onto a model that explains the mental processes involved in language learning and language use.

Thus, the different perspectives of CS offer different views with regard to CS use and its relationship to language learning and language use. The proponents of intra-individual, psycholinguistic view of CS subscribe to the theory that competence creates performance. They do not believe that CS should be taught in the classroom, because they believe that learners already have the underlying cognitive processes (competence) to use strategies from their L1 and therefore there is no need to teach it to them for use in the L2 (Bialystok, 1990; Kellerman, 1991). What learners need instead is to be given

linguistic data from the L2 so that they may be able to use that underlying competence to produce speech in the L2.

Proponents of inter-individual, interactional view subscribe to the same theory as negotiation researchers, that performance yields competence and this means that teaching CSs in the classroom may be useful for learners (Rost & Ross, 1991; Tarone, 1984; Tarone & Yule, 1989). They maintain that through practice and tasks done in the classroom, students can learn to use strategies and that this might increase language proficiency. However, findings on the relationship between teaching CS in the classroom and increased language proficiency are still inconclusive.

Perhaps the strongest argument for the relationship between CS and SLA is the one that correlates with arguments made by negotiation researchers, that learners' use of CSs such as clarification and confirmation requests, elicits comprehensible input - - a necessary component for SLA. To extend the argument to the NSs' use of CS, if a NS requests clarification of a student's unclear utterance, this may encourage the student to modify their output, also considered to be a necessary condition for SLA.

### **Review of Findings in Negotiation and CS Literature**

In this section, a review of the findings of negotiation and CS studies relevant to this study will be discussed. Over the years, a lot of research has focused on determining variables likely to affect negotiation and CS use. The

studies reviewed here generally use data obtained from a variety of experimental tasks ranging anywhere from information-gap to picture-reconstruction to interviews to communicative tasks and therefore the findings tend to reveal more quantitative than qualitative aspects of negotiation and CS use and more linguistic than social aspects. This section is broken down into a discussion of the different variables relevant to the present study including, learner proficiency, task and task related factors, topic, face, and factors related to the classroom and non-classroom setting such as participant roles, goals, and expectations.

### **Learner Proficiency**

While not entirely conclusive, a few negotiation studies have revealed that there is some effect for learners' L2 proficiency level, especially in NS-NNS negotiation. Pica (1988) found that in interactions between NSs and learners of low L2 proficiency, learners made fewer modifications in their output partly due to the fact that NSs were reluctant to ask lower level learners for clarification because of the learners' low proficiency level. Instead, she found that NSs were more likely to model the correct utterance for the learner in the form of a confirmation check (e.g., "Do you mean xxx?"). Also, in interactions with low proficiency learners, NSs tended to dominate and control the discourse topic, which in turn gave them an edge over successfully guessing what the learner was trying to say without having to engage in

negotiation. In contrast, a study about learner-learner negotiation revealed no significant evidence on whether or not learner proficiency level affected the use of conversational adjustments such as clarification requests (Porter, 1983). Although, as Porter (1983) pointed out, this may have been because the proficiency level between the two groups was not significant enough. In a more general account of negotiation between NSs and low level proficiency learners, Shortreed (1993) describes the exchanges as riddled with lengthy communication breakdowns resulting in a lot of code-switching or eventual abandonment of the topic. Considering this, it comes as no surprise that NSs were found to make more adjustments to their speech when talking with lower-level NNSs than when talking to advanced NNSs (Shortreed, 1993).

While the above studies focused on how NSs adjusted their speech in negotiations with learners of different proficiency, other studies have looked at NNSs modification of their utterances within negotiation and how this is affected by their proficiency level. Pica (1987) and Holliday (1988) in particular, found that compared to low proficiency learners, advanced learners were more likely to modify their output when they perceived a lack of clarity in their production, perhaps because they had the linguistic resources to do so, while beginning learners were less likely to modify their output due to a lack of interlanguage resources. Thus, while not being able to draw strong conclusions about the relationship between language proficiency and negotiation, it is suggested that NSs tend to adjust their speech more in

response to lower-level NNSs, and that negotiation is perhaps longer, more frequent, and less successful between NSs and lower-level NNSs. Moreover, advanced NNSs are more likely to modify their utterances in response to NS signals, primarily because they have the linguistic means to do so.

Like negotiation studies, CS studies have generally found that the effect of learner proficiency on strategy selection is tentative. In the Nijmegen Project (see Bialystok, 1990), learners of varying proficiencies were compared on the same task, but proficiency was not found to be a major factor in their selection of CSs. On the other hand, Bialystok (1983) looked at three levels of French learners and found that while there was no significant difference in their quantitative use of CS, the advanced group tended to use fewer L1 based strategies such as language-switch (code-switching) and foreignization (applying the L2 morphology or phonology to create a (usually) non-existent word in the L2, eg., *doggu* for "dog" - using Japanese phonology). She concluded that rather than being a determining variable, learner proficiency should only be considered an intervening variable in CS use. Similarly, Paribakht (1985), in a study that involved native speakers of Persian as well as advanced and intermediate learners of English, found that compared to the intermediate learners, NSs and advanced learners tended to use more of a linguistic approach to CS perhaps because they had more linguistic resources available to them to be able to do so. However, overall, proficiency was not found to be a major factor in CS use in their study. Similarly, other studies

showed that task factors overrode proficiency effects. For example, Poulisse and Schils (1989) found that task-related factors played a larger role in strategy choice than learners' proficiency. Similarly, in their study, Rost and Ross (1991) first hypothesized that learners' proficiency level would affect the type of clarification questions that participants used but this was only partially supported by their findings. Instead, they found that task had an overriding effect.

To summarize, some support has been found for the effect of learner proficiency in both negotiation and CS use. For negotiation, the effect seems to be manifested in terms of how the interlocutor responds to learners' unclear utterances, and in terms of whether or not learners have the linguistic resources to modify their utterances in response to feedback from the interlocutor. Also, when learner proficiency is low, NSs may resort to taking over the flow of the conversation so as to avoid difficult comprehension problems. For CS use, the effect of learner proficiency is only somewhat evident in the type of CS selected. Advanced learners, who have a better command of the L2 may tend to use more L2-based strategies such as circumlocution, and lower proficiency learners may tend to use more L1-based strategies such as codeswitching. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that for CS use task effects may override proficiency effects.

### Task and Task-related Features

Task type is probably the most investigated factor in negotiation and CS studies. It has been shown to have an effect on the quantity and quality of negotiation and CS use. Researchers have also found that sometimes it is not simply the task type, but the different task related factors that affect negotiation. Task related factors that have been found in some way to affect negotiation are; participation structure (i.e., whether participation is equal or asymmetric), participation patterns (i.e., teacher-fronted or small group work), one way versus two way exchange of information, required versus optional exchange of information, signal type (i.e., open versus closed signals), topic or content type, and the amount of production required to complete a task. For CS research, those task related factors thought to affect CS use are; task demands, context, time constraints, the presence or absence of an interlocutor, and universal principles of communication. Thus, this section will look at both task type and task related features that have been shown to affect negotiation and CS use.

In Pica's (1987) study of a decision-making discussion versus an information-exchange task, the information-exchange task produced almost four times as many conversational modifications (confirmation or clarification requests etc.) within negotiations. She found that the reason for this was that in the decision-making task, the stronger and more proficient students controlled the conversation so the participant structure was such that

other weaker students did not get to talk much and less negotiation occurred as a result. However, in the information-exchange task, because each participant was on an equal level and had an equal amount of knowledge they were required to share in order to complete the task, more confirmation checks were made because participation structure was more symmetric. Crookes and Rulon (1988) also found that tasks requiring collaborative problem solving produced four or five times more negotiations than free conversation with the same pairs. This was possibly due to the fact that difficult topics may often be avoided in free conversation but in a task that requires participants to solve a problem, they must negotiate in order to successfully complete the task. Pica et al. (1989) also looked at task and its effect on learner modification of output in negotiation and found that among three different tasks: (a) information-gap, (b) jigsaw, and (c) discussion, there was no significant effect for task on learners' modification of output. However, general outcomes revealed that the information-gap task was most consistent across dyads in presenting opportunities for NSs to request clarification and NNSs to modify their output. They noted other unexpected results as well. When they looked at the modifications that did occur in each task, they found that students made significantly more morphosyntactic modifications of their output in the discussion task than any of the other tasks. These are the types of modifications that Swain (1985) argues is most important for SLA. They also found that gender was a variable that affected the amount of clarification

requests NSs made of NNSs. Specifically female NSs made fewer requests for clarification of female NNSs and more for male NNSs. Perhaps the most important finding, however, was that learner modification of output was affected most by the way the NS responded to the NNS's unclear utterances. If the NS expanded, repeated, or provided a corrected model of the NNS's utterance, the NNS was more likely to provide confirmation instead of modifying their own output to incorporate the NS's feedback. On the other hand, if the NS signalled their lack of understanding without providing an expansion, repetition, or model of the correct language (e.g., used a clarification request), the NNS was obliged to modify their original utterance to make it more comprehensible to the NS. Pica et al. (1989) came to the conclusion that the type of signal the NS used to indicate comprehension problems affected the quality (i.e., more morphosyntactic modifications) and quantity of learners' modifications more than the task type. Thus, for Pica et al.'s (1989) study, it was not a single variable such as task type that affected modification of output, but a variety of inter- and intra-personal variables.

There have also been a few studies comparing participation patterns involving teacher-fronted and small group work and the effect of task on learner production. Participation patterns invariably affect participation structure, depending on the nature of the activity. For example, Rulon and McCreary (1986) found that students produced more clarification and confirmation checks during small group work than they produced during

teacher-fronted interaction. They suggested that this was because the teacher controlled the interaction and gave students little opportunity to speak and the students who did not understand did not want to admit it and embarrass themselves by asking the teacher for clarification or confirmation. Thus, participant structure, in terms of who has the right to control the floor and initiate exchanges etc. seems to be another factor affecting negotiation in the classroom. Essentially, one expert to many novices may limit the participation rights of students in number and scope in a lot of classroom interactions thereby reducing chances for negotiation. The fact that participation patterns and structure affect negotiation was confirmed by Doughty and Pica's (1984 as cited in Young & Doughty, 1985) study of conversational modification in teacher-to-class, NNS-NNS pairs, and NNS group interaction. They found that there were significantly more modifications in NNS pairs and NNS groups than in teacher-fronted interaction, although the crucial factor seemed to be whether the task at hand involved a shared information exchange or not. In another study on teacher-fronted and small-group participation patterns, Pica and Doughty's (1985) study looked at input and interactional features of teacher-fronted and group versions of the same type of communicative activity and found that there was more grammatical input available in the teacher-fronted activity than in the group work. There were also more other- and self-repetitions used in the teacher-fronted activity, which Pica and Doughty (1985) suggested was more of a reflection of the

teacher's role in maintaining the classroom activity. However, they also found that while few in number in both activities, there were more clarification requests in the group work. They concluded that there were more chances for students to use the L2 in the group work because the participation structure allowed for more equal interaction and for this reason it may have had a positive effect on the students' language acquisition.

Pica and Doughty (1985) also reflected on the task type they used, a decision making task where the participants were not required to exchange information, and suggested that it was a major factor in the overall low number of conversational modifications they observed in both tasks. For future research, they suggested that in contrast to tasks that do not require an exchange of information, tasks that require participants to exchange information on an equal basis may be most effective in facilitating negotiation work. Thus, in a follow-up study, Pica and Doughty (1988) looked at conversational interaction, but this time as a function of classroom participation pattern (group work vs. teacher-fronted activities) and task type (required two-way exchange versus an optional exchange of information from their 1985 study). They hypothesized that the required two-way information exchange in this study would generate more conversational modifications (e.g., requests for clarification, confirmation, repetitions) than the optional exchange task from their 1985 study. This was supported only for the group activity. Comparing the results of the teacher-fronted optional exchange task

from the previous study (Pica & Doughty, 1985) with the two-way informational exchange task in this study, they found only a minimal 4% increase in conversational modifications for the two-way task. They pointed out that even though there was a large increase in the amount of talk in the teacher-fronted activity, the increase consisted mostly of unmodified interaction. However, for the comparison of the optional exchange group task versus the required two-way exchange group task, they found a significant increase of 26% in the amount of conversational modifications in the required two-way group task. This increase demonstrated that the required information exchange group task provided the best conditions for negotiation work in terms of not only the amount of negotiation that occurred, but also for the amount of modifications that occurred within negotiations. This was perhaps because the participation structure was such that not one person could control the interaction, but that each participant was required to participate equally. In contrast, they found that the optional exchange group work activity had the least amount of total production and the smallest proportion of modified utterances. This finding indicated when left on their own to do an optional exchange task students in the group situation did the worst. They concluded that task and participation pattern were both *critical factors in determining the quality of interaction in terms of conversational modification in the classroom*. However, in a similar study looking at dyads and small group negotiation in a required versus optional exchange task, Foster (1998) found

that there was no overall effect for task type or for groupings. Three areas were addressed in this study, language production, comprehensible input, and modified output and how these three were affected by task and groupings. Their results showed that for either task the dyad grouping produced more speech per student. Foster (1998) suggested that this was because in the small group setting the participation structure was such that a few students tended to dominate the interaction while other members remained silent, however, in the dyad grouping it was difficult for students not to participate more actively. For comprehensible input, her results indicated that the required information exchange task for the dyad grouping produced more negotiating moves (e.g., clarification requests etc.), although she noted that sometimes one partner took on most of the responsibility for negotiating and that this made the exchanges quite uneven in terms of negotiating moves. With regard to the small group settings, Foster (1998) found that once again, a few students dominated the interaction and produced the most negotiating moves and that other students seemed to be content with getting comprehensible input indirectly through their more active peers. Also, she noted that students in one small group produced more speech and had more negotiating moves than any of the other small groups presumably because they were interested in the topic and put a lot of effort into debating it. Even though this observation was made in passing, it is interesting in that few negotiation studies have ever cited students' interest in a topic as a factor in increasing the amount of talk or

negotiation even though it is entirely likely that such interest serves an important role in motivating students to talk as well as motivating them to try to get their meaning across despite limitations in their interlanguage. As for the third area, modified output, the results indicated very little learner modification of output overall, with the dyad groups producing more than the small groups. This was surprising because the dyad groups were found to produce more negotiating moves and it was expected that these would result in more modification, however, many of the moves did not result in learner modification of output. In fact, Foster (1998) notes that a lot of negotiation moves remained unnoticed, or received an unmodified response in the form of a "yes" or a "no". Foster (1998) suggested that this was because the casual classroom environment did not push students to fulfil the task or pay attention to the form of their interlanguage. Thus overall, the outcomes revealed that the dyad setting with the required exchange task fared best in terms of amount of language produced, negotiation, and modified output. However, Foster (1998) argues that the lack of participation by most students doing group work, the general disinclination to negotiate even when utterances were unclear and the relaxed atmosphere of working in a group did much to discourage negotiation and modification of output. She concluded that unlike Pica et al.'s (1989) findings, negotiation and modified output were not "alive and well" in the typical classroom and that tasks have to be more strictly designed and conducted in more formal experimental settings used in

order to ensure that students are required to participate on an equal level as well as to negotiate when utterances are unclear.

Another task related factor that has been examined in negotiation are one-way versus two-way tasks. Two-way tasks are those in which both participants share information they have. In contrast, one-way tasks are those in which one person holds the information and information flow is unidirectional. In general, several studies have noted that significantly more negotiation work occurs in two-way than in one-way tasks ( Doughty & Pica, 1986; Long, 1980, 1989, 1990). For example, in a study on two-way tasks, Crookes and Rulon (1988) found that there was a tendency for learners to incorporate more feedback than in one-way tasks. Duff (1986) looked at learners' production in a decision-making versus opinion-exchange task and while these are not strictly one-way versus two-way tasks, he found that the decision-making task provided learners with more opportunities to engage in negotiation because it generated more questions and more turns per learner. While most studies have shown two-way tasks to promote more negotiation, a study by Gass and Varonis (1985) found exactly the opposite, that a one-way task facilitated more negotiation work than a two-way task. However, they discovered the reason their results turned out so unexpectedly. The two-way task involved having participants first listen to one of two different tapes of a detective interviewing suspects in a robbery and then exchange the information and finally determine which suspect committed the crime.

Therefore, Gass and Varonis (1985) attributed the small amount of negotiation work to the fact that the participants in the two-way task had more shared assumptions than the participants in the one-way task (a picture reconstruction task) and therefore less negotiation was needed to complete the task. Although, it is not clear from Gass and Varonis' (1985) article what "assumptions" the participants in the two-way task shared. Thus, there is evidence to indicate that there is variation even among studies that looked at the same types of tasks. Possibly in response to this, Pica et al. (1993) tried to identify those conditions that need to be met in an activity or task to facilitate negotiation. They (Pica et al., 1993) argued that there are four task features that promote the best conditions for negotiation in the classroom. First, if a task is to promote negotiation, participants should be required to participate actively by requesting and giving information. Second, each participant must hold part of the information that must be exchanged in order to meet the goal of the task (a two-way required information exchange task). This ensures that both participants must participate equally in order to finish the task. The third requirement is that participants must have the same goal. Participants need to carry out the task with an idea of what they need to accomplish by it so that the task is not too difficult or confusing. The last requirement is that only one acceptable outcome is possible. Given these requirements, Pica et al. (1993) maintain that if all four are present within any given task, the possibilities are

maximized that negotiation work will increase in quality (i.e., more modified output) and quantity.

The last two factors to be mentioned here, the level of production required to finish a task and topic or content type have not been looked at extensively but studies that have looked at these factors suggest they may have an affect on negotiation and CS use. Only one study has really looked at the amount of production needed to complete a task (Shortreed, 1993). This seems like a simple but important observation, namely that the more a student is required to produce to finish a task, the more likely negotiation will occur. Shortreed (1993) looked at two tasks, a drawing task and a recognition task. He found that the drawing task required students to produce more speech to finish the task and he determined that this was part of the reason there was *more negotiation, more repair strategies and more restructuring moves made* in this task as compared to the recognition task. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that the more speech students have to produce in order to finish a task the more likely they are to encounter gaps in their interlanguage that they would have to negotiate in order to successfully complete the task.

Topic familiarity or lack thereof is another factor that may affect negotiation and communication strategy use in terms of content knowledge and affective relationship to a particular topic. Only a few studies have specifically looked at familiarity and its effect on negotiation. Specifically, Pica (1992a) notes that negotiation becomes limited when the topics used in a task

are so familiar to participants that they do not have to negotiate many communication breakdowns. Similarly, Plough and Gass (1993) and Gass and Varonis (1984) found that when participants engaged in unfamiliar tasks, they produced more negotiation work. It is likely then, that with unfamiliar topics and tasks participants have to negotiate more because they have gaps in their background knowledge and these must be solved in order to complete the task successfully. However, another aspect of topic familiarity seems relevant to negotiation and CS use. Specifically, whether or not students have had exposure to and practice in the target language of a topic area and if this has an effect on their interlanguage performance (Zuengler, 1993). In other words, when students don't have the lexical or grammatical knowledge required to talk about a particular topic, they may find themselves having to compensate for this lack of knowledge through the use of negotiation and CSs. However, research also suggests that when a NNS is considered the relative "knower" on a particular topic, they produce more speech than their NS interlocutor (Selinker & Douglas, 1985; Woken & Swales, 1989; Zuengler & Bent, 1991). Some studies have also suggested that when the NNS takes on the role of knower in the conversation, this affects their strategy usage. For instance, Selinker and Douglas (1985) found that when the NNS was the knower in the conversation, they made more of an attempt to compensate for difficulties because it seemed more important to show that they were the knower. Yet when they were not the knower they easily abandoned attempts to

compensate for difficulties because they did not feel that they had to be responsible for conveying the information. In addition, Cornu and Delahaye (1987) found that when NNS subjects talked about topics in their major field of study versus non-major field topics, they used fewer nonverbal strategies. Affective relationship to a particular topic has also been found to have an effect on students' interlanguage performance. Eisenstein and Starbuck (1989) found that students' produced more speech, but were less accurate when talking about a topic they considered interesting versus one that they considered uninteresting. The researchers suggest that the difference may be due to monitoring or cognitive load. When subjects talked about a topic they were interested in, they talked more and may have monitored less. Or, the topics the students were interested in may have required a greater cognitive load, causing students to be less accurate. The verdict is still out as to which of these may have affected the subjects' interlanguage production more. In sum, if a student is the knower in a conversation, their main struggle is to express what they know, requiring them to produce comprehensible speech. On the other hand, when the NS is the knower the student's task is to figure out what the NS means. When the student is the knower, their role is to speak and explain and this puts heavy demands on their linguistic resources. The NS's primary role then, becomes one in which they try to decipher what the student is trying to say, but even guessing may be difficult because they may not know the topic well enough to make an educated guess. Additionally, if a

student is interested in and motivated to talk about the topic, they are perhaps more likely to attempt to overcome difficulties using communication strategies rather than abandon the topic when things get difficult.

As for task effect specific to CS research, findings vary so significantly from study to study that conclusions are tentative at best. In fact, the range of claims with regard to task type and task related factors and their effect on CS use runs the gamut from no effect for task at all to entirely task dependent. On the "no effect" end, Bialystok and Frohlich (1980) did a comparison of three elicitation methods: (a) written picture description, (b) oral picture description, and (c) oral picture description with the intent of describing the picture so someone could reconstruct it. The three elicitation methods involved no interaction. They found that the students used roughly the same set of strategies regardless of elicitation method. On the other end of the spectrum, Poulisse and Schils' (1989) study, that involved a comparison of learners of differing proficiency levels on three different tasks: (a) picture description (no interaction), (b) story-retell, and (c) interview, found that task-related factors were the more important predictors of strategy use, even overriding proficiency effects. The task-related factors included; task demands, context, time constraints, and the presence or absence of an interlocutor. For example, they found that if task demands were high as in the picture description task, learners had to work hard to solve all of the lexical problems and used a lot of CSs, but if demands were low (as in the interview), they could leave some

problems unsolved as long as they completed the task as a whole. They found that context also played a role in the nature of the CSs used. In the picture reconstruction task, where participants had to describe the relative position of objects in a picture to an interlocutor who would reconstruct the picture, there was little contextual information to rely on, whereas in the interview and story-retell tasks, participants were able to somewhat rely on the context to provide information. Time constraints were also found to play a role in the use of CS in terms of determining the number of CSs students chose as well as how long they chose to spend on explaining or describing something. For example, for the interview task, Poullisse and Schils (1989) found that students may have felt constrained by conversational rules and chose not to go into lengthy, difficult CS work. Finally, the presence or absence of an interlocutor was also found to have an effect on CS use. Namely, obtaining feedback from an interlocutor let the students know if their strategies were working, therefore, they didn't have to overcompensate with CSs in the interview task as they did in the picture description task, where there was no interlocutor present. In another study Rost and Ross (1991) looked at listening strategies and learner proficiency as well as task, and their findings partially supported an effect for task and proficiency level on learners' use of CS. They maintained that certain task requirements may make the use of some CSs inevitable, such as when a particular task requires listeners to provide feedback, it is likely that listeners make more requests for clarification. Rost and Ross (1991) also noted

that there are certain features of tasks that might affect strategy selection. Specifically, they found that use of strategies depended somewhat on cognitive considerations such as the amount of information to be understood, as well as what strategies learners perceived to be appropriate and acceptable to task and interlocutor. Given all the results, Rost and Ross (1991) concluded that strategy use is affected by a combination of proficiency and contextual factors.

The strong version of task effect espouses the view that task is one of the most important factors in CS use. In a review of the Nijmegen studies' data, Poulisse (1997) concluded that there is evidence of significant effects of task on certain types of strategy use. Poulisse (1997) focused only on compensatory strategies, strategies where learners try to expand their interlanguage in order to compensate for their inadequate command of the target language. She argues that in the controlled tasks with no interlocutor present, such as real-world object and novel-abstract shape description tasks, students tended to use lengthy analytic strategies because there was no feedback on the clarity of the students' utterances and they went to great lengths to overcome their lexical difficulties. On the other hand, in more naturalistic tasks with an interlocutor present, the students used shorter and less detailed analytic strategies as well as transfer-based strategies (e.g., language-switch). Further analysis revealed that when task demands were high as in the detailed picture description, the subjects used lengthy reconceptualization strategies. However, in the story-retell and interview

tasks, the subjects opted for more low effort strategies due to time constraints and cognitive complexity. In the interview task, subjects used less transfer strategies due to the presence of an interlocutor who did not speak their L1. It is also suggested that in CS studies requiring students to describe an object to an interlocutor, that depending on the nature of the object, abstract or concrete, different CSs are required. For example, in an elicitation involving descriptions of real-world objects, abstract objects, and story telling, learners used extensive analytic strategies (circumlocution etc.) for the abstract objects. For the real-world objects they tended to use more holistic strategies ('this looks like a...'), while using shorter strategies of the analytic, holistic, and transfer type for the story-telling task (Poullisse, 1990). The difference between describing abstract shapes versus real-world objects has also been noted in Faerch and Kasper (1986), who wrote the following:

Problems having to do with how to refer to concrete, physical entities like 'zebra-crossings', 'a pair of scissors' or 'a rabbit' can be solved by means of achievement strategies like paraphrase (description, exemplification) and use of gestures. Such strategies seem to be fairly easy for most learners to utilize... Learners are faced with higher demands when trying to convey abstract concepts like 'nationalism', 'sacrilege' and 'hospitality'. In these cases, a different repertoire of strategies is needed. First of all, there are strategies that cannot be used (description of size, colour, shape, gesture, sound-imitation). (p. 185)

Faerch and Kasper (1986) also suggest that like abstract entities, talking about cultural entities proves difficult for second language learners to deal with and is likely to require the use of communication strategies to convey the

precise cultural denotations and connotations. Accordingly, incomplete understanding between participants about cultural objects or practices seems to promote negotiation.

There are a few studies whose viewpoints on task effects and CS use seem to be different from the above studies. For example, in a study about the interactions of NNS teaching assistants and their NS students, Williams, Inscoc, and Tasker (1997) looked at how the interlocutors used CS and negotiation to come to a mutual comprehension in a lab-setting. They concluded that the nature of the task, to complete an experiment, affected the types of CSs and negotiation used by the students and the teaching assistant. The students overwhelmingly opted for confirmation checks that were used to gradually isolate the problem in a negotiation with the assistant. The authors note that the success of the interactions was due to the focus on mutual comprehension and the use of conservative strategies to break down the task into smaller, easier to manage chunks. Thus, participants seemed to use those strategies that made reaching the goal of mutual comprehension easier and faster. Poulisse's (1997) argument supports this, namely that strategy choice within and across different tasks may have more to do with general principles of communication such as Principle of Clarity (be clear and informative) and Principle of Economy (be brief and economical) than the task itself (Grice, 1975). She maintains that participants in a conversation will choose a strategy based on whether the strategy will be effective and require

the least amount of effort in achieving the desired results. She argues that the Principles of Economy and Clarity explain why Poulisse's (1997) subjects went to great lengths to overcome their lexical difficulties because no interlocutor was present to give them feedback on the effectiveness of their strategies. As such, they did not know how much explanation would be effective. On the other hand, in the task with the interlocutor present, the interlocutor gave students feedback on the effectiveness of their description and students used shorter, less detailed analytic strategies because they required the least amount of effort given the desired result. Thus, task features such as the presence or absence of an interlocutor or tasks requiring students to modify their output etc. affect strategy use in terms of what strategy requires the minimum amount of effort to achieve the sought after results.

This section on task and task related factors and the role they play in negotiation and CS choice is difficult to summarize because the lack of similarity in task design, implementation, participant factors, as well as other variables that may have affected experimental outcomes. Nevertheless, it is possible to point out some basic observations of the relationship between task-type, task factors and their effect on negotiation. First, tasks involving a two-way exchange of information where the participants are required to share that information in order to achieve a specific goal may present more opportunities for participants to engage in negotiation. However, a number of intervening variables may affect the amount and quality (e.g., more or less

learner output modification) of negotiation. Perhaps the most important variable to consider is the type of signal the NS uses (i.e., request for clarification vs. corrected model of utterance) to let the NNS know that a nonunderstanding has occurred. Requests for clarification encourage students to modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible to their interlocutors, while a corrected model of a NNS's unclear utterance is likely to result in a simple yes or no response from the NNS (Pica et al., 1989). Another factor most likely to affect opportunities for negotiation is the participation pattern, whether the task is teacher-fronted, small groups, or dyads. Such groupings have different participation structures as in the teacher-fronted task, where the teacher controls the interaction or in the small groups where the more proficient students may participate more in the interaction. To illustrate, teacher-fronted tasks in general seem to provide students with less opportunity to speak and engage in negotiation work because the interaction is asymmetrical as teachers tend to dominate and control the activity. Moreover, in both teacher-fronted and small group tasks, oftentimes only the most proficient students tend to participate and other students may be too embarrassed to admit they don't understand something. Small group work findings also indicated that less active students remained silent while the more active, proficient students did all the work. Thus, dyads seemed to be most effective in facilitating negotiation work, but only if the task required a two-way information exchange task and the students were interested in the

topic and the context was more formal in terms of motivating the students to complete the task and focus on the form of their language (Foster, 1998). It has been suggested in this section that when students are unfamiliar with topics in the L2 negotiation and the use of communication strategies may increase as a result. On the other hand, if students are familiar with a topic and considered the knower they may also be more likely to talk more and more motivated to get their message across, therefore more likely to engage in negotiation and use CSs. Another task related factor that was not examined as much in the negotiation literature, but that researchers believe may affect negotiation is the amount of production a task requires to complete. Specifically, tasks that require students to produce more output are more likely to result in more negotiation.

As for task and CS use, findings also vary considerably. While Bialystok and Frohlich (1980) found virtually no effect for task, Poulisse and Schils' (1989) study found that task-related factors such as task demands, context, time constraints, and the presence or absence of an interlocutor, were the most important predictors of strategy use, even overriding proficiency effects. This was supported by Poulisse's (1997) review of the Nijmegen studies' data that showed task-related factors such as the presence or absence of an interlocutor, or the description of abstract versus concrete objects influenced subjects' choice of CS. Rost and Ross's (1991) study also revealed that CS use depended somewhat on the amount of information to be understood, as well as what

strategies learners perceived to be appropriate and acceptable to the task and interlocutor. However, from a standpoint of general principles of communication, Poulisse (1997) argued that strategy choice is based on the Principles of Clarity and Economy, essentially that participants choose strategies that are effective and require the least amount of effort in achieving the results they want to achieve. In sum, perhaps what can be said about task and its role in negotiation and CS use is that outcomes are not so much reflective of task as a single deciding factor, but a combination of task-related and interpersonal factors.

□

### **Concerns for Face**

Typically, negotiation researchers have not been concerned with “face” as a factor in negotiation. However, some negotiation studies have made cursory comments about face and its possible effect on negotiation and CS use but have not specifically labeled it as such. This is perhaps because a lot of negotiation data is gathered in a classroom setting rather than in a non-classroom setting where face might play more of a role. Because this study includes non-classroom negotiation, specifically NS-NNS negotiation in the study abroad host family setting, face may play a more important role than it does in the classroom setting. For the present study Brown and Levinson’s (1978) notion of face will be used. They define face as a “person’s public self image that one wants to claim for oneself” (Brown and Levinson, 1978, p. 61).

It is categorized into a binary paradigm consisting of positive face and negative face. Positive face is the desire to have the approval of others or be ratified by others, while negative face is the desire to remain autonomous and not have others impede or infringe on one's rights. Brown and Levinson (1978) assert that important speech acts such as requests, offers, orders, and compliments to name a few, are inherently tied to face. Repair in particular is also a type of exchange where face is found to play a role. As such it is perhaps necessary to also look at studies on repair, where face is routinely touted as a important factor. Accordingly, this section will discuss the notion of face in repair studies and how it relates to the present study. Then, because the present study is concerned with comparing classroom and non-classroom (host family) negotiation, the findings on face in repair studies, negotiation studies and CS studies will be divided into those that look at face in the classroom setting versus the non-classroom setting.

Repair studies come from the work of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) who use a conversation analysis (CA) approach to data. Although this study does not use a CA approach, findings are relevant because like negotiation research, repair research looks at how interlocutors are able to overcome communication problems. Moreover, the devices used in repair such as clarification requests, confirmation requests, comprehension checks etc., are the same devices that are labeled to identify moves in negotiation. Unlike negotiation however, repair is analyzed from a conversation analysis

perspective which maintains that interaction is structurally organized and that contributions to the interaction is shaped by a prior context, usually the utterance made just prior to the contribution. This is why repair studies refer to repair in terms of who initiated the repair and who completed the repair (e.g., *self-initiated, self-completed repair*). Accordingly, one of the major findings of repair is that in NS-NS interaction, self-initiated self-repair is preferred over other-initiated other-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). This has also been noted in NS-NNS interactions (Day, Chenoweth, Chun, & Leppescu, 1984). Where face comes in is through Brown and Levinson's (1978) work. They maintain that the preference for self-initiated self-completed repair reflects participants' mutual concern for "face" (Brown & Levinson, 1978). However, unlike research on repair, the present study is not interested in who initiates repair etc. but how negotiation is affected by face concerns in terms of the strategies that are used in negotiation. Thus, the focus in this section will be on reviewing the relevant findings on face in repair and negotiation studies.

Repair studies have shown that concerns for face are manifested differently in the classroom setting as compared to non-classroom settings due to the different goals, expected outcomes and participant roles inherent in the classroom setting. For instance, in teacher-fronted classrooms the teacher is the "floor-keeper" in the classroom, so the move to interrupt and repair student errors may outweigh concerns for face. Van Lier (1988) points out that

in teacher-led classrooms, not only is there a preponderance of other-initiated other-completed repair, but there is also a lot of repair that involves teachers interrupting a student's turn to correct a mistake (intra-turn/other-initiated repair). This shows that the social concerns of the classroom and the non-classroom are clearly different and that one of these differences is the emphasis on face. However, that pedagogical concerns override face concerns in the classroom is not necessarily always the case. Kasper (1985) looked at repair in two different stages of a classroom lesson, the language-centered and the meaning-centered stage, and found that in the language-centered stage, repairs were teacher-initiated, teacher- or peer-completed. In the meaning-centered stage, however, self-initiated self-completed repair was preferred, but there was still a lot of other-initiated and completed repair. In another study, Kinginger (1995) looked at continuum of "natural" to more "instructional" activities in the classroom and found that 'instructional activities' are characterized by more other-initiated other-completed repair and in "natural" tasks, repair is often avoided. She concludes that the differences in repair found between classroom and non-pedagogic contexts may have to do with the difference in goals or expected outcomes. Whereas in non-pedagogic conversation the goal is mutual understanding, in more 'instructional' activities, the goal is grammatical accuracy. As for the 'natural' activities, Kinginger (1995) attributed the avoidance of repair to the students' monolingual background. Because the students were able to code-switch if they had

any trouble saying something in the L2, they could avoid most types of repair. Thus, classroom activities that are "natural" or "meaning focused" tend to exhibit more self-initiated self completed-repair namely because the goal is communication and the expected outcome is to be able to convey a comprehensible message. In contrast, "instructional" or "language - centered" activities tend to result in more other-initiated other-repair because the goal is grammatical accuracy and the student is expected to be able to demonstrate that grammatical accuracy (Kasper, 1985; Kinginger, 1995). To summarize, the findings in repair studies suggest that depending on goals and expected outcomes, concerns for face in the classroom are sometimes outweighed by pedagogical concerns but depending on the nature of the activity this may not always be the case.

Negotiation studies are not concerned with face, but some studies have briefly commented on face as a factor affecting negotiation. For example, in Rulon and McCreary's (1986) classroom study, one of the reasons cited for the low amount of negotiation in the teacher-fronted task was that students who did not understand something did not want to admit it and embarrass themselves by asking the teacher for clarification or confirmation. This notion is supported by Pica (1987) who maintains that students may avoid seeking clarification of teachers' utterances simply because it may signal incompetence or a lack of attention. Essentially, in both these studies students appeared to be saving face by not initiating negotiation when there was an incomplete

understanding.

Van Lier (1988) noted that in classroom settings other-repair is common, while in informal non-classroom settings, self-repair is preferred. He maintains that in informal settings, factors that affect the use of repair are "intelligibility and interpretability, conversational rhythm and tempo, and the concern for face" (p. 204). Along these same lines, Schegloff et al. (1977) maintained that there is a preference for self-repair in informal conversation over other types of repair such as other-repair. This is because other-repair may threaten participants' negative face. Thus, while in the classroom setting, other-correction by the teacher may be more acceptable, in informal situations such repair is considered more face-threatening. Similarly, negotiation researchers have noted that too many repairs or requests for clarification may make for uncomfortable social relationships and can be annoying (Pica, 1994). Ozaki (1989) also supports the notion that even in NS-NS conversation such clarification requests and comprehension checks can possibly be construed as face threatening. Similarly, in NS-NNS conversation, both NSs and NNSs may be wary of making too many requests for clarification because it thwarts smooth communication and may be face threatening. In her study of Japanese foreigner talk, Richardson (1997) maintains that due to concerns for the NNS's face, NSs were more careful about which characteristics of foreigner talk they employed. For example, the Japanese NSs in her study preferred to use "covert comprehension checks" rather than "overt comprehension checks" because

the more indirect the comprehension check, the less likely it was to draw attention to the NNS's language deficiencies. Thus, anything that drew attention to the NNS's inadequate use of the target language was done so "indirectly" so as to maintain the appearance of "native talk" and to "save face". Similarly, in Chun et al.'s, (1982) study of NS-NNS conversations, they found that NSs performed few overt corrections of NNSs' mistakes namely because it would have been inappropriate in two ways, it would have been face threatening and since the focus was on communication it would not have been suitable to the goal of the conversation. However, they also maintained that "on-record" correction in NS-NNS conversations may be more frequent if the interlocutors were friends and knew each other well enough that the NNS did not perceive the correction to be a threat. There is also some evidence that learners who accept themselves in the role of incompetent NNS may not feel threatened when corrected by NSs especially if their verbal or non-verbal behavior initiated the other repair (Hosoda, 2000). In fact, in her study of other repair in Japanese NS-NNS conversations, Hosoda (2000) found that Japanese NSs only performed other repair after the NNSs' verbal (e.g., appeal for help) or non-verbal (e.g., head tilts, raised eyebrows etc.) behavior invited the other repair. Face also affects negotiation in a non-classroom setting particularly in terms of what does and does not get negotiated. For example, in a non-classroom study of a telephone conversation between a NS and NNS, Varonis and Gass (1985b) suggested that when one interlocutor does

not understand the other's utterance, they may opt for face-saving moves by continuing on with the conversation until the need for clarification becomes necessary. Along these same lines, in his study of learners and their homestay families at the dinner table, Iino (1996) noted that the main underlying assumption of both the host family and the host student was that in order to live together successfully it was necessary to avoid confrontation and save the other's face. Thus, the use of potentially face threatening acts like other-initiated-repair were avoided in order to preserve the participants' face. Iino (1996) found that host family members felt uncomfortable when students made pragmatic or sociolinguistic errors, but were not made uncomfortable by students' linguistic errors during dinner conversations. Iino (1996) observed that the majority of negotiations were over lexical items, while only thirteen to nineteen percent of the host family members negotiated students' errors involving the appropriateness of their expressions. This indicates that host family members largely avoided negotiating with the students on important social aspects of their language usage, aspects that when used inappropriately, may result in threats to face. Iino (1996) found that one reason sociolinguistic errors were not negotiated was because the host family members believed that the student just didn't know any better and that it was actually "cute" rather than considered offensive. Another reason they were not negotiated was because it is difficult for host family members to engage in negotiation with students about inappropriate language especially when the threat to face

that there are certain features of tasks that might affect strategy selection. Specifically, they found that use of strategies depended somewhat on cognitive considerations such as the amount of information to be understood, as well as what strategies learners perceived to be appropriate and acceptable to task and interlocutor. Given all the results, Rost and Ross (1991) concluded that strategy use is affected by a combination of proficiency and contextual factors.

The strong version of task effect espouses the view that task is one of the most important factors in CS use. In a review of the Nijmegen studies' data, Poulisse (1997) concluded that there is evidence of significant effects of task on certain types of strategy use. Poulisse (1997) focused only on compensatory strategies, strategies where learners try to expand their interlanguage in order to compensate for their inadequate command of the target language. She argues that in the controlled tasks with no interlocutor present, such as real-world object and novel-abstract shape description tasks, students tended to use lengthy analytic strategies because there was no feedback on the clarity of the students' utterances and they went to great lengths to overcome their lexical difficulties. On the other hand, in more naturalistic tasks with an interlocutor present, the students used shorter and less detailed analytic strategies as well as transfer-based strategies (e.g., language-switch). Further analysis revealed that when task demands were high as in the detailed picture description, the subjects used lengthy reconceptualization strategies. However, in the story-retell and interview

tasks, the subjects opted for more low effort strategies due to time constraints and cognitive complexity. In the interview task, subjects used less transfer strategies due to the presence of an interlocutor who did not speak their L1. It is also suggested that in CS studies requiring students to describe an object to an interlocutor, that depending on the nature of the object, abstract or concrete, different CSs are required. For example, in an elicitation involving descriptions of real-world objects, abstract objects, and story telling, learners used extensive analytic strategies (circumlocution etc.) for the abstract objects. For the real-world objects they tended to use more holistic strategies ('this looks like a...'), while using shorter strategies of the analytic, holistic, and transfer type for the story-telling task (Poulisse, 1990). The difference between describing abstract shapes versus real-world objects has also been noted in Faerch and Kasper (1986), who wrote the following:

Problems having to do with how to refer to concrete, physical entities like 'zebra-crossings', 'a pair of scissors' or 'a rabbit' can be solved by means of achievement strategies like paraphrase (description, exemplification) and use of gestures. Such strategies seem to be fairly easy for most learners to utilize... Learners are faced with higher demands when trying to convey abstract concepts like 'nationalism', 'sacrilege' and 'hospitality'. In these cases, a different repertoire of strategies is needed. First of all, there are strategies that cannot be used (description of size, colour, shape, gesture, sound-imitation). (p. 185)

Faerch and Kasper (1986) also suggest that like abstract entities, talking about cultural entities proves difficult for second language learners to deal with and is likely to require the use of communication strategies to convey the

precise cultural denotations and connotations. Accordingly, incomplete understanding between participants about cultural objects or practices seems to promote negotiation.

There are a few studies whose viewpoints on task effects and CS use seem to be different from the above studies. For example, in a study about the interactions of NNS teaching assistants and their NS students, Williams, Inscoe, and Tasker (1997) looked at how the interlocutors used CS and negotiation to come to a mutual comprehension in a lab setting. They concluded that the nature of the task, to complete an experiment, affected the types of CSs and negotiation used by the students and the teaching assistant. The students overwhelmingly opted for confirmation checks that were used to gradually isolate the problem in a negotiation with the assistant. The authors note that the success of the interactions was due to the focus on mutual comprehension and the use of conservative strategies to break down the task into smaller, easier to manage chunks. Thus, participants seemed to use those strategies that made reaching the goal of mutual comprehension easier and faster. Poulisse's (1997) argument supports this, namely that strategy choice within and across different tasks may have more to do with general principles of communication such as Principle of Clarity (be clear and informative) and Principle of Economy (be brief and economical) than the task itself (Grice, 1975). She maintains that participants in a conversation will choose a strategy based on whether the strategy will be effective and require

the least amount of effort in achieving the desired results. She argues that the Principles of Economy and Clarity explain why Poulisse's (1997) subjects went to great lengths to overcome their lexical difficulties because no interlocutor was present to give them feedback on the effectiveness of their strategies. As such, they did not know how much explanation would be effective. On the other hand, in the task with the interlocutor present, the interlocutor gave students feedback on the effectiveness of their description and students used shorter, less detailed analytic strategies because they required the least amount of effort given the desired result. Thus, task features such as the presence or absence of an interlocutor or tasks requiring students to modify their output etc. affect strategy use in terms of what strategy requires the minimum amount of effort to achieve the sought after results.

This section on task and task related factors and the role they play in negotiation and CS choice is difficult to summarize because the lack of similarity in task design, implementation, participant factors, as well as other variables that may have affected experimental outcomes. Nevertheless, it is possible to point out some basic observations of the relationship between task-type, task factors and their effect on negotiation. First, tasks involving a two-way exchange of information where the participants are required to share that information in order to achieve a specific goal may present more opportunities for participants to engage in negotiation. However, a number of intervening variables may affect the amount and quality (e.g., more or less

the least amount of effort in achieving the desired results. She argues that the Principles of Economy and Clarity explain why Poulisse's (1997) subjects went to great lengths to overcome their lexical difficulties because no interlocutor was present to give them feedback on the effectiveness of their strategies. As such, they did not know how much explanation would be effective. On the other hand, in the task with the interlocutor present, the interlocutor gave students feedback on the effectiveness of their description and students used shorter, less detailed analytic strategies because they required the least amount of effort given the desired result. Thus, task features such as the presence or absence of an interlocutor or tasks requiring students to modify their output etc. affect strategy use in terms of what strategy requires the minimum amount of effort to achieve the sought after results.

This section on task and task related factors and the role they play in negotiation and CS choice is difficult to summarize because the lack of similarity in task design, implementation, participant factors, as well as other variables that may have affected experimental outcomes. Nevertheless, it is possible to point out some basic observations of the relationship between task-type, task factors and their effect on negotiation. First, tasks involving a two-way exchange of information where the participants are required to share that information in order to achieve a specific goal may present more opportunities for participants to engage in negotiation. However, a number of intervening variables may affect the amount and quality (e.g., more or less

learner output modification) of negotiation. Perhaps the most important variable to consider is the type of signal the NS uses (i.e., request for clarification vs. corrected model of utterance) to let the NNS know that a nonunderstanding has occurred. Requests for clarification encourage students to modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible to their interlocutors, while a corrected model of a NNS's unclear utterance is likely to result in a simple yes or no response from the NNS (Pica et al., 1989). Another factor most likely to affect opportunities for negotiation is the participation pattern, whether the task is teacher-fronted, small groups, or dyads. Such groupings have different participation structures as in the teacher-fronted task, where the teacher controls the interaction or in the small groups where the more proficient students may participate more in the interaction. To illustrate, teacher-fronted tasks in general seem to provide students with less opportunity to speak and engage in negotiation work because the interaction is asymmetrical as teachers tend to dominate and control the activity. Moreover, in both teacher-fronted and small group tasks, oftentimes only the most proficient students tend to participate and other students may be too embarrassed to admit they don't understand something. Small group work findings also indicated that less active students remained silent while the more active, proficient students did all the work. Thus, dyads seemed to be most effective in facilitating negotiation work, but only if the task required a two-way information exchange task and the students were interested in the

topic and the context was more formal in terms of motivating the students to complete the task and focus on the form of their language (Foster, 1998). It has been suggested in this section that when students are unfamiliar with topics in the L2 negotiation and the use of communication strategies may increase as a result. On the other hand, if students are familiar with a topic and considered the knower they may also be more likely to talk more and more motivated to get their message across, therefore more likely to engage in negotiation and use CSs. Another task related factor that was not examined as much in the negotiation literature, but that researchers believe may affect negotiation is the amount of production a task requires to complete. Specifically, tasks that require students to produce more output are more likely to result in more negotiation.

As for task and CS use, findings also vary considerably. While Bialystok and Frohlich (1980) found virtually no effect for task, Poullisse and Schils' (1989) study found that task-related factors such as task demands, context, time constraints, and the presence or absence of an interlocutor, were the most important predictors of strategy use, even overriding proficiency effects. This was supported by Poullisse's (1997) review of the Nijmegen studies' data that showed task-related factors such as the presence or absence of an *interlocutor*, or the description of abstract versus concrete objects influenced subjects' choice of CS. Rost and Ross's (1991) study also revealed that CS use depended somewhat on the amount of information to be understood, as well as what

strategies learners perceived to be appropriate and acceptable to the task and interlocutor. However, from a standpoint of general principles of communication, Poulisse (1997) argued that strategy choice is based on the Principles of Clarity and Economy, essentially that participants choose strategies that are effective and require the least amount of effort in achieving the results they want to achieve. In sum, perhaps what can be said about task and its role in negotiation and CS use is that outcomes are not so much reflective of task as a single deciding factor, but a combination of task-related and interpersonal factors.

□

### Concerns for Face

Typically, negotiation researchers have not been concerned with “face” as a factor in negotiation. However, some negotiation studies have made cursory comments about face and its possible effect on negotiation and CS use but have not specifically labeled it as such. This is perhaps because a lot of negotiation data is gathered in a classroom setting rather than in a non-classroom setting where face might play more of a role. Because this study includes non-classroom negotiation, specifically NS-NNS negotiation in the study abroad host family setting, face may play a more important role than it does in the classroom setting. For the present study Brown and Levinson’s (1978) notion of face will be used. They define face as a “person’s public self image that one wants to claim for oneself” (Brown and Levinson, 1978, p. 61).

It is categorized into a binary paradigm consisting of positive face and negative face. Positive face is the desire to have the approval of others or be ratified by others, while negative face is the desire to remain autonomous and not have others impede or infringe on one's rights. Brown and Levinson (1978) assert that important speech acts such as requests, offers, orders, and compliments to name a few, are inherently tied to face. Repair in particular is also a type of exchange where face is found to play a role. As such it is perhaps necessary to also look at studies on repair, where face is routinely touted as a important factor. Accordingly, this section will discuss the notion of face in repair studies and how it relates to the present study. Then, because the present study is concerned with comparing classroom and non-classroom (host family) negotiation, the findings on face in repair studies, negotiation studies and CS studies will be divided into those that look at face in the classroom setting versus the non-classroom setting.

Repair studies come from the work of Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) who use a conversation analysis (CA) approach to data. Although this study does not use a CA approach, findings are relevant because like negotiation research, repair research looks at how interlocutors are able to overcome communication problems. Moreover, the devices used in repair such as clarification requests, confirmation requests, comprehension checks etc., are the same devices that are labeled to identify moves in negotiation. Unlike negotiation however, repair is analyzed from a conversation analysis

perspective which maintains that interaction is structurally organized and that contributions to the interaction is shaped by a prior context, usually the utterance made just prior to the contribution. This is why repair studies refer to repair in terms of who initiated the repair and who completed the repair (e.g., self-initiated, self-completed repair). Accordingly, one of the major findings of repair is that in NS-NS interaction, self-initiated self-repair is preferred over other-initiated other-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). This has also been noted in NS-NNS interactions (Day, Chenoweth, Chun, & Leppescu, 1984). Where face comes in is through Brown and Levinson's (1978) work. They maintain that the preference for self-initiated self-completed repair reflects participants' mutual concern for "face" (Brown & Levinson, 1978). However, unlike research on repair, the present study is not interested in who initiates repair etc. but how negotiation is affected by face concerns in terms of the strategies that are used in negotiation. Thus, the focus in this section will be on reviewing the relevant findings on face in repair and negotiation studies.

Repair studies have shown that concerns for face are manifested differently in the classroom setting as compared to non-classroom settings due to the different goals, expected outcomes and participant roles inherent in the classroom setting. For instance, in teacher-fronted classrooms the teacher is the "floor-keeper" in the classroom, so the move to interrupt and repair student errors may outweigh concerns for face. Van Lier (1988) points out that

in teacher-led classrooms, not only is there a preponderance of other-initiated other-completed repair, but there is also a lot of repair that involves teachers interrupting a student's turn to correct a mistake (intra-turn/other-initiated repair). This shows that the social concerns of the classroom and the non-classroom are clearly different and that one of these differences is the emphasis on face. However, that pedagogical concerns override face concerns in the classroom is not necessarily always the case. Kasper (1985) looked at repair in two different stages of a classroom lesson, the language-centered and the meaning-centered stage, and found that in the language-centered stage, repairs were teacher-initiated, teacher- or peer-completed. In the meaning-centered stage, however, self-initiated self-completed repair was preferred, but there was still a lot of other-initiated and completed repair. In another study, Kinginger (1995) looked at continuum of "natural" to more "instructional" activities in the classroom and found that 'instructional activities' are characterized by more other-initiated other-completed repair and in "natural" tasks, repair is often avoided. She concludes that the differences in repair found between classroom and non-pedagogic contexts may have to do with the difference in goals or expected outcomes. Whereas in non-pedagogic conversation the goal is mutual understanding, in more 'instructional' activities, the goal is grammatical accuracy. As for the 'natural' activities, Kinginger (1995) attributed the avoidance of repair to the students' monolingual background. Because the students were able to code-switch if they had

any trouble saying something in the L2, they could avoid most types of repair. Thus, classroom activities that are "natural" or "meaning focused" tend to exhibit more self-initiated self completed-repair namely because the goal is communication and the expected outcome is to be able to convey a comprehensible message. In contrast, "instructional" or "language - centered" activities tend to result in more other-initiated other-repair because the goal is grammatical accuracy and the student is expected to be able to demonstrate that grammatical accuracy (Kasper, 1985; Kinginger, 1995). To summarize, the findings in repair studies suggest that depending on goals and expected outcomes, concerns for face in the classroom are sometimes outweighed by pedagogical concerns but depending on the nature of the activity this may not always be the case.

Negotiation studies are not concerned with face, but some studies have briefly commented on face as a factor affecting negotiation. For example, in Rulon and McCreary's (1986) classroom study, one of the reasons cited for the low amount of negotiation in the teacher-fronted task was that students who did not understand something did not want to admit it and embarrass themselves by asking the teacher for clarification or confirmation. This notion is supported by Pica (1987) who maintains that students may avoid seeking clarification of teachers' utterances simply because it may signal incompetence or a lack of attention. Essentially, in both these studies students appeared to be saving face by not initiating negotiation when there was an incomplete

understanding.

Van Lier (1988) noted that in classroom settings other-repair is common, while in informal non-classroom settings, self-repair is preferred. He maintains that in informal settings, factors that affect the use of repair are "intelligibility and interpretability, conversational rhythm and tempo, and the concern for face" (p. 204). Along these same lines, Schegloff et al. (1977) maintained that there is a preference for self-repair in informal conversation over other types of repair such as other-repair. This is because other-repair may threaten participants' negative face. Thus, while in the classroom setting, other-correction by the teacher may be more acceptable, in informal situations such repair is considered more face-threatening. Similarly, negotiation researchers have noted that too many repairs or requests for clarification may make for uncomfortable social relationships and can be annoying (Pica, 1994). Ozaki (1989) also supports the notion that even in NS-NS conversation such clarification requests and comprehension checks can possibly be construed as face threatening. Similarly, in NS-NNS conversation, both NSs and NNSs may be wary of making too many requests for clarification because it thwarts smooth communication and may be face threatening. In her study of Japanese foreigner talk, Richardson (1997) maintains that due to concerns for the NNS's face, NSs were more careful about which characteristics of foreigner talk they employed. For example, the Japanese NSs in her study preferred to use "covert comprehension checks" rather than "overt comprehension checks" because

the more indirect the comprehension check, the less likely it was to draw attention to the NNS's language deficiencies. Thus, anything that drew attention to the NNS's inadequate use of the target language was done so "indirectly" so as to maintain the appearance of "native talk" and to "save face". Similarly, in Chun et al.'s, (1982) study of NS-NNS conversations, they found that NSs performed few overt corrections of NNSs' mistakes namely because it would have been inappropriate in two ways, it would have been face threatening and since the focus was on communication it would not have been suitable to the goal of the conversation. However, they also maintained that "on-record" correction in NS-NNS conversations may be more frequent if the interlocutors were friends and knew each other well enough that the NNS did not perceive the correction to be a threat. There is also some evidence that learners who accept themselves in the role of incompetent NNS may not feel threatened when corrected by NSs especially if their verbal or non-verbal behavior initiated the other repair (Hosoda, 2000). In fact, in her study of other repair in Japanese NS-NNS conversations, Hosoda (2000) found that Japanese NSs only performed other repair after the NNSs' verbal (e.g., appeal for help) or non-verbal (e.g., head tilts, raised eyebrows etc.) behavior invited the other repair. Face also affects negotiation in a non-classroom setting particularly in terms of what does and does not get negotiated. For example, in a non-classroom study of a telephone conversation between a NS and NNS, Varonis and Gass (1985b) suggested that when one interlocutor does

not understand the other's utterance, they may opt for face-saving moves by continuing on with the conversation until the need for clarification becomes necessary. Along these same lines, in his study of learners and their homestay families at the dinner table, Iino (1996) noted that the main underlying assumption of both the host family and the host student was that in order to live together successfully it was necessary to avoid confrontation and save the other's face. Thus, the use of potentially face threatening acts like other-initiated-repair were avoided in order to preserve the participants' face. Iino (1996) found that host family members felt uncomfortable when students made pragmatic or sociolinguistic errors, but were not made uncomfortable by students' linguistic errors during dinner conversations. Iino (1996) observed that the majority of negotiations were over lexical items, while only thirteen to nineteen percent of the host family members negotiated students' errors involving the appropriateness of their expressions. This indicates that host family members largely avoided negotiating with the students on important social aspects of their language usage, aspects that when used inappropriately, may result in threats to face. Iino (1996) found that one reason sociolinguistic errors were not negotiated was because the host family members believed that the student just didn't know any better and that it was actually "cute" rather than considered offensive. Another reason they were not negotiated was because it is difficult for host family members to engage in negotiation with students about inappropriate language especially when the threat to face

involved an interlocutor who was present at the table. Thus, because of participants' concerns for face, conversations in non-classroom settings may be characterized by less repair in general and especially by less other-initiated other repair unless the participants are good friends and such repairs do not constitute a threat to face or if the NNS has invited the other repair through verbal or non-verbal behavior. A focus on communication in non-classroom settings may also inhibit repair and negotiation when learners make errors particularly if the error does not cause comprehension problems. What does and does not get repaired or negotiated may also be affected by face. Namely, if negotiating or repairing a student's mistake results in threats to face, it is likely to be avoided.

To review, the differences and similarities in the non-classroom setting in terms of face are not of an absolute nature and have a lot to do with intra-setting variables such as goals and expectations. Van Lier (1988) noted that in classroom settings, other-repair is common, while in informal non-classroom settings, self-repair is preferred. It is suggested that this is due to the focus on pedagogy which oftentimes overrides concerns for face in the classroom. Exceptions to the abundance of other-repair in the classroom do exist however. For example, when activities are more "natural" and the focus is on real communication rather than grammatical accuracy, other repair is not as predominant. As for non-classroom settings, Schegloff et al. (1977) noted that there is a preference for self-repair over other types of repair such as other-

repair. Brown and Levinson (1978) claim that this is because other-repair threatens participants' negative face. In the classroom, however, a teacher's role is expected to be one of continuously threatening students' face, impeding on their rights (negative face) by correcting their mistakes, interrupting them, and evaluating them (Cazden, 1988). In contrast, in non-classroom settings, concerns for face are manifested in less other-initiated repair and sometimes avoidance of repair. NSs may avoid negotiation or repair especially when the error is a sociolinguistic or pragmatic one that is inherently face threatening (Iino, 1996). Both NNSs and NSs may also avoid negotiation and make fewer requests for clarification because doing so too often could draw attention to the NNS's language deficiencies as well as hinder comprehension and make the conversation tedious. However, like the classroom there may be exceptions to this especially when participants are close friends and other-repair is not considered a threat to face.

### **Factors Related to the Classroom and Non-classroom Setting**

Although of particular concern to this study, there have only been a few studies that have specifically compared negotiation and CS use in the classroom and non-classroom setting. However, factors such as how NSs talk to NNSs (foreigner talk), their respective participant roles, and goals and expectations in the classroom and non-classroom setting are likely to have an effect on negotiation. Accordingly, this section will discuss these factors in

general and specifically how they relate to negotiation in both the classroom and non-classroom (host family) setting.

The way NSs adjust their speech when talking to NNSs, called "foreigner talk" has been a subject of interest to SLA researchers who are interested in identifying the characteristics of the target language input learners are exposed to in conversations with NSs (see Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991 for a review). While the characteristics of foreigner talk are quite similar in both the classroom and non-classroom setting, there are some speech characteristics that may be more likely to occur in the classroom versus the non-classroom setting and vice versa. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to discuss the findings of foreigner talk for both the classroom and non-classroom and how they relate to research on negotiation.

One of the characteristics examined in foreigner talk in the classroom, henceforth "teacher talk", is the amount of speech teachers' produce. The general conclusion is that in teacher-centered classrooms, teachers produce more speech than students (Ellis, 1990). They also slow down their rate of speaking according to the learners' level of proficiency (Chaudron, 1985, 1988) and adjust their vocabulary in the same way (Henzl, 1979). Even so, teachers' speech to students is likely to be grammatically well formed. However, there are instances when teachers produce ungrammatical utterances to facilitate comprehension, especially with lower level learners (Ellis, 1982). In general, teachers often try to aim their speech so that students do not become frustrated

due to comprehension difficulties. Another aspect of teacher talk is the use of English in FL classrooms where it is the first language of the students. In their study of English use in the FL classroom, Polio and Duff (1994) found that teachers were wholly unaware of the amount of English they used in class and when and for what purpose they used English. Although the amount of English the teachers used varied, one teacher was found to use as little as 10% of the target language in class, mainly relying on English for all interactions. Polio and Duff (1994) noted that the most common use of English was for isolated words such as "quiz" and "test" and other vocabulary items that were essential to continue on with an exchange or to highlight something in the teachers' utterance. Moreover, when communication breakdowns occurred, negotiations were often in English and not the target language. Polio and Duff (1994) commented that in cases where negotiations were in the target language, they were lengthy and time consuming. Therefore teachers often negotiated with students in English to save time and this limited students' opportunities to develop strategies to deal with breakdowns in the target language in the classroom. Using English to deal with breakdowns meant that teachers did not often modify their speech in the target language, which could have served as an important model to students on how they could modify their own speech to make it more native-like (Polio & Duff, 1994). Moreover, in their study comparing negotiation between NS-student dyads in a non-classroom setting with teacher-student dyads in the classroom Pica and Long,

(1986) found that teachers produced more display questions and comprehension checks, but fewer confirmation and clarification requests than the NSs did. Accordingly, there was less negotiation and Pica and Long (1986) concluded that there was less comprehensible input available to students in the classroom setting as opposed to the non-classroom setting. In general, some characteristics of teacher talk, producing more speech than students, slowing down their rate of speech, aiming their speech at the students' level of comprehension, using English to solve comprehension problems as well as using fewer confirmation and clarification requests are likely to limit opportunities for students to use their linguistic resources and negotiate with their teachers over breakdowns in communication. As a result, students' exposure to comprehensible input as well as opportunities for modification of output may be limited in the classroom. However, an important note to make here is that teacher talk characteristics often differ greatly from teacher to teacher. Therefore, the extent to which any individual teacher's teacher talk affects negotiation depends on which characteristics of teacher talk they employ and how often they employ it.

NS speech that is adjusted to NNS interlocutors in a non-classroom setting is often referred to as "foreigner talk". Several studies done on NS-NNS discourse maintain that the use of foreigner talk enables the native speaker to compensate for the NNS's lack of L2 proficiency. General characteristics of foreigner talk include slower speech, more repetition,

allowance of topic shifts, more confirmation, more elaboration, simplifying grammar etc. (Long, 1983; Varonis and Gass, 1982, 1985; Arthur et al., 1980; Chun et al., 1982). However, the characteristics of Japanese foreigner talk in particular are most relevant to this study because the setting is in the Japanese host family. Therefore, findings on Japanese foreigner talk will be the focus of discussion here. To begin, several studies on Japanese foreigner talk have identified characteristics thought to be specific to Japanese. For example Skoutarides (1981) found that in speech to NNSs Japanese NSs tended to use more overt nouns and pronouns that probably would have been omitted in NS-NS discourse. In contrast however, rather than omitting them, Japanese NSs were more likely to use more grammatical particles and stress them in their speech to NNSs in order to clarify grammatical relationships in their utterances (Skoutarides, 1981; Long, 1983). However, this was not the case with sentence-final particles (e.g., *ne*, *yo*, etc.). In fact, NSs used less sentence-final particles in speech to NNSs than they did to NSs (Richardson, 1997). The overuse of foreign loan words of European and English origin to facilitate comprehension was also found to be another characteristic of Japanese foreigner talk (Richardson, 1997; Iino, 1996). In addition, in his study of Japanese host families, Iino (1996) found that host family members used a different set of norms when talking to host students and consequently adjusted their speech sometimes to the point of providing students with incorrect, inappropriate, or simply non-target-like language input. He called

this "*gaijinization*" (speech aimed toward foreigners) and noted that Japanese host family members not only used more polite speech in the form of polite verb forms (*desu/masu* form), avoided the use of non-standard Japanese. In fact, in one host family situation, the host mother and the host sister would correct and translate the host grandfather's Kyoto dialect into standard Japanese for the host student. Iino (1996) proposed several reasons for the host family members "*gaijinization*" of their speech. He believed that the NSs adapted their speech in certain ways because they believed that the adaptations represented the "correct" image of the Japanese language to foreigners even if these adaptations were not normally used with other NSs. He also suggested that the reason NSs "*gaijinized*" their speech by using polite form and standard dialect as well as overusing pronouns (e.g., *watashi* = I, *anata* = you) and stressing case particles because communicatively it was more efficient to do so in terms of time and energy. Essentially, the NSs thought their adaptations would make it easier for the student to understand their speech. Some of Iino's observations contrast with what Marriott (1995) observed in her study of students' acquisition of politeness norms in a Japanese study abroad situation. One of the aspects that she looked at included the ability to use the plain style and polite style appropriately. She found that at the end of the study abroad, few students knew how to alternate between both styles appropriately, often using the plain style when they should have used the polite style. Marriott (1995) maintained that the overuse of the plain style was

due to the dominant use of the plain style in non-classroom interactions between the students and their friends or host family members. She had confirmation of this from the students, who commented in their journals about the prevalent use of the plain form in out-of-class settings. Thus, there is some contradictory evidence as to whether or not Japanese NSs tend to overuse the polite style (*~masu*) as Iino's (1996) data suggests, or whether they tend to use the plain style more as Marriott's (1995) study suggests.

Other important findings in Japanese foreigner talk seem to be related to findings in negotiation and CS use. For example, in a study of Japanese foreigner talk, Richardson (1997) found that Japanese NSs avoided requesting a lot of clarification but instead tended to expand the NNS's unclear utterances and render them into native-like sentences, then ask for confirmation that the intended utterance had been correctly interpreted. NSs also displayed a tendency to complete NNSs' sentences, which Richardson (1997) maintained was a feature of Japanese FT. However, Maynard (1989) claims is a common feature of NS-NS Japanese discourse not only of Japanese foreigner talk. Other "strategies" Richardson (1997) found included the use of comprehension checks and providing NNSs with unknown vocabulary as well as providing English definitions of Japanese words. Thus, when one considers the findings on Japanese foreigner talk in terms of how it affects negotiation, it may be that the use of foreigner talk including NSs' overuse of loan words, the polite form, standard Japanese, as well as their reluctance to request clarification of

NNSs' unclear utterances may limit opportunities for students to initiate negotiation and modify their own output. However, Varonis and Gass (1982, 1984) suggested that NS use of foreigner talk is dependent on the comprehensibility of the non-native's speech. Similarly, Long (1996) maintains that NS use of foreigner talk often depends on the NS's perception of the learner's level of comprehension and the NS's familiarity with the NNS's interlanguage. As such, Japanese NSs' speech to NNSs may differ in the extent to which the characteristics of Japanese foreigner talk are manifested and this leaves room for the possibility that negotiation is not unlikely in NS-NNS conversation.

To summarize, according to the reviewed studies above, teacher talk in the classroom and foreigner talk in the Japanese host family setting can be similar in the sense that the way the NSs talk and the adjustments they make may serve to discourage a lot of negotiation in conversation. In the classroom teachers often discourage breakdowns by adjusting their vocabulary, using English, aiming their speech at the students' level of comprehension, as well as requesting less confirmation and clarification when students utterances are unclear. In non-classroom Japanese NS-NNS conversations, Japanese speakers tend to "*gaijinize*" their speech by using a lot of loan words, requesting confirmation of students' unclear utterances rather than clarification, overusing polite verb forms as well as overusing pronouns, case particles, and standard Japanese. There is some conflicting evidence, however,

that suggests NSs do not overuse of polite forms, rather they tend to use more plain style (Marriott, 1995). Consequently, both teacher talk and foreigner talk seem to limit the amount of NS target-like input students are exposed to as well as reduce opportunities for students to modify their output or hear NSs modify their own output.

Participant roles may also affect negotiation in different settings. The roles of teacher and student assume in the classroom are manifestly different from the roles interlocutors assume in a non-classroom setting. These roles often have an effect on how participants deal with breakdowns in communication. Thus, this section discusses the roles of participants in the classroom and in the Japanese host family setting as well as the potential effect these roles may have on negotiation.

Undoubtedly the most significant factors influencing the roles of teacher and student in the classroom are the institutionally defined rules and expectations associated with educational settings. Responsible for managing classroom interaction involving several participants and designated the "expert" because of their superior language ability, the teacher's role is one of power (Holmes, 1978). This asymmetrical role relationship between the teacher and students may manifest itself in several interactional features of classroom discourse. Besides institutionally defined expectations and rules, the large number of participants in the classroom and the desire to avoid confusion as well as make efficient use of class time encourages teachers to

control who says what to whom and when. While there is variation in the role of the teacher depending on the teacher, the class, and the activity, some general characteristics of the teacher as “knower” or “expert” are fairly common. Gremmo, Holec, and Riley (1978, p. 142) outline all the discourse rights that teachers may exercise in the classroom:

1. Participate in all exchanges
2. Initiate exchanges
3. Decide on length of exchanges
4. Close exchanges
5. Include and exclude other participants in exchanges
6. Open all adjacency pairs
7. Be the only possible addressee of any exchange initiated by another participant
8. Decide on the order of other participants' turns
9. Decide on the number of turns to be attributed to each participant

The role of the teacher has been shown to affect classroom interaction in general and the quantity and quality of negotiation as well. For example, Long and Sato (1983) found that NS-NNS non-classroom conversations resulted in more confirmation, comprehension, and clarification checks and therefore more negotiations than in the classroom. While not a comparison of classroom and non-classroom per se, Pica (1987) found these same results when she looked at two activities, one done with teacher participation and one with learner groups without teacher participation. She found that the activity in which the teacher had not participated resulted in more negotiation moves. While it would be impossible in both these studies to attribute these differences to just one factor, one suggested reason was the institutional roles

of teacher and student in the classroom eliminated the need for a lot of negotiation. As Pica (1987) pointed out, in the classroom the teacher is considered the expert while the students' role is to display knowledge. This role paradigm affects negotiation in a variety of ways. Pica (1987) notes that students were less likely to engage in negotiation with teachers because they did not want to display their lack of knowledge on the content matter and therefore were saving face by not doing so. Also, the status difference between teacher and students may have discouraged students from making confirmation checks etc. because they may have been perceived as threats to the teacher's authority. Without labeling it as such, some CS studies have also suggested that teacher roles affect how students solve production problems in the classroom setting (Mitchell, 1988; Rosing-Schow & Haastrup, 1982 as described by Holmen, 1985). Rosing-Schow and Haastrup (1982) observed that in the classroom learners tended to appeal to the teacher for assistance or resort to reduction strategies (give up the original communicative goal) more than in the role-play activity with a NS. The use of appeals for assistance may have been because the teacher's role as expert allowed the students to use the teacher as a "walking dictionary" whenever they had production problems. Mitchell (1988) looked at teachers' and learners' use of CSs in the classroom and found that the role of teacher as "classroom resource" was an important source of input for students and that teachers constantly explained, repeated, exemplified, and interpreted their own and the students' utterances to provide

a wealth of comprehensible input for students. In the case of CS use, Mitchell (1988) noted that when teachers gave up a bit of their authority and equipped students with the means to indicate comprehension problems in the L2, essentially forcing them to take an active role in solving breakdowns, the learners used CS to that end. However, when teachers remained in the role of authority, the classroom interactions were not found to facilitate CS use.

NS-NNS roles in the host family setting are harder to define partly because role relationships change from family to family and partly because there are few studies that look at the Japanese study abroad situation in this respect. One such study, Iino (1996), examined NS -NNS interactions in the Japanese host family and found that unlike institutional settings, host family members and students had a difficult time defining their respective roles in the situation. He maintained that there were two basic types of role relationships manifested in the host family situations. One role relationship is described as a two-way exchange where the role relationship was not asymmetric but instead involved a fairly even cultural and linguistic exchange between the host family and the host student. In this case, the Japanese host family members learned as much from their host students as their host students did from them (Iino, 1996). However, Iino (1996) found that the most common relationship between student and host family was the one-way exchange with the student as care receiver and the host family as care giver. In this type of role relationship the student was placed in a relatively

powerless role as someone who was deficient in the target language and culture and had to rely on the host family members as a resource for learning (Iino, 1996). Some students commented that if they played this role, essentially the role of "*gaijin*" (foreigner), their linguistic mistakes and inappropriate behavior were tolerated, almost like they would be in a parent- child relationship. Iino (1996) maintained that this was another aspect of "*gaijinization*". Namely, students could make grammatical and sociolinguistic mistakes without being corrected by their host family members because the host family members perceived the student's role to be one in which they were largely not held responsible for errors or inappropriate behavior. In fact, linguistic and sociolinguistic errors were often labeled "cute" and as long as these errors did not cause comprehension problems, they were often not negotiated or corrected but considered appropriate for "*gaijin*" (foreigners). Marriott's (1995) study of students' stay abroad in Japan confirms Iino's (1996) observations. During interviews with the students about their study abroad experiences the students were asked whether they had ever received negative feedback with respect to their use of the plain or formal style and students commented that they had not. Thus, there seems to be a consensus that students are not expected to use sociolinguistic forms appropriately. Although Iino (1996) did not remark specifically on the individual roles of the host family member, some of his findings may be interpreted from the perspective of role relationship. For example, he noted that compared to the other host

family members, it was the host family mother who spent the most time with the host student. This indicated that the host mother was the primary "care giver" in the role relationship and was perhaps the most familiar with the student's interlanguage and therefore the one who could probably understand them the most. Similarly, in one host family Iino (1996) observed that the host mother and sister took it upon themselves to translate the host grandfather's use of Kyoto dialect into standard Japanese. This indicated that perhaps the host mother and sister felt it was their responsibility not only to present what they thought was "correct" Japanese to the student but also to maintain the level of comprehension for the student's sake. Although not a study of host family situations, Richardson's study (1997) of Japanese foreigner talk supports the view that the NSs view their role in NS-NNS interactions as one in which they are to facilitate comprehension for the NNS in such a way that did not draw overt attention to the NNS's language deficiencies. Specifically, Richardson (1997) found that Japanese NSs avoided requesting a lot of clarification of students' unclear utterances but instead tended to expand the NNS's utterances and render them into native-like sentences, then ask for confirmation that the intended utterance has been correctly interpreted. Such actions suggest that the Japanese NSs felt it was their role in the interaction to help the student get their intentions across and they did so by attempting to guess what the student was trying to say, sometimes based upon minimal input from the student, then saying it in the form of a request for clarification

or confirmation so the student could accept or reject it. Thus, various findings suggest that the role of NS host family member is one of care giver and source of target language input for the student as well as the person who works hard to maintain a satisfactory level of comprehension for the student in conversations. As for the host student, their role is often one of care receiver, one in which they are not wholly responsible for their mistakes and inappropriate behavior. If we look at the implications of the role relationship between NS and NNS toward negotiation however, the roles both participants assume seem to limit the amount of negotiation in the host family setting. First, if NSs see their role toward NNSs as one in which they (the NSs) are *primarily responsible for maintaining the level of comprehension*, then it is entirely possible that the student is not given the opportunity to be exposed to language above their current level of comprehension. Consequently, there is little reason to negotiate because there are few comprehension difficulties. Moreover, if NSs hyperadapt their speech because they believe that they ought to provide "correct" Japanese to NNSs, then the L2 input students receive may be less than native-like and actually inhibit successful SLA. Similarly, if NSs view students' linguistic errors as acceptable because of the student role as "*gaijin*" (foreigner), this ultimately means that students may not get feedback on the inadequacies of their interlanguage and are less likely to have to modify their utterances to make them more native-like. Moreover, when NSs are reluctant to request clarification of students' unclear utterances but instead

reformulate the student's utterance into target-like Japanese and request confirmation of their interpretation, students may be exposed to valuable target-like input but it becomes less necessary for them to modify their utterances because the NS has already done it for them. Hence, the data suggests that *role relationships between host family members and their host students may inhibit negotiation and compromise the quality of target-like input students are exposed to as well as their opportunities to modify their own output.*

To summarize, the findings in the classroom and non-classroom setting suggest that the quality and quantity of negotiation and CS use is affected by the roles participants assume. In the classroom, the role relationship between teacher and student is one of expert and novice. As such, teachers control almost all aspects of classroom management and this tends to limit negotiation in general. However, when teachers relinquished a little of their authority, students tended to take more active roles in solving comprehension difficulties through negotiation (Mitchell, 1988). However, students may be less likely to engage in negotiation with teachers because they do not want to admit their inadequacies or threaten the teacher's authority. The role of teacher as expert and as an L2 resource also affects CS use in the classroom. For example, learners tended to use more appeals for help in teacher-student interaction than in their interactions with NSs. This was because the teacher was viewed as a resource in the classroom (Rosing-Schow

& Haastrup, 1982 as described by Holmen, 1985). On the other hand, Mitchell (1988) maintained that when teachers assumed the role of "classroom resource", they (teachers) explained, repeated, exemplified, and interpreted their own and the students' utterances and provide a wealth of comprehensible input for students. Similarly, the role relationship between NS and NNS in non-classroom setting tends to lean toward an expert-novice type of relationship in the form of care giver-care receiver. This role relationship also seems to limit the amount of negotiation in the host family setting. For example, as the "care giver" NSs tend to see their role as one in which they are to provide the NNS with "correct" Japanese, which includes overuse of the standard dialect, polite forms, and overt noun phrases as well as case particles. All of these adjustments result in fewer communication breakdowns and negotiation as well as expose the student to non-target like input. Moreover, some NNSs often assume the role as care receiver NSs accept students' linguistic errors and students often do not get feedback on where their interlanguage falls short and therefore are less likely to attempt to modify their output. In both the classroom and the host family setting, the data suggests that role relationships between the NS and students does little to encourage negotiation and ultimately may affect the quality of target-like input students are exposed to as well as limits students opportunities to adjust their output to make it more target-like.

Goals and expectations in the classroom versus the non-classroom setting have also been shown to affect negotiation and communication strategy use. For example, Pica et al. (1989) maintains that goals of interactions in the classroom are predetermined by the teacher and often are characterized more by a focus on correct form rather than on meaning, although this obviously depends on the teaching approach and the activity at hand. Moreover, unknown topics and information are often carefully controlled so as not to frustrate students by making too many demands on their interlanguage resources. As such, there may be relatively fewer instances in which true lack of understanding occurs. Such instances characterized by a lack of understanding are essential for negotiation and CS use, as Pica (1992) points out:

Further limiting the amount of negotiation that can occur in the classroom are teachers' use of preplanned lessons and their experience with learner production. Often, teachers understand everything learners say to them and pitch their L2 input at a level of complete comprehensibility. From an interactionist perspective, teacher lessons or research interviews are not an efficient means to assist language learning in the classroom or to study the processes of L2 comprehension and interlanguage modification. This is because lessons and interviews do not guarantee conditions in which learners can take an active role. In lessons and interviews, learners must comply with goals they have had no part in setting. Their opportunities to work toward collective or individual goals are blocked, as teacher and researchers control both the questions that are asked and the responses that are expected. These opportunities to negotiate meaning or exchange information are also limited since information flows only in one direction - from answer-supplying learner to question-asking teacher or researcher. (p. 203)

However, even when there is a focus on meaning in the classroom, negotiation may not always increase as a result. To illustrate, in their study of teacher versus non-teacher participation in two types of activities, Pica et al. (1989) found that mutual comprehension in the teacher participation activity was too easily achieved. As noted above, this was mainly because teachers were so familiar with the students' language abilities they were able to decipher what students were saying without engaging in negotiation. Moreover, the teachers were able to say things at a level where students had no trouble comprehending and again this limited negotiation because there were few comprehension difficulties to deal with. In contrast, the student-only groups had to work harder for mutual comprehension because they did not have the ability to immediately decipher their partners' incomprehensible interlanguage nor were they able to say things in the L2 at a level that their partners would completely understand. Thus the goal of mutual comprehension does not always guarantee increased negotiation and may actually inhibit negotiation if the NS is so familiar with the NNS's speech that they can easily interpret what the NNS is saying and adjust their speech to the NNS's level. However, there is some evidence to suggest that even when classroom activities involve a focus on correct form negotiation is not necessarily impeded. Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguished between conversational negotiation and didactic negotiation, both of which occur in the classroom. Conversational negotiation occurs when the goal is mutual

comprehension and there is a communication breakdown. Didactic negotiation occurs when the focus is on grammatical accuracy and there is no evidence of comprehension difficulties. In these cases the teacher essentially initiates a negotiation through a clarification or confirmation request as if something in the student's utterance has not been understood. This in turn prompts the student to modify their original utterance to make it more correct. Didactic negotiation is not only found during activities where the focus is on form but also during activities where the focus is on communication and mutual comprehension. Lyster and Ranta (1997) maintain that even when the focus is on communication, didactic negotiations serve to draw students' attention to form without compromising the focus on communication. Essentially, the basic moves of a garden variety negotiation are present, but in didactic negotiation there is a perceived lack of understanding rather than a real lack of understanding and the expected outcome is that the student will modify their original ill-formed utterance to make it more accurate. Therefore, depending on how a teacher goes about providing feedback on students' incorrect utterances, focus on form rather than on communication does not necessarily mean less negotiation. On the contrary, it may bring about increased student modification of output and draw students' attention to form, two of the conditions negotiation researchers believe are necessary for SLA.

Several CS and negotiation studies have also looked at whether free

conversation with communication as the main goal facilitates or discourages negotiation and the use of communication strategies. Long (1996) contends that free conversation is poor catalyst for negotiation and interlanguage development because when difficulties arise participants may easily abandon the topic or treat topics superficially so as to avoid problems. There are also other plausible reasons free conversation is thought to discourage negotiation. For example, the goal of non-classroom discourse is most often communication and mutual comprehension and this means negotiations occur as a result of comprehension difficulties, what Lyster and Ranta (1997) call the "conversational function" of negotiation. Since it is most important in non-classroom conversations to maintain a satisfactory level of comprehension, there are instances where NNSs may make mistakes that do not get negotiated simply because these mistakes do not cause comprehension problems. Moreover, even when utterances cause comprehension problems they may not always get negotiated because too many negotiations make smooth communication difficult and may be face-threatening (Pica, 1994). Therefore, the focus on communication in the non-classroom setting may not be especially conducive to negotiation in terms of student modification of output and focus on form. However, Pica et al. (1993) argues that tasks with a focus on communication that feature a two way exchange of information or ideas and where participants are either required or motivated to exchange the information have a tendency not only to facilitate negotiation, but also the use

of strategies to overcome difficulties. Furthermore, it is Faerch and Kasper's (1983) contention that activities stressing communication as the goal often lead to topics that are unfamiliar and that require an extensive knowledge of the L2. As a result, students are challenged to compensate for their lack of linguistic resources by negotiating and using communication strategies. Thus, arguments that support the idea that conversations with communication as the main goal facilitate negotiation and CS use are based on assumptions that there is a two way exchange of information or ideas, that unknown topics may be brought up, and that participants are required or motivated to exchange their information or ideas with each other.

Goals and expectations in the classroom and non-classroom may well have an effect on the quantity and quality of negotiation, but the results seem less than definitive. For example, when the focus of a classroom activity is on grammatical accuracy rather than on communication or mutual comprehension, students' utterances may trigger more correction than negotiation. On the other hand, depending on the teacher's approach to feedback, even activities which focus on correct form may result in "didactic negotiation" where the teacher feigns a lack of understanding so as to prompt the student to modify their utterance and make it more target-like (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Thus, even a focus on correct form in activities can result in negotiation that encourages student modification of output. However, more "natural" activities in the classroom where the focus is on communication

and mutual comprehension may not necessarily translate into more negotiation. Pica et al. (1989) found that teachers were so familiar with the students' language abilities that they were able to not only adjust their speech according to students' comprehension level but also decipher what students were saying, often making negotiation unnecessary. Goals in the non-classroom setting may also inhibit negotiation in several ways. For instance, when the goal is communication and mutual comprehension, unless comprehension problems arise, students' linguistic mistakes are not likely to trigger negotiation. This is because students' utterances can be grammatically ill-formed but still be completely understandable. As such, focus on form in negotiations may be less likely in the non-classroom setting unless comprehension difficulties arise and students may not get important feedback on their non-target-like forms as well as get fewer opportunities to modify their utterances to make them more target-like. However, in interactions where two-way communication is the goal and where different and unfamiliar topics arise spontaneously as they often do in non-classroom conversations, students are challenged and encouraged to actively contribute their own ideas and information as well as overcome comprehension difficulties through negotiation and the use of strategies. This is in contrast to interactions that are typical in the classroom where information flows in one direction, where communication is often not the goal, and where everything is carefully controlled so as to eliminate or avoid difficulties. Therefore, there

may be less need for students to negotiate and use communication strategies to compensate for inadequate linguistic resources.

To summarize, it appears that other factors override goals and expectations in both the classroom and non-classroom. For example, during activities where the focus is on form teachers may choose to provide feedback on students ungrammatical utterances by feigning comprehension difficulties and trigger didactic negotiations that forces the student not only to focus on form but also to modify their output. In such cases, teaching style may override the goal of grammatical accuracy to trigger more negotiation. Similarly, in the non-classroom setting where students are actively involved in setting goals and where unfamiliar topics may arise spontaneously negotiation and CS use may increase. In this case, topic unfamiliarity and active participation seem to be the deciding factors affecting negotiation and CS use.

## CHAPTER THREE THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine the negotiations and CS use between five second language learners of Japanese and their NS interlocutors in a Japanese study abroad classroom and host family setting. The data was collected during a summer study abroad program in Japan during the summer of 1999. The main data comes from video and audio-taped recorded interactions between five second language learners of Japanese and Japanese native speakers that occurred in the classroom and host family setting. Supplemental data was also obtained through interviews, journal entries, and group discussions. The approach to the data was a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodology used to collect the data, and to outline and discuss the important components of this study, the setting, the participants, the data collection, and the data analysis.

### The Settings

The Japanese study abroad program that served as the setting for this study was a Japanese immersion program in Hokkaido that offered beginning level to advanced level instruction for a period of eight weeks in the summer. A total of 60 students participated in the program the year the study was conducted, 1999. The study abroad program not only included formal classroom instruction in Japanese, but also a host family program where

students were able to live with Japanese families for the duration of their stay.

The daily schedule at the study abroad program consisted of three-fifty minute periods of Japanese language instruction in the morning. The classes that were offered ranged from the beginning to advanced level and class size ranged from seven to fifteen students. At the beginning of the summer session, each student took a placement test that was used to determine their class level. The placement test included a short oral proficiency interview and a written placement test consisting of five parts: (a) kanji and vocabulary, (b) grammar, (c) composition, (d) listening comprehension, and (e) reading comprehension. Instead of utilizing a textbook series that spanned several levels, the textbooks varied from level to level. On a more detailed level, schedules (in Japanese) handed out by the teachers indicated on a weekly basis what the instructional content of each class period was to be for that day. For example, the instructional content may be labeled: reading (*yomimono*), dialogue (*kaiwa*), grammar (*bunpoo*), project (*purojekto*), test (*shiken*), and the like. In addition to this description, the pages in the textbook that correlated with the instructional content were often indicated on the schedule. The language of instruction was Japanese. In fact, a "Japanese only" rule was enforced when students were in the building, whether they were in or out of class. This meant that teachers, staff, and students were expected to speak Japanese at all times unless absolutely necessary. In fact, at the beginning of the program, students were asked to sign a "Japanese only" form

that stated, "I pledge to speak only Japanese in the school building unless I am asked or permitted by the teachers or the staff members to speak any other language". The students were told that if they were observed speaking English during school hours, even during class breaks, that they would be reprimanded and that repeated violations of the Japanese only rule might result in some type of disciplinary action. Despite the strict warnings, the extent to which the Japanese only rule was followed depended on the individual teacher, student, staff member, and the situation.

In addition to the morning language classes, optional lectures on Japanese politics, culture, and literature were offered in the afternoon as well as cultural classes where students could participate in such events as Japanese flower arranging, tea ceremony, and calligraphy. For these events, the "Japanese only" rule was suspended. The lectures were conducted by the lecturer in English including a question and answer period after the lecture. Similarly, the cultural classes were conducted in Japanese but translated into English by an interpreter. In either situation however, students were free to speak in Japanese if they chose to do so.

The students were also required to participate in an activity club that met once or twice a week and was headed by one of the Japanese instructors. The clubs were centered around planning different activities for the students, teachers, and host families such as a picnic, a karaoke night, designing a 'yearbook' etc.. Students and instructors were expected to follow the "Japanese

only" rule during these club meetings, but as stated above, the extent to which this rule was followed depended on how much the teachers enforced the rule.

For the duration of their stay, the majority of the students stayed with Japanese host families. All of the host families were volunteers and although there were a few host families that were new to the program, many had participated in the host family program for several years. The members of the host family ranged from small families of two to large families of six or seven. The host family members had a meeting at the beginning of the summer program and were given initial advice on what to expect from their host student and were told of the types of mistakes, cultural and otherwise, that students might be likely to make. For example, host family members were told to take their host student through their home and point out where the student would need to change slippers to enter a room such as the bathroom or how to properly use the *ofuro* (bathtub). The host families were also told that since the students were in Japan to study Japanese that they should not use English when talking to the students, but that they could ask the students to teach them some English as a part of a cultural exchange. For the most part, the person who spent the most time with the student on a daily basis was the host mother. In fact, host mothers often participated in host family meetings, observation days, and other program events such as the annual "flea market" as the only representative of their family. This was in part because host fathers often spent a lot of time at work and host siblings

were usually in school and therefore did not have a lot of time to spend attending events or interacting with the host student as much as the host mother did.

### The Participants

**Table 3.1. The participants**

Students		Instructors	Homestay Family Members
*Name 1) Susan=	**Class level Intermediate (Bilingual Eng/Spanish)	1) Instructor Hoshino: Susan's intermediate teacher	1) Susan's Family: Mother, Grandmother
2) Amy=	High Intermediate	2) Instructor Endo: Jamie, Amy and Mandy's high intermed. teacher	2) Amy's Family: Mother, Father
3) Jamie=	High Intermediate		3) Jamie's Family: Mother
4) Mandy=	High Intermediate	3) Instructor Yoshimura: Lisa's low advanced teacher	4) Mandy's Family: Mother, Father
5) Lisa=	Low Advanced		5) Lisa's Family: Mother, Father
*Names have been changed **Based on a placement examination targeting reading/writing /listening/ and speaking ability. ***Age: 18-20			*Only includes those who participated in the study

As illustrated in Table 3.1, the participants in this study included five students studying Japanese, their Japanese teachers, and their host family members. Students were offered a stipend for volunteering for the study and prior to any data collection in either the host family or the classroom setting, I met with the students, the instructors, the classmates, and the host family members. During this informal meeting, written consent was secured from all participants, the research was explained, as were video and audio taking procedures, and I answered any questions or concerns the participants had.

## The Students

The five students that participated in this study were all females between the ages of eighteen and twenty years old. The students were offered a small stipend for volunteering for this study. They have been given the following names to protect their identity: Susan, Amy, Jamie, Mandy, and Lisa. The first language of all the students except Susan was English. Susan was a bilingual speaker of Spanish and English. At the time of the study Susan had completed two semesters of Japanese at the college level. Amy had studied Japanese for four years in high school and had completed four semesters of Japanese in college. Jamie and Mandy also studied four years of Japanese in high school and both completed four semesters in college. Lisa had also studied Japanese in high school and had six semesters at the college level. Both Amy and Lisa had been in Japan before on student exchange programs. Amy spent two weeks living with a host family in Japan when she was in high school and although her stay did not involve studying Japanese in a formal classroom situation, she accompanied her host family sibling to a regular Japanese school for a portion of her two week stay. Lisa had studied for a semester abroad at another exchange program in Japan that involved staying with a host family as well as receiving formal Japanese instruction in a classroom setting.

The initial intention was to get students from all the different class levels, however lower level students were reluctant to participate, saying

their Japanese was not good enough and the high-advanced students did not want to participate because they did not want to compromise their studies. Thus, the class levels of the students who did participate ranged from intermediate to low-advanced. Their class level were determined by the results of the initial placement test (described above). Susan was placed in an intermediate level class, Amy, Jamie, and Mandy were placed in the same high-intermediate class, and Lisa was place in a low-advanced class. All five students remained in these classes until the program had ended.

### **The Instructors**

After the students volunteered to participate in the study, permission was secured from their instructors to video and audio-tape their interactions in the classroom. Amy, Jamie, and Mandy were in the same high-intermediate class, therefore, rather than five teachers, only three Japanese instructors participated in the study. Hereafter, Susan's intermediate teacher will be referred to as Instructor Hoshino. Amy, Jamie, and Mandy's teacher will be referred to as Instructor Endo, and Lisa's low-advanced teacher will be referred to as Instructor Yoshimura (see Table 3.1). Instructor Hoshino and Yoshimura were female and Instructor Endo was male. All three teachers were native speakers of Japanese but were also fluent in English. All three had been teaching Japanese for several years in the United States. At the time of the study all three teachers were employed at American universities during the normal academic year and had come to Japan to teach Japanese in

the study abroad program only for the summer. Because of their familiarity with the United States, they were used to dealing with and teaching American students and were well acclimated to American society. Instructor Hoshino's class (Susan) had a total of ten students, while Instructor Endo's class (Jamie, Amy, and Mandy) class had twelve students, and Instructor Yoshimura's class (Lisa) had seven.

### The Host Family Members

This study abroad program had a well established host family program and for the duration of their study, the students stayed with a Japanese family. The number of members in the host family ranged from two to six, but not all participated in the video and audio recordings. The host families will be hereafter referred to as Susan's host family, Amy's host family, etc..

Susan's host family members were long time participants in the host family program and had participated regularly on a year-to-year basis for more than ten years. They could not actually recall how many homestay students they had before Susan, but they had considerable experience with foreign students and had often travelled abroad. In Susan's case, the main participants in the tapings were the host mother and host grandmother. Although the host mother did not speak any English, the host grandmother had studied conversational English for several years and often used English to talk to Sandy.

Amy's host family had also participated in the host family program for

a long time. Amy was their eighth host family student. As a result, they had a lot of exposure to non-native Japanese speakers and to American host students in particular. The majority of the recordings were just between Amy and her host mother, however, every once in a while, the host father participated in the taping sessions. In addition, although Amy's host brother and sister-in-law did not live in the house, they had come for a visit during which they were asked to participate in a taping session. Both of them had relatively little exposure to nonnative speakers of Japanese. Although no one else in the family spoke English, the host mother had been studying conversational English for several years and often translated words and phrases into English for Amy. Jamie's host family had only participated in the host family program twice before and out of all the host families that had participated in the study, her family was the least experienced with non-native speakers of Japanese. Taping sessions included only Jamie and her host mother, who did not speak any English. Mandy's host family had also participated in the homestay program for several years. Mandy was their fifteenth student. The family members included only a host mother and father. The taping sessions included both the host mother and father and were usually conducted during dinner. Both the host mother and host father did not speak any English. Lisa's host family consisted of a host father and mother. This family has also been participating in the host family programs for several years. The tapings were mainly of interactions between Lisa and

her host mother, but the father took part in one or two of the tapings. Neither the host mother or father can speak English. In sum, except for Jamie's host family, the rest of the host families had considerable experience with American non-native speakers of Japanese. They were used to talking with the students and are used to the types of cultural and linguistic problems that could occur in conversations with the students.

### **Data Collection**

The different procedures of data collection and data analysis used in the present research were chosen to enhance the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the study.

Credibility was demonstrated by using data triangulation, methodological triangulation, time triangulation, location triangulation and prolonged engagement as well as persistent observations (Denzin, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Davis, 1992). Data triangulation is the gathering of data from different sources (Denzin, 1978). In this case, information and interpretations of data were obtained from three different sources, the students, teachers, and host family members. Methodological triangulation is the process of using at least three different types of methods of data gathering that provide different types of data (Brown, 2001). The different types of data collected for this study included video and audio-recordings, journals, group discussions, and interviews. Time triangulation was also established by gathering data at different times during the school day (first, second, or third

period), different times in the host family setting (morning, afternoon, and evening) and at different times during the semester (beginning, middle, and end). Location triangulation is the process of using different sites from which to gather data. In this study, data was gathered from three different classrooms and from five different host family settings. Prolonged engagement and persistent observation as proposed by Davis (1992) were also established by conducting weekly group interviews, observations, and reviewing journal entries that were used to check the information provided in the audio and video-taped recordings. Moreover, because I have had a long-time relationship with the summer program itself, the teachers, and the host family members, I was familiar with the school, the classroom and the host family setting and I had build up a lot of trust with the participants prior to this study.

Transferability is also an issue that needs to be addressed when conducting qualitative research (Davis, 1992). The issue of transferability is addressed in this study by providing a thick description with which other researchers may determine whether or not the results may be applicable to other settings or contexts. This involves clearly describing the theoretical framework, the research questions, the setting, participants, the data collection procedures, as well describing and providing examples of the patterns found in the data, what these patterns indicate and what conclusions can be drawn from them in relation to the conceptual framework and current

research in the field (Davis, 1995). However, although the thick description was provided to address the issue of transferability, given the small number of participants as well as the distinct characteristics of the participants, it is perhaps unlikely that the sampling of participants in this study are representative of a larger population of study-abroad participants in general thus making it unlikely that the results are transferable to other contexts. Nevertheless, the thick description provided should allow other researchers to determine the extent to which the results may be applicable to other contexts or populations.

Dependability was enhanced by the use of overlapping procedures of data collection, through "stepwise replications", and by having a colleague code part of the data in order to establish an intercoder agreement (Denzin, 1994). As with credibility, one of the means of establishing dependability is to use data collection procedures that cross-validate information. For this study, the journal entries, group discussions, interviews, and recordings provided a lot of cross-validation of information. Using stepwise replications to enhance dependability involves gathering data a number of different times at the same location. In this study, not only were video and audio-recordings taken in the classroom and the host family settings at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester, but recordings were also done during different times of the day in order to ensure a sampling that reflected the range of interactions that participants were likely to engage in in the span of a typical day. Another

means of addressing dependability was to have a colleague code the data and calculate the percent of intercoder agreement. Thus, a colleague was given approximately ten percent of the data and asked to code the trigger types and the communication strategies used in the negotiations and the intercoder agreement coefficient was calculated as 92% (Brown, 2001).

Lastly, confirmability was established by retaining all the data including the audio and video-recordings, journals, and all observation notes and keeping it available for scrutiny by other researchers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

### **Video and Audio-recorded Data**

Video-taping was be conducted according to suggestions based on Duranti (1997) and Iino (1998). In the classroom and in the homestay, the video camera was set at a distance so as to capture all the interaction going on, and an omni-directional microphone and a tape recorder were used to ensure better quality recordings. For the classroom situation, the tape recorder and microphone were placed in front of the student(s) participant. In the host family situation, the tape recorder and microphone were put in the middle of all the participants. I influenced the interaction as little as possible during the video and audio recordings by leaving the room during the video-taping. This method of "remote observation" (Iino, 1998) has been shown to be the least intrusive and allows the researcher to avoid being pulled into the interaction. No elicitation methods were used to elicit the data and the participants were told to talk the way they would normally talk if the camera

and tape recorder were not there. In the first recording in the host family setting, the participants were very aware of the camera for the first 15 minutes or so, but then seemed to forget about it. For the classroom, the video camera was unobtrusive and did not draw attention even during the first recording.

In order to record the students' interactions with their host family members, twice a week, the students were given the video camera and tape recorder to bring home with them and return the equipment in a couple of days after they had finished recording two 50 minute sessions. The students were instructed how to set up the video camera and the tape recorder and they did so for each recording that took place in the host family setting. The interactions were recorded at a variety of different times, sometimes after school, during dinner, or after dinner, while still at the dinner table.

The video and audio-taped host family data originally consisted of 52 approximately fifty-minute recorded interactions between the students and their host family members. However, because analyzing such a large quantity of data proved to be nearly impossible, cross sections of the data were taken. Three recordings per student were chosen based on when they had been recorded during the students' stay. One was chosen from the beginning of their study, one from the middle, and one from the end. This resulted in a total of approximately 12.5 hours of video and audio-recorded homestay interactions between the students and their host family members.

A brief description of the type of conversations that occurred during

the recordings in the host family setting is also necessary to set a backdrop for the results of this study. Probably what describes the conversations in the host family most accurately is "informal conversation". For the most part, topics were chosen randomly and both students and host family members just talked about anything that they wanted to. On those occasions where no one could think of anything to talk about, the student could refer to a list of topics (given below) provided by me in order to stimulate conversation.

1. Talk about popular places to visit in America and ask about them about popular areas in Japan.
2. Talk about a vacation you've been on and ask about a vacation that they've taken.
3. Talk about American and Japanese every day cultural practices.
4. Talk about American holidays and ask about Japanese holidays.
5. Talk about a favorite movie, drama, TV series that you like.
6. Talk about a recent topics in the news.

Topics 1, 3, 4, and 5 on the list were used occasionally by the students but not for the entire duration of a recording. In general, the conversations between the students and their host family members involved talking about a variety of topics that were not preplanned and came up spontaneously.

Unlike the host family video and audio recorded data, I set up the camera and the tape recorder then left the room as the interaction was recorded. The recording time for the classroom setting was approximately fifty minutes, equal to one classroom period. Originally, 35 approximately 50-minute interactions were recorded in the classroom setting. However, to reduce the amount of analysis necessary, three cross sections of recorded data

were taken from the same weeks as they were taken from the host family data. However, the recordings that were chosen had to represent different periods of the instructional day in order to avoid any incorrect generalizations about, for example, the types of activities that occurred. Thus, three 50-minute recordings taken from all three classes resulted in a total of 7.5 hours of recorded classroom data.

The content of the interactions in the classroom mainly consisted of typical classroom interactions, including teacher-fronted exercises, pair work, drills, class discussions and the like. The recordings were made at different times during the language classes to capture different activity types as well as different times of the day: the beginning, middle, and end of the instruction day.

### **Journals**

Participants were also asked to write self-report journals after the recording sessions with their host family members and in the classroom. The journals were used to increase the credibility of the study by using overlapping methods that provide cross-validation of participants' feelings, observations, and insights about the interactions they engaged in with NSs. Bailey's (1983) five steps in conducting diary studies in second language research were followed. These five steps are the following:

- 1) The diarist provides an account of his or her personal language learning experience.
- 2) The diarist systematically records events, details, and feelings.

- 3) The journal entries are revised for public perusal.
- 4) The researcher studies the journal entries as data, looking for 'significant trends'.
- 5) The factors identified as important to the language-learning experience are discussed.

(Bailey, 1983, p. 74)

As an addition to Bailey's (1983) guidelines, I provided the participants with a list of basic questions to address as they wrote in their journals. The questions included the following:

1. Listen to the tape, or recall the taped session today and talk about any particular difficulty you had during the taping- either expressing yourself in Japanese or understanding the teacher or your homestay parents. Describe what you did or they did to resolve the difficulty. Was it resolved? Talk about how you felt about it. Include details.
2. Talk about your homestay and your interactions with your homestay parents. Mention anything memorable- especially when you might have had trouble understanding or being understood. Include details.
3. Talk about your class and your interactions with your teacher as well as your classmates. Mention anything memorable- especially when you might have had a hard time understanding or being understood. Include details.
4. Describe what you learn in class and in your homestay about Japanese language and culture. Is what you learn at your homestay the same as what you learn in class? and how you learn it?
5. Write about anything relevant to your study in Japan.

The students wrote in their journal three times a week and turned their entries in before the weekly group discussions so I could read the entries and clarify or ask questions about them during the group discussion. Questions or comments were also written on the diary to encourage

participants to provide further detail or include other pieces of information prompted by the entry.

### Group Discussions

For hypothesis testing and triangulating purposes, audio-taped group discussions in English were conducted on a regular basis once a week. This yielded eleven hours of audio-taped group discussions that were all used as a resource in interpreting the data. Since having the group discussion sessions with all the students at once proved to be difficult, the students were split into two groups: Amy, Jamie, and Mandy in one group, and Lisa and Sandy in the other. The way the group discussions were conducted was based partly on Spradley's (1979) interview methods. He describes ethnographic interviews as a series of "friendly conversations" rather than as interrogations. He spells out the following elements as important:

#### Elements in the Ethnographic Interview

1. Greetings
2. Giving ethnographic explanations
3. Asking ethnographic questions
4. Asymmetrical turn taking
5. Expressing interest
6. Expressing cultural ignorance
7. Repeating
8. Restating informant's terms
9. Incorporating informant's terms
10. Creating hypothetical situations
11. Asking friendly questions
12. Taking leave

(Spradley, 1979, p. 67)

For the most part, these elements were followed during the group discussions. I generated discussion on one hand by asking questions, and clarifying and confirming what had been observed in the video-recordings and in the journal entries and the students' comments, questions, or observations generated discussion as well. The students were often asked the same types of questions that they had already addressed in their journal entries as well as other questions meant to encourage reflection on their interactions with their teachers and host family members. Often, the discussion would turn to what the students thought of Japan, Japanese culture, Japanese people, and students' roles, expectations, changes in attitude, and their awareness of using and learning the language.

### **Interviews**

Lastly, the homestay family members and the teachers were interviewed once each for an hour during the course of the program. The interviews with the host family members was conducted in Japanese. They were asked questions designed to elicit mostly demographic data such as how long they had participated in the homestay program, their length of exposure to non-native speakers of Japanese, and whether they spoke any English or not. They were also asked to comment on their interactions with their students, what made it easy or difficult to communicate with their host family student with regard to the language itself or other aspects of language use (e.g., politeness etc.), and what they did when they didn't understand the

student or the student didn't understand them. The interview with the teachers was conducted in both English and Japanese. The teachers were also asked basic demographic information as well as what types of activities they did in class, what their style or philosophy of teaching was, and what they perceived their role in the classroom to be. Other questions inquired into how they treated student errors in the classroom as well as what they did when a student had trouble understanding or when they had trouble understanding the student.

### Data Analysis

This section describes the philosophy and methods underlying the analysis of the data. The data for the present study was overwhelmingly qualitative but the analysis combined quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative analysis was limited to descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages suggesting trends in the data. The quantitative analysis included interpreting and identifying factors, trends, and patterns in the data.

As suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), the qualitative analysis of the data generated as well as verified the research questions. Miles and Huberman (1994) discuss three steps in analyzing qualitative data. They maintain that a pre-analysis should occur before data collection. Essentially, the researcher should determine the conceptual framework that the study will be using, the research questions, and what instruments they will use to

gather the data - called data reduction. For the present study, the study proposal outlined all of the issues of data reduction before the study was conducted. Next, Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that the data must be displayed and analyzed during data collection. They point out that the process of data collection, data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions is not a linear process, but an interactive one, and stress the importance of analyzing data as soon as it becomes available, so that any hypotheses can be tested and more questions can be generated before the next set of data becomes available. Thus, in accordance with Miles and Huberman's (1994) suggestions, as soon as they became available, I watched the video taped interactions and journal entries, took notes on what occurred, what was said, noted any observable trends, and finally generated questions to be asked in the group discussion sessions as well as hypotheses to be tested during group discussions or upon analyzing subsequent data. Lastly, they suggest that after data collection the researcher should draw conclusions and verify any findings. This was done by a process of reviewing all the different types of data; audio and video recordings, interviews, group discussions from the perspectives of all the participants; students, teachers, and host family members. A colleague was also enlisted to code a portion of the material and an intercoder agreement was calculated in order to enhance dependability to the study.

To begin, the video and audio-recorded data was transcribed with a

pedal operated transcriber. The following transcription conventions were adapted from Ohta (2001) and used during the transcription.

**Table 3.2. Transcription conventions**

Italics	Indicates original language used in the data
?	Rising intonation/question intonation
:	Elongation of a syllable
(.)	Brief Pause (less than half second)
(0.1) (0.2) etc.	Timed pause by number of seconds
-	False Start
[	Indicates overlap with portion in next turn which is similarly bracketed
[[	Indicates double overlap with portion in previous turn which is bracketed as [ .
=	Speech that precedes and follows this marker is connected without any pause.
( )	Unclear speech. An approximation or guess at what was said may be written in the parentheses.
(( ))	Researchers comments enclosed in double parentheses
S1;, S2:	Unidentified student
SS:	Several students

(Ohta, 2001, p. 27)

### The Negotiations

After transcribing all of the video and audio-data that was to be used in the study, I first analyzed the transcripts for instances of negotiation. An instance of negotiation was identified by meeting the criteria of one of two types of the following:

- 1) One of the interlocutors overtly indicated that there was less than complete understanding and a joint attempt to solve the problem ensued.
- 2) The learner directly or indirectly indicated that they did not know how to say something and a joint attempt to solve the problem ensued.

After identifying instances of negotiation in the data, the first step of the quantitative analysis was to determine the frequency of negotiations in each recording and the number of interlocutor turns per negotiation. The number of turns was determined by using the following definition of turn:

Turn is a fundamentally solo-speaking interactional unit in conversation recognizable by participants as carrying some referential and/or functional meaning and therefore recognized as semantically and/or interactionally meaningful. In order for an utterance to be considered a turn, both talking and nontalking participants must recognize that the taker of the turn says something and that his or her activity is recognized as such with the nontalking partner assumes a complementary listener's role." (Maynard, 1989, p. 64-65)

Next, the frequencies of trigger type were determined. Each trigger type was categorized specifically as originating from a native speaker or a learner. The following labels and descriptions of each trigger type are defined in detail in Table 3.3 below. These descriptions were used to code the trouble source that had "triggered" the negotiation, hence labeled a "trigger". The list of trigger types was created based on the conversational data in both settings and what it revealed about trouble sources that led to negotiation. The types of triggers included lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and undetermined. Each trigger type was further differentiated by whose utterance had triggered the negotiation, the student's or the native speaker's.

**Table 3.3. Trigger types**

1. *Lexical trigger - NS*: The native speaker uses a lexical item that the student does not understand and this results in negotiation of the item.

2. *Lexical trigger - student*: The student has trouble using or producing a lexical item and this results in negotiation.

3. *Grammatical trigger-NS*: The native speaker uses a grammatical structure or morphological form that the student doesn't understand. This results in negotiation.

4. *Grammatical trigger -student*: A grammatical element in the student's utterance results in negotiation.

5. *Pragmatic trigger -NS*: The NS's utterance contains a pragmatic element that the learner misunderstands or does not understand. Negotiation follows.

6. *Undetermined trigger -NS*: Something in the NS's utterance causes a nonunderstanding/misunderstanding, the cause of which cannot be determined and negotiation results. This may include a reception problem in reception such as not having heard a part of an utterance etc..

7. *Undetermined trigger -student*: Something in the student's utterance causes a nonunderstanding/ misunderstanding, the cause of which cannot be determined. Negotiation results. This may include a problem in reception such as not having heard a part of an utterance etc..

The type of trigger was usually made evident through the content of the negotiation. If for some reason the trigger was not clear, I attempted to clarify the trigger type by examining the students' journals for retrospective comments or asking the participants during group discussion to comment. If it was still not clear, the trigger was considered "undetermined". Later, a colleague was asked to analyze ten percent of the data by identifying and labeling the trigger type and an intercoder agreement was determined.

In addition to counting the trigger types, the frequency of multi-party and peripheral negotiations was determined according to the definitions below:

- 1) Multi-party negotiation: Negotiations in which more than two people participated.
- 2) Peripheral involvement in negotiation: Negotiations in which the subject was not directly involved but had indirectly observed the negotiation (e.g., between classmates and the teacher)

Although I had not originally intended to include peripheral negotiation, there was good evidence to suggest that even peripheral participation in classroom negotiation is beneficial (Allwright, 1980; Busch, 1982; Ellis, 1985; Ohta, 2001). For example, in her study of the effect of three different input conditions on comprehension, Pica (1992) found that regardless of the input condition: (a) interactionally negotiated - self generated, (b) interactionally negotiated - other generated, (c) text that has been modified based on interactionally negotiated data), no significant comprehension differences were found among all three input groups. This suggests that learners who only participated peripherally equally benefitted from the adjusted input generated by teachers and more active peers. In the classroom then, students have the opportunity to directly and indirectly participate in negotiations which are both beneficial to their comprehension. Based on these findings, peripheral negotiations were included into the analysis.

Next, the classroom transcripts were analyzed to determine the different types of activities that the students and teacher were engaged in. For each portion of the transcript that included negotiations, the activity type was described and labeled. The activity descriptions and labels were provided either by using the labels the teacher used on their daily class schedules, students' descriptions and labels of the type of activities they engaged in, and or by general examination of the activities.

### **Communication Strategies Within Negotiation**

After determining the trigger of the negotiation, each interlocutor's turn in the negotiation was examined for the use of communication strategies. CS research has spawned numerous taxonomies due to the different theoretical treatment of the strategies. There is little agreement on how CS should be classified and to spend time on all of them in this section would be futile. For the purposes of this study, a taxonomy was needed that fit the view of CS as a tool in negotiation. For McMeekin (1998), a lot of taxonomies were considered but many fell short in their ability to describe both the NS and NNS use of communication strategies. Because Dörnyei and Scott's (1995, 1997) taxonomy includes CSs like those found in meaning-negotiation and repair studies it was found to be most appropriate for this study. Their taxonomy is on the broad end of the continuum of CS taxonomies and has received criticism for its lack of parsimony, but for the purpose of this study, it seemed to fit the data more closely than any of the

other taxonomies. Therefore, Table 3.4 below indicates a complete list of CSs that were examined in the present study. For further reference, Appendix A includes complete definitions and examples of each of the CS listed below.

**Table 3.4. List of communication strategies**

---



---

1. Request for confirmation	13. Sentence completion
2. Confirmation	14. Interpretive summary
3. Request for clarification	15. Approximation
4. Clarification	16. Use of all purpose words
5. Rephrase	17. Word-coinage
6. Appeal for help	18. Similar-sounding words
7. Other repetition	19. Code switch
8. Self repetition	20. Foreignizing
9. Asking for repetition	21. Comprehension check
10. Point/Gesture	22. Literal translation
11. Retrieval	23. Prompt
12. Trailing off	24. Display question

(adapted from Dörnyei and Scott, 1995, 1997)

Wagner and Firth (1997) make an important point about analyzing CS, that only those CSs that are made evident in the talk itself should be analyzed. That is, some CSs prove to be problematic for researchers because they involve too much "mind reading". Namely, some of the CSs in Dörnyei and Scott's (1995) original taxonomy, "message reduction", "message replacement", "use of fillers", and "feigning understanding" etc., are often difficult to assess in data. One cannot really know if a speaker is avoiding topics or using fillers to gain time unless a retrospective comment by the speaker indicates such. Although this study does include retrospective

comments from the students, it was not like carefully controlled studies where learners could be immediately questioned as to what their thought processes were when they did something. Therefore it was beyond the scope of the data to guess at the use of these particular CSs, and they were not included in this study.

Identification of communication strategies proved to be difficult mainly because sometimes several strategies appeared in a single utterance and all of them had to be identified. Accordingly, a colleague was asked to analyze ten percent of the data and identify the communication strategies therein so an intercoder agreement could be determined.

The discussions on negotiation and CS research in Chapter Two illustrated how negotiation and CS fit together from a theoretical perspective. However, the purpose of this section is to show how the conversational data in the present study was analyzed by integrating CS with a negotiation framework. Yule and Tarone's (1991) article is especially informative about how these two areas of research can be integrated. Citing Long and Sato's (1984) argument that interlanguage studies have focused mainly on the learner's speech and ignored speech to the learner, Yule and Tarone (1991) attempt to show how CS and negotiation can be used together to create an analysis of NS-NNS talk that looks at "both sides of the page", literally both participants' contributions to the conversation. They point out that negotiation analysis tends to focus mainly on the NS's contributions in the

negotiations, labeling the NS's use of requests for clarification and the like, but that the NNS's contributions are rarely acknowledged. Accordingly, they argue that CSs can be used to identify not only the NNS moves, but also the NS moves that seem to be ignored in the negotiation analysis (e.g., those that do not fall into the category of clarification or confirmation requests or comprehension checks). In support of their argument, they present an excerpt of a negotiation and compare and contrast how the excerpt would normally be viewed from a negotiation standpoint and then how CSs could be used to label the participants' moves resulting in a better analysis of the negotiation in terms of identifying the contributions that both interlocutors make in trying to create mutual comprehension. In a similar fashion, this section provides a typical analysis of a negotiation excerpt and how our understanding of that same excerpt may benefit from the use of CS to identify important moves that both of the participants make. An example of a typical negotiation is depicted in the following excerpt taken from Pica (1987). In this excerpt, the NS and NNS are talking about the NNS's country, however, a word that the NNS mispronounces in line 3, "*aysti*" (iced tea) causes comprehension problems and a negotiation between the two interlocutors ensues.

**Excerpt 3.1a [Example of negotiation analysis]**

- 1 NNS: I don't like because the people form that country- the mens and the womens - the men they think too much

- 2 NS: I've heard others say that also
- (trigger) → 3 NNS: my country say the people from there the many many times all time they say they are the last *aysti* in the Sahara
- (clarif. req.) → 4 NS: the last *asyti*? *aysti*?
- 5 NNS: they say maybe another word- in the Sahara, understand?
- (clarif. req.) → 6 NS: I understand Sahara but, I don't understand *aysti*
- 7 NNS: they say I am-
- 8 NS: right I am the last-
- 9 NNS: the last *aysti* in the Sahara
- (clarif. req.) → 10 NS: but what's *aysti*?
- 11 NNS: is too hot in the Sahara there are no water
- (clarif. req.) → 12 NS: no no but they're the last *aysti*?
- 13 NNS: *ays: ti*
- 14 NS: iced tea! I see
- 15 NNS: or the or the the last very cold coke
- 16 NS: all right I see

(Pica, 1987, p. 47)

It is easy to see that the above negotiation is triggered by the NNS's problematic utterance of *aysti* (iced tea) in line 3. The term "trigger" was coined by Varonis and Gass (1985a) and is used in the present study to identify the trouble source that causes the negotiation. Note that typically in a negotiation framework, analysis of the above excerpt would focus mainly on the NS's moves such as requests for clarification or confirmation (lines 4, 6, 10, and 12), which are generally labeled "conversational modifications" and how those modifications provide the learner with either comprehensible input, feedback on their interlanguage, or encourage learner modification of output. As for the NNS's moves, they are generally of interest to negotiation researchers only if the NNS attempts to modify their output in response to the NS's requests for clarification or confirmation, which could have implications toward SLA. This means that there are quite a few participant

moves that contribute to solving the problem, but which remain unidentified in the negotiation. This brings us to how communication strategies fit into the negotiation framework. Devices labeled in communication strategy research typically include those same devices labeled in negotiation; requests for clarification and confirmation, as well as comprehension checks. They also include such devices such as circumlocution, codeswitching, and word coinage to name a few (see Dörnyei & Scott, 1995, for a complete list of CS taxonomies and their definitions). Also similar to negotiation research, communication strategy research focuses on how language learners and their interlocutors overcome problems in communication, usually attributable to the learner's inadequate interlanguage resources. By using communication strategies within a negotiation framework, participants' moves can be identified as CSs, giving researchers a more detailed view of the moves that participants make within a negotiation that contribute to solving problems in communication. While Excerpt 3.1a (above) illustrates the labeling of participant moves in a typical negotiation analysis, the same excerpt (1b) below is labeled using communication strategies taken from the list of strategies used in this study (see Index A for definitions).

**Excerpt 3.1b [Example of negotiation analyzed with CS]**

- 1 NNS: I don't like because the people form that country- the mens and the womens - the men they think too much
- 2 NS: I've heard others say that also

(Lexical Trigger)	3	NNS:	my country say the people from there the many many times all time they say they are the last <i>aysti</i> in the Sahara
(other repetition/clarif. req.)	4	NS:	the last <i>asyti</i> ? <i>aysti</i> ?
(comprehension check)	5	NNS:	they say maybe another word- in the Sahara, understand?
(clarif. req.)	6	NS:	I understand Sahara but, I don't understand <i>aysti</i>
(clarify/rephrase)	7	NNS:	they say I am-
(other-repetition)	8	NS:	right I am the last-
(self repetition)	9	NNS:	the last <i>aysti</i> in the Sahara
(clarif. req.)	10	NS:	but what's <i>aysti</i> ?
(expansion)	11	NNS:	is too hot in the Sahara there are no water
(clarif. req.)	12	NS:	no no but they're the last <i>aysti</i> ?
(rephrase)	13	NNS:	<i>ays: ti</i>
(use of example)	14	NS:	iced tea! I see
	15	NNS:	or the or the the last very cold coke
	16	NS:	all right I see

(Pica, 1987, p. 47)

One can immediately see the difference between the labeling of participant moves in Excerpt 3.1a, which focuses particularly on the NS's moves in lines 4, 6, 10, and 12 as clarification requests, and that of Excerpt 3.1b, which identifies all of the CSs used by both the NS and the NNS. In this excerpt, not only do lines 4, 6, 10, and 12 remain labeled as clarification requests as they are in the first version, but the other turns are labeled indicating the type or types of communication strategies used in that particular utterance. For example, besides the request for clarification moves that the NS has made, we can see that the NS also used 'other repetition' (lines 4 and 8) among his strategies in an attempt to work with the NNS to overcome the problem. The NNS also contributes to the problem solving by using several strategies such as making a comprehension check (line 4), changing his/her original utterance slightly, called "rephrasing" (line 7),

repeating his original utterance, although unfortunately with the same problematic pronunciation (line 9), expanding the context of his original utterance (line 11), and finally, rephrasing his original pronunciation of the word (line 13) making it close enough to the English pronunciation that the NS is able to recognize it as "ice tea". Thus, compared to the typical negotiation analysis (Excerpt 3.1a), using CSs in the analysis, we are able to identify the key moves made by both participants and highlight the contributions that both participants make in order to overcome breakdowns in communication. Therefore, a CS analysis gives the researcher a better understanding of how both participants jointly contribute to the process of solving communication problems.

### **Conditions Thought to Facilitate SLA**

Three conditions created by negotiation thought to facilitate second language acquisition are comprehensible input, modification of output, and focus on form (see Chapter Two for a review). Following Pica's (1996) analysis, the extent to which NSs provided students with comprehensible input in response to student signals of comprehension difficulties was determined by calculating the percentage of times NSs responded to students' requests for clarification by clarifying their utterances, thereby providing comprehensible input. Similarly, the percentage of times students modified their output was determined by counting the number of times students modified their output in response to NS feedback in the form of requests for confirmation or

clarification. Lastly, the extent to which negotiations promoted focus on form was determined qualitatively, based on how NSs' feedback on students' unclear utterances drew students' attention to the gaps between their interlanguage and the L2. Focus on form was also evident when NSs reformulated their own utterances as well as students' utterances to provide students with target-like input and draw students' attention to form-meaning relationships. Thus, both qualitative and quantitative analyses were used to determine whether or not the negotiations in both the classroom and host family setting provided the essential conditions for language acquisition.

#### **Factors and Trends in the Data**

Identifying any factors or trends in the negotiations or in the use of communication strategies was ongoing and occurred during and after coding of the data. Such factors or trends were noted and support for these observations was searched for in the different data sources. In actuality, part of this step had already occurred during the initial viewing of the data and subsequent follow up with students during the group discussion and reading of journal entries. For example, an observable trend of a NS preference for requests for confirmation versus requests for clarification was observed in the host family setting and was noticed during some of the initial data viewing. This was confirmed by one of the learners who noted that when she made mistakes her host mother would often say something like, "you mean...?". Subsequently, after initially noticing the trend and then checking the

transcript data for more confirmation, a deeper look into the trend was conducted by examining the other data (journals, group discussions, and interviews).

## CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS AND DISCUSSION PART I: NEGOTIATION FREQUENCY AND LENGTH

The purpose of this section is to report and discuss the findings related to the first research question and is divided into three sections. The first section gives an account of the findings on the frequency of the negotiations that occurred in the classroom versus host family setting. The second section discusses the number of turns within negotiations (negotiation length) and the third section considers the different variables that may have played a role in the overall amount of negotiations that students participated in in the host family and classroom setting.

It is important to note that the quantitative data in this study was analyzed in terms of descriptive statistics suggesting certain trends rather than focusing on statistical significance, which is difficult to determine due to the small number of participants. However, the qualitative aspects of the data such as those found researcher's interpretive analysis, group discussions, interviews and journal entries served to provide another basis of information from which to identify and support tendencies in the data. In this way, the quantitative and qualitative results, while not statistically significant, work together to give a detailed picture of negotiation and communication strategy use in the host family and study abroad classroom.

### Negotiation Frequency

The first step in analyzing the recorded data was to identify all NS-NNS negotiations and then determine the actual number of negotiations that had occurred in any particular recording. Thus this section presents and discusses the results directly related to the first research question as restated below:

I. What are the similarities and differences in negotiation in the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family contexts in terms of:

a) The frequency and number of turns of NS -NNS negotiation and the factors that affect them.

Determining the amount of negotiation students engage in in any situation is important because it may have implications toward language acquisition in terms of the availability of comprehensible input, opportunities for modification of output, and opportunities to focus on form. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to provide an account of the amount of negotiation that occurred in the host family and classroom setting as well as providing a discussion of the following factors that may have influenced the amount of negotiation students and NSs engaged in. These factors includes unfamiliarity of topic, topic interest, describing abstract versus concrete entities, describing cultural entities, equal participation, the use of English, proficiency level, and talkativeness.

**Table 4.1. Amount of negotiation in host family and classroom setting**

	<b>Total number of negotiations</b>	<b>Number of 50 min. recordings</b>	<b>Average number of negotiations/50 min.</b>
<b>Host Family</b>	286	15	19
<b>Classroom</b>	133	9	14.8

Table 4.1 shows the descriptive statistics for the number of negotiations students engaged in in the host family and classroom setting. It should be noted that the approximate length of a single recording in both the host family and the classroom setting was fifty minutes. Therefore, because the NS-NNS data consisted of 15, fifty-minute recordings for the host family setting and 9, fifty-minute recordings of classroom data, the total number of negotiations was divided by the total number of fifty-minute sessions to reflect the number of negotiations per fifty minutes of conversation. The comparison reveals that the students engaged in an average of 4.2 more negotiations per recording session in the host family setting than in the classroom. Another factor to consider here is the number of negotiations students actually directly participated in. As stated in Chapter Three, negotiations that students did not directly but peripherally participated in were also considered in the classroom setting. Table 4.2 (below) shows the total number of negotiations per class and what number and percentage of those were peripheral negotiations. The table indicates that 61.65% of all negotiations that occurred in the classroom were peripheral.

**Table 4.2. Number and percentage of peripheral negotiations per class**

<b>Instructor's name</b>	<b>Hoshino (Susan)</b>	<b>Endo (Amy, Jamie, Mandy)</b>	<b>Yoshimura (Lisa)</b>	<b>Total negotiations</b>
<b>Total number of negotiations</b>	46	42	45	133
<b>Number of peripheral negotiations</b>	35	19	28	82
<b>% of Peripheral negotiations</b>	76%	45.2%	62.2%	61.65%

Instructor Hoshino's class showed the highest percentage of peripheral negotiations, Instructor Yoshimura's class the next highest, and Endo's class showed the lowest percentage of peripheral negotiations. Thus, the data indicates that students' participation in negotiations was more often peripheral than direct, with the exception of Instructor Endo's class. In the classroom then, students had the opportunity to directly and indirectly participate in negotiations which were both beneficial to their comprehension. The following comments from a group discussion illustrate the extent to which the students themselves believe they benefitted from this type of interaction.

**Researcher:** To what extent do you pay attention when another classmate and the teacher are trying to clear up a word or grammar point?

**Mandy:** I pay real close attention if it's something we'll be responsible for later like on a test or if I don't know it and I want to know, like if it's something I'll know will be useful.

Jamie: Yeah, like "check please", I wrote that down because I know I'll use it. And sometimes he (Instructor Endo) will call on you and you have to be paying attention otherwise you look like an idiot.

Amy: But sometimes when we go off on tangents and I'm not interested in it, I might tune it out. The other day when we were talking about South America though, and I remembered "*minami amerika*" (South America) and "*burajiru*" (Brazil) because I thought I could use it.

Thus, according to the students' comments, there are some caveats to consider when including peripheral negotiation in an analysis such as this. Namely, one cannot be certain whether students are paying attention or not during a particular negotiation. If the talk is "useful" to the students in terms of what they'd like to be able to say in the L2 or in terms of what they may be held responsible for on a test, it is likely that they will pay attention and benefit from a negotiation even if they do not directly participate in it. However, as Amy stated above, students may 'tune out' if the topic is not something they are interested in or that they will be held responsible for or if it is deemed not useful. These are some of the variables to consider when determining whether a particular negotiation has warranted a student's attention or not.

In addition to peripheral negotiations, most negotiations in the classroom, whether peripheral or direct, were multiparty negotiations in which several classmates freely interjected comments, explanations, and questions. In fact, instructors in all three classes facilitated an environment in

which students were encouraged and even in some cases required to contribute in situations where problems arose or an explanation was needed. Although all instructors were skillful in getting students to participate in multi-party negotiations, Instructor Yoshimura was perhaps the most adept at using other students as a resource when comprehension problems arose. For example, when a student didn't understand something, rather than explain it all herself, she often had other students explain it in the L2. Likewise, if she didn't understand what a student was saying, she would often ask for clarification from the whole class. She commented that as NNSs, the students often understood exactly what it was that someone was having problems with and could explain it more effectively than she could. It is precisely this aspect of multi-party classroom interaction that contributes to the belief in this study that the majority of peripheral negotiations are beneficial to students. To explain, most of the peripheral negotiations and even direct negotiations for that matter are multi-party ones in which instructors encourage the direct participation of several students. Consequently, students are more likely to be paying attention when they know that such participation is required of them, perhaps effectively limiting the number of times a student can just 'tune out'.

Although the above total calculation of the average number of negotiations per fifty minutes gives a general idea of negotiation frequency in both settings, it does not seem to reflect the wide range of negotiation frequencies from student to student and from recording session to recording

session. For example, Table 4.3 below shows the total and average number of negotiations per student and the number of negotiations for each of the three recording sessions. It shows that the total number of negotiations for the three fifty-minute recording sessions and the average number of negotiations typical of each student for any particular recording session varied considerably.

**Table 4.3. Number of negotiations in the host family per student per recording**

Student	# of Neg. for session #1	# of Neg. for session #2	# of Neg. for session #3	Total # of negotiations	ave # neg. per 50 min
Amy	16	17	13	46	15.3
Jamie	31	18	17	66	22
Susan	32	15	29	76	25.3
Mandy	19	19	14	52	17.3
Lisa	16	16	14	46	15.3

Susan engaged in the most negotiations to yield an average of 25.3 negotiations per fifty minutes. She engaged in as few as 15 negotiations and as many as 32 negotiations in a given fifty minute recording session. This is slightly higher than Jamie who averaged 22 negotiations per fifty minutes and had a range of 17 to 31 negotiations in any given recording session. Mandy was third as far as total number of negotiations and averaged 17.3 negotiations per fifty minutes and the actual number of negotiations per recording session was found to be fairly consistent. Lastly, both Lisa and Amy engaged in the least number of total negotiations, 46, averaged the fewest number of negotiations

per session and had a fairly small range of negotiations per session. Thus, breaking the frequency data down into the number of negotiations attributed to each individual student, it becomes clear that there is a wide variation of not only total number of negotiations that occurred per student, but also in terms of the number of negotiations that occurred in each recording session.

**Table 4.4. Number of negotiations per class per 50 minute recording session**

Teacher/student(s)	# of Neg. for session #1	# of Neg. for session #2	# of Neg. for session #3	Total # of negotiations	Ave # neg. per 50 min
Endo/Amy, Jamie, Mandy	4	15	23	42	14
Yoshimura/Lisa	15	15	15	45	15
Hoshino/Susan	15	13	18	46	15.3

In contrast to the host family setting where the total number of negotiations varied considerably between students, the classroom data revealed that for each class the number of negotiations varied little. To illustrate, Table 4.4 (above) shows that all three of the instructors' classes were similar with respect to the total number of negotiations and the average number of negotiations per fifty-minutes. However, as for the range of negotiations that occurred in each of the three recorded class sessions, there is some variability. While Instructor Hoshino and Yoshimura's classes vary little in the range of negotiations per recording session, the number of

negotiations per session in Instructor Endo's class varies greatly from as few as 4 negotiations in one recording session to as many as 23 in another.

**Table 4.5. Negotiation frequencies in the host family versus classroom**

<b>Student</b>	<b>Total # of negotiations in the host family</b>	<b>Total # of negotiations in the classroom</b>	<b>Ave. # of neg. /50 min. for host family</b>	<b>Ave. # of neg. /50 min. for host family</b>
<b>Amy</b>	46	*42	15.3	14
<b>Jamie</b>	66	*42	22	14
<b>Susan</b>	76	46	25.3	15.3
<b>Mandy</b>	52	*42	17.3	14
<b>Lisa</b>	46	45	15.3	15

\*Note that 3 students were in the same class, thus directly or indirectly participated in the same number of negotiations

A comparison of negotiation frequency in the host family and classroom setting in Table 4.5 above indicates that in a few cases, the amount of negotiation in the host family is similar to what occurred in the classroom. Note that for Amy, Mandy, and Lisa, the difference in the number of negotiations they engaged in in the host family compared to the classroom is small. For Susan and Jamie however, the difference is more pronounced. Susan engaged in 10 more negotiations in the host family setting than in the classroom and Jamie in 8 more in the host family than in the classroom.

To review, the total number of negotiations students engage in in the host family versus the classroom setting suggests some interesting trends. The first is that (according to Table 4.1 above) the average number of negotiations per recording session in the host family is higher than in the classroom

setting. In addition, there appears to be more individual variation in the range of the number of negotiations per recording session in the host family setting as compared to the classroom setting, with Instructor Endo's class as an exception. Lastly, two out of five of the students engaged in 8 more negotiations per recording session in the host family setting than they did in the classroom.

### Negotiation Length

Just looking at the average number of negotiations per fifty-minute recording session may be quite misleading in terms of determining the actual amount of negotiation students engaged in. For example, in the host family setting, that Susan engaged in an average of 25.3 negotiations per fifty minutes and Amy and Lisa engaged in only 15.3 negotiations for the same amount of time does not necessarily mean that Susan participated in more negotiation than Lisa and Amy in terms of the actual amount of negotiation. What is being referred to as the actual amount of negotiation is roughly defined as the number of turns in any given negotiation. The total number of turns in negotiations as compared to the number of negotiations provides a more accurate view of the actual amount of negotiation students engaged in. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the number of turns in negotiations in the host family versus the classroom setting.

**Table 4.6. Number of turns in negotiations in the host family setting**

Student	Total # of turns for all 3 recordings	# of turns in the shortest & longest negotiation	Ave # turns per negotiation
Amy	330	3 - 35	7.2
Jamie	419	3 - 16	6.35
Susan	565	3 - 58	7.43
Mandy	433	3 - 39	8.33
Lisa	333	3 - 19	7.24

Table 4.6 reveals three different frequency data based on the number of negotiation turns per student for all three fifty-minute recordings; (a) the total number of turns that occurred in all three fifty-minute recordings, (b) The number of turns in the shortest and longest negotiations per student, and (c) the average number of turns per negotiation. The data confirms that not only did Susan have the highest number of negotiations, but that she also ranked highest in the total number of negotiation turns, indicating that she engaged in the most negotiation. It is also worth noting that the longest negotiation recorded in the data was Susan's and contained 58 turns. Mandy was second in terms of the amount of negotiation engaged in and the longest negotiation she engaged in was comprised of 39 turns. Interestingly enough, Mandy's negotiations, on average, were the longest with 8.33 turns per negotiation and Susan was next with an average of 7.43 turns per negotiation. Jamie ranked third in the amount of negotiation she engaged in, but her negotiations appear to be the shortest and the length of her negotiations did not go beyond

16 turns. Lastly, the data shows that in terms of total negotiation turns, Amy and Lisa engaged in the least amount of negotiation of the five students. However, Amy's negotiations could be as long as 35 turns and Lisa's negotiations were fairly short, not going beyond 19 turns in any particular negotiation, similar to Jamie. This indicates that again, the total number of turns and range of negotiation length varies considerably from student to student and recording session to recording session. This is similar to what occurred in the classroom recording sessions although there is not nearly as much variation in the number of turns per negotiation in the classroom as compared to the host family setting.

**Table 4.7. Number of turns in negotiation in the classroom setting**

Teacher/student(s)	Total # of turns for all 3 recordings	# of turns in the shortest & longest negotiation	Ave # turns per negotiation
Endo/Amy, Jamie, Mandy	311	3 - 21	7.4
Yoshimura/Lisa	293	3 - 16	6.5
Hoshino/Susan	261	3 - 17	5.67

Table 4.7 reveals that in the classroom setting, those students in Instructor Endo's class; Amy, Jamie, and Mandy, ranked highest in total number of turns, longest negotiation, and average number of turns per negotiation. Ultimately, it shows that Amy, Jamie and Mandy engaged in more negotiation in class than the other two students, Lisa and Susan. Lisa

ranked second in the amount of negotiation she engaged in in Instructor Yoshimura's class as indicated by the total number of negotiation turns, and Susan engaged in the least amount of negotiation in her class. The number of turns for the longest negotiation was similar in Lisa's and Susan's case, not going beyond 17 turns.

**Table 4.8. Number of turns in negotiation in the host family vs. the classroom**

Student	Total # of turns in host family	Total # of turns in classroom	# of turns in the shortest & longest neg. in host family	# of turns in the shortest & longest neg. in classroom	Ave # turns per neg. in host family	Ave # turns per neg. in classroom
Amy	330	311	3 - 35	3 - 21	7.2	7.4
Jamie	419	311	3 - 16	3 - 21	6.35	7.4
Susan	565	293	3 - 58	3 - 16	7.43	6.5
Mandy	433	311	3 - 39	3 - 21	8.33	7.4
Lisa	333	261	3 - 19	3 - 17	7.24	5.67

Consistent with the comparison on total number of negotiations, Table 4.8 shows the total number of negotiation turns, number of turns in the longest negotiation, and the average number of turns per negotiation. It indicates that Susan, Mandy, and Lisa's negotiations are shorter in the classroom setting than in the host family setting and that they engaged in more negotiation turns in the host family than they did in the classroom setting. However, for Amy and Jamie, the negotiations were shorter in the host family setting than in the classroom. This is a bit misleading however, when the range is considered. Namely, everyone except Jamie had a wider

range of number of turns in negotiations in the host family setting than they did in the classroom. This meant the students' negotiations in the host family setting could be as short as 3 turns or as long as 58 turns as in Susan's case. However, in the classroom, the range was only 3 to 21 turns per negotiation. To summarize, the data indicates that for most of the students, negotiations are fewer in number and shorter in length in the classroom than they are in the host family setting. However, the extent of the difference varies from student to student and from recording session to recording session.

#### **Factors Affecting Negotiation Frequency and Length**

At first glance, counting the frequency and number of turns of negotiations may seem rather insignificant in what it can reveal about negotiation. However, making deeper inquiries into the reasons the frequency and number of turns in negotiations fluctuate from recording to recording, from student to student, and between the two different settings can reveal more about the nature of negotiation in both the classroom and host family and how it is affected by different factors.

For the present study, there are several reasons the frequency and number of turns in negotiations may have differed in any particular recording session. These reasons were determined from a variety of data sources. To illustrate, as part of this study students wrote comments in their journals after their taping sessions and in group discussions were specifically asked if they

had any difficulty communicating anything during the recording session as well as why and how they attempted to solve the difficulty (refer to the list of questions in Chapter 3). Students' comments such as "I had a hard time explaining ....." or "We struggled over....." or "I don't think s/he understood most of what I tried to explain about .....", often indicated when and why in the conversation students experienced "trouble" with communication. Accordingly such indications of "trouble" usually meant students had engaged in negotiation in an attempt to solve the problem. Thus students' comments in their journals and during group discussions as well as qualitative analysis of the transcripts were important in determining what it was that made a particular conversation "difficult" and in turn, resulted in negotiation. From these different data sources then, several factors emerged that seemed to determine whether or not a particular conversation proved to be difficult and therefore required more negotiation work. Specifically, the qualitative analysis of the transcript data and the participants' comments indicated that some of the factors that affected the difference in negotiation frequency, not only across individuals but also from recording session to recording session, were related to the topic or to the content of the talk. This includes factors such as topic familiarity, talking about abstract versus concrete entities, and talking about culturally based entities. However, qualitative analysis also suggested that other factors such as proficiency, talkativeness, interest, symmetric interaction, and the tendency to use English to solve communication problems also

affected negotiation frequency.

### **Topic Familiarity**

Students' comments in journals and group discussion sessions often talked about "not knowing" a particular topic and consequently how "not knowing" made talking about that topic more difficult. The issue of "familiarity" itself is two-tiered. There is a lack of familiarity about a particular topic in one's own native language, as when someone is talking about something they have little knowledge of in their native language (i.e., physics). There is also the level of familiarity with the vocabulary, structural grammar etc. that one might need in order to converse about a particular topic in Japanese. While there were instances when the participants were not familiar with a topic in their native language, most of these instances centered around talking about cultural entities, and will be discussed later in this section. It is this latter issue of lack of familiarity with how to talk about a topic in Japanese that students commented about most often and that will be discussed in this section. Thus, the issue of topic familiarity was defined as those topics that the students had not talked about before in Japanese or had not previously studied it in class (however familiar it might be to them in English). In one of the group discussions, Susan commented about the issue of familiarity.

I think I wrote this in my journal, but most of the time when I talk about something and I'm finding I'm having a hard time saying what I

feel, it's because I'm talking about a topic which I have never studied and don't have any words for. And I have no way to explain what I want to say and it's really difficult because in the middle of the conversation I'll run into a word I don't know how to say and it's really difficult, and I don't know how to use other words to explain it and by the time I get back to my point it's already lost. (*Susan-Group discussion*)

This observation about familiarity and its effect on negotiation frequency is not new in the negotiation literature and has been mentioned as one of the variables of task type. Both Plough and Gass (1993) and Varonis and Gass (1984) found that when subjects participated in unfamiliar as compared to familiar tasks they were likely to engage in more negotiation work. Similarly, Gass and Varonis (1985) had participants watch a video of a detective interviewing subjects in a robbery and then asked the students to work together to exchange information and determine who had committed the crime. They found that when students had more "shared assumptions" about the crime and who had committed it, they were less likely to negotiate because they were already familiar with certain aspects of the task and how it was to be solved. This effect of familiarity on negotiation is also supported by Pica (1992), who said that when topics and referents are so familiar, participants do not need to negotiate as often because they are faced with fewer communication breakdowns.

Specific examples from this study where familiarity proved to have an effect on the amount of negotiation that occurred in the host family include

an instance where Susan tried to explain to her host family mother and grandmother about her experiences in modern dance. During a series of lengthy negotiations where just about every word she attempted to utter resulted in a negotiation, Susan tried to talk about not only what modern dance was, but the type of modern dance she was interested in (described as “acrobatic”) and the detailed moves involved in this type of dance, including walking on one’s hands, flipping, picking one’s partner up, swinging from posts, and running around the stage etc.. The following excerpt is one of the eight negotiations that resulted from this topic. In this excerpt, Susan (S) is trying to describe to her host mother (M) a series of moves in modern dance, the first of which is walking on one’s hands. She has trouble describing this in Japanese so she first uses literal translation to describe the action, “walking with your hands” at the same time gesturing the action, and then appeals to her host mother for help, “for example, what is it called?”.

**Excerpt 4.1 [Topic familiarity and negotiation - host family]**

- 1 S *anoo te wa te de [te de de arukimasu to ((gesture of walking on hands)) [tatoeba nan to iu? um hand by hand when (you) walk by by hand ((gesture of walking on hands)) for example what is it called?*
- 2 M *[um [unun saka- te de aruku wa sakadachi sakadachi sakadachi suru ashi ga ue deshoo? [uh hm [uh hm uh handst- walk with your hands is handstand handstand to do a handstand (your) legs are up right?*
- 3 S *hai yes*

- 4 M *te wa shita?*  
hands are down?  
5 S *hai ah sakadachi no ato de* ((gestures flipping over))  
yes ah after the handstand ((gestures flipping over))  
6 M *hai hai hai e::h!?*  
yes yes yes e::h!?

Given Susan's attempt at describing the action using literal translation and gesture, the host mother seems to have no difficulty understanding what Susan wants to say. She provides the word for Susan in line 2 but still requests confirmation from Susan in this line and in line 4 that the action involves having "(your) legs up" and "hands down". Susan confirms that this is the action she is trying to describe and then uses the word provided to her through her host mother's feedback to continue her explanation of the sequence of dance moves.

As mentioned previously, this excerpt was only one of the eight negotiations that Susan engaged in to describe the series of modern dance steps. It seems fairly obvious that the inadequate knowledge of vocabulary to describe the different moves is the main reason Susan has to engage in so many negotiations to get her meaning across. A lack of familiarity with certain topics is most likely to be characterized by a lack of vocabulary with which to talk about the topic. Therefore, as in this case, the participants engage in negotiation to overcome their insufficient linguistic resources.

A classroom example in which unfamiliarity resulted in several negotiations is evident in one of Instructor Endo's class in which students

were asked to think about social issues they could create a class debate about (being married vs. being single etc.). The class came up with some topics and then proceeded to discuss arguments for and against each issue. The transcripts are rich with negotiations namely because, as Jamie, Amy, and Mandy reported later in a group discussion, they did not know how to talk about certain issues, the relevant vocabulary or grammar, and were not sure how to frame their sentences as opinions. Excerpt 4.2 is a negotiation from this class period, where Jamie (J) is talking to Instructor Endo (E) about a topic that their group has come up with for the debate.

**Excerpt 4.2 [Topic familiarity and negotiation in the classroom]**

- 1 E *un hokani wa?*  
un what else?
- 2 J *um jidoo shakai to uh tai! shizen no shakai*  
um automatic society and uh versus! natural society
- 3 E *un shizen no shakai shizen no nature ne shizen no shakai to ?*  
un natural society natural nature right natural society and?
- 4 J *jidooka?*  
automatize?
- 5 E *jidooka?*  
automatize?
- 6 J *kikai?*  
machine?
- 7 E *kikaika automation? toka*  
mechanize? automation? and the like?
- 8 J *hai*  
yes
- 9 E *a hnihongo ne high uh technology jyanai? high tech shakai to iu kotoba shinbun de shizen no shizen no seekatsu to hai tekku no seekatsu, hai ((calling on next group))*  
Ah, in Japanese isn't it high uh technology? There's a word called high tech society in the newspaper nature natural living and high tech living, yes ((calling on next group))

It is clear from the above excerpt that Jamie does not know the vocabulary to describe her debate topic, but approximates it with *jidoo*, which means 'automatic' in Japanese as in 'automatic door' in line 1. In line 2, Instructor Endo requests clarification, letting Jamie know that he does not understand what she is trying to say. In line 4 then, Jamie clarifies by rephrasing the original word *jidoo* (automatic) into *jidooka* (automatize) and Instructor Endo repeats this word as a request for clarification in line 5, indicating his continued incomplete understanding of the word Jamie is saying. Jamie responds in line 6 and clarifies by rephrasing again, this time using an approximation *kikai* 'machine' which has similar properties to the word she wants to convey, but is not quite specific enough. In line 7, Instructor Endo rephrases what Jamie said, *kikai* (machine) to *kikaika* (mechanize) and pairs it with an English translation of the word and then requests confirmation of the correctness of his interpretation of what Jamie wants to say. Jamie responds by confirming in line 8, letting Instructor Endo know that his interpretation of what she wants to say is correct. However, in line 9, because Instructor Endo finally understands what it is that Jamie is trying to say, he is able to give her the correct terminology for describing this particular societal issue in Japanese, which is "high tech living" versus 'natural living'.

Endo then quickly moves to the next group to ask them about the ideas that they came up with, essentially ending the negotiation.

This particular class session about the debate topics had 23 negotiations in it, the highest number out of all three recorded sessions and quite a bit higher than the second highest taping session, in which 15 negotiations occurred. Furthermore, after this class, a group discussion with the three students, Jamie, Amy, and Mandy revealed that it was a difficult class because they did not know the vocabulary and the grammar related to the topics they had chosen.

It seems obvious that students would have difficulty talking about something they have very little knowledge about in the L2, however, it is not so obvious that this would ultimately lead to more negotiations, especially in the host family situation. This is mainly because in the host family situation, there is always the option to abandon a topic and give up because the student may not feel as if they are responsible for the information that is communicated as they may be responsible for information in the classroom situation (i.e., as when information shows up on a test or homework later). In fact, Long (1996) suggests that free conversation is a poor vehicle for IL development because there is a lack of fixed topics or outcomes and this promotes superficial treatment of topics as well as abandonment of any topic that causes difficulty. In the present study however, this does not seem to be the case at all. Topic abandonment was rarely observed in the host family data

and students rarely made comments in their journals and in group discussions about switching or abandoning topics when things got difficult. On the contrary, what was very noticeable about the interactions between the students and their host family members, with the exception of one student (Amy), was the students' obvious determination to communicate their message no matter how difficult. They often resorted to lengthy negotiation as well as creative and elaborate use of communication strategies to get their meaning across. One of Lisa's journal entries supports this:

We still haven't recovered the word for 'moose'. And wasn't there one place where mom gave up on explaining something? That's rare. We usually hash it out until we understand each other, even if it's not completely. (*Lisa, Journal entry*)

The last question to be addressed on the issue of familiarity is, how is it different in the classroom and the host family setting? In this study, lack of topic familiarity is noticeable most often in conversations in the host family data, where a variety of topics crop up during the natural course of free conversation. In contrast, students rarely commented on instances in classroom discourse where they were unfamiliar with the topic. The only exceptions observed were in Instructor Endo's class when students were asked to come up with debate topics and discuss them and a few other instances where students were asked to explain words or concepts that had come up during classroom drills and that became a part of "tangential" talk. For the

most part however, students in the classroom were rarely asked to talk about things that they had not previously studied. It is as Pica (1992a) notes:

The element of familiarity can make classrooms particularly unfavorable as contexts for negotiation. (p. 451)

She goes on to explain that in the classroom, teachers often steer conversation away from difficult or unfamiliar topics so as to minimize students' frustration. In which case, topics may be so familiar and language may be aimed at a such a familiar level that students are faced with few communication breakdowns to negotiate. Thus, with regard to familiarity, the host family setting may generate more opportunities than the classroom for students to negotiate because of the likelihood of students encountering more unfamiliar topics in conversation.

### **Student Interest**

One factor that seems to have been ignored in the negotiation literature thus far is the issue of student interest in a topic. Foster's (1998) study is the only study that has even remotely mentioned interest as a factor in increasing negotiation. She observed that the students in one small group produced more speech and had more negotiating moves than any of the other small groups presumably because they were interested in the topic and put a lot of effort into debating it. Even though this observation was made in

passing, it is entirely likely that such interest serves an important role in motivating students to talk as well as motivating them to try to get their meaning across despite limitations in their interlanguage. Several students commented on talking about things that interested them either in class or in the host family setting and how this affected their attention, motivation to talk, and motivation to try to understand things.

Yeah, the other day we talked about Japanese weddings because my mother went to my host brother's wedding last week. She told me that everyone gives money to the bride and groom and that the bride changed her dress something like three times! See, this is the stuff we don't get ever get to talk about in class. And she showed me some 'omiyage' (gifts) that all the guests get to take home with them. Isn't that cool? We talked for over an hour. (*Amy, group discussion*)

My *otoosan* (father) was a kid after the war ended and he was telling stories the other night about the American soldiers that used to give him chocolate and ice cream. I couldn't understand everything he said but it was interesting because I'd never heard any stories about Japan after the war. I learned some new words like *heetai* (army) and *bakudan* (bomb). (*Mandy, group discussion*)

I was trying to explain my favorite movie, "Ferris Bueller's Day Off", to them and I was trying so hard because it was such a funny movie and I wanted them to get it, and they sort of laughed but humor is really hard to translate so when you have to explain everything in detail something gets lost, but I think they got the gist of it. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

When the teacher talks about something interesting, I know that I pay more attention. It's like we are constantly doing this, 'let's compare Japanese with American' all the time. It gets boring. and the other day when she had us talk about our *nakayasumi* (mid-semester break) it was like the whole class couldn't wait to talk. (*Lisa, group discussion*)

(In response to Lisa's comment above) Yeah, that's exactly how it is. Like today we were doing some drill and somebody brought up that

video game where you have to step on the arrows to music and she (the teacher) didn't know about it so we're all trying to explain it to her. It was so funny. (*Susan, group discussion*)

But sometimes when we go off on tangents and I'm not interested in it, I might tune it out. The other day when we were talking about South America though, and I remembered *minami amerika* (South America) and *burajiru* (Brazil) because I thought I could use it. (*Amy, group discussion*)

The general theme in all of the above comments is that when students are interested in something they tend to be more motivated to get their message across, produce more speech, and to try to understand what the other person is saying. All of this can lead to increased negotiation, namely because when students are interested in conveying a message or understanding an utterance, they are likely to try to overcome their lack of interlanguage resources through negotiation and the use of communication strategies. Thus, although there are no negotiation studies that have looked at the effect of interest on negotiation, students' comments above provide evidence from their point of view that when they are interested in something, they are likely to put more effort into listening to and talking about it.

### **Describing Abstract vs. Concrete Entities**

The second feature noted that made communication difficult was the nature of the word or concept being conveyed. For example, students commented that attempting to communicate an action or an object that one

did not know the vocabulary for required less effort than attempting to communicate an abstract idea such as "humor" or "freedom". They asserted that it was equally as difficult to understand an abstract notion that their host family might try to convey to them. The difference between describing abstract shapes versus real-world objects has been noted in the communication strategies literature but the negotiation literature has not specifically looked at the difference in negotiation with regard to abstract versus concrete objects. Faerch and Kasper (1986) wrote that,

Problems having to do with how to refer to concrete, physical entities like 'zebra-crossings', 'a pair of scissors' or 'a rabbit' can be solved by means of achievement strategies like paraphrase (description, exemplification) and use of gestures. Such strategies seem to be fairly easy for most learners to utilize,... Learners are faced with higher demands when trying to convey abstract concepts like 'nationalism', 'sacrilege' and 'hospitality'. In these cases, a different repertoire of strategies is needed. First of all, there are strategies that cannot be used (description of size, colour, shape, gesture, sound-imitation). (p. 185)

In not so many words, these were also the reasons students gave for the difficulty in portraying abstract concepts over concrete actions or objects. As noted above, one reason given was that actions and objects could be described through everyday words and limited grammar, and most importantly through mime and gesture. This last point about the use of gestures seems to be important in a lot of the students' communication with their host families and comments such as the following were noted in their journal entries and in the group discussions.

My host mom and I use a lot of hand actions and facial expressions when we talk, that's how we communicate when we have trouble explaining things. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

Yeah, like actions, if you show a good action they usually figure it out. My homestay mom picks it up so fast and she's like boom! got it. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

On the other hand, when students wrote about conveying abstract words, such as "superficial", "humor" or "freedom", they commented that it required a more 'sophisticated' level of explanation in terms of vocabulary and grammar and said that they often felt that they could not get their meaning across successfully. An example of this is Excerpt 4.3, in which Lisa (L) and her host mother (M) are talking about Lisa's favorite movie in which Catholics and Protestants fight for power in England. Lisa is trying to explain that if one group is able to take the 'freedom' away from the other, then they will have more power. Lisa has some difficulty with the abstract notion of "freedom" (*jiyuu*) and negotiates this with her host mother (M).

**Excerpt 4.3 [Abstract entities and negotiation in the host family]**

- 1 L *sono koto o suru riyuu wa maa jibun no ryuu ah chigai ryuu to ano nedan ano ryuu mo=*  
the reason they do that is uuh because one's own dragon  
ah different dragon and that price that dragon is also=
- 2 M *=ryuu? ryuu?*  
=dragon? dragon?
- 3 L *wa ano dooshite shita no?*  
why did they do it?
- 4 M *dooshite un*  
why un
- 5 L *ano ryuu ko-*  
well, dragon
- 6 M *riyuu?*  
reason?

- 7 L a::h (indicates frustration)  
a::h
- 8 M *riyuu deshoo?*  
reason right?
- 9 L *ah riyuu ((whisper)) freedom furiidomu tte wakaru?*  
ah reason ((whisper)) freedom do you know freedom?
- 10 M *un ((hesitant))*  
u:n ((hesitant))
- 11 L *jibun no koto o kimeru*  
you make your own decisions
- 12 M *kimerareru?*  
you can make decisions?
- 13 L *ji-ji- kimerareru jibun no=*  
ji-ji- you can make decisions, your own=
- 14 M *=un dooree no yoo na kanji jibun no koto o tanin ga kimeru tte iu koto?*  
=un like a slave when someone else makes decisions for them?
- 15 L *un soo*  
yes
- 16 M *jiyuu de nai koto?*  
not being free?
- 17 L *ah jiyuu! jiyuu!*  
ah freedom! freedom!
- 18 M *jiyuu! ah ahaha haha ((laugh))*  
freedom! ah ah hahaha ((laugh))
- 19 L *jiyuu to riyuu wa itsumo riyuu ah naruhodo ah wakatta*  
freedom and reason it's always reason ah I get it ah I understand
- 20 M *ah soo ah ahha ahah ((laugh))*  
ah okay ah ah ha ahah ((laugh))
- 21 L *ah sono hito no jiyuu o totte motto chikara ga takusan naru*  
ah if you take that person's freedom you get a lot of power
- 22 M *soo soo*  
yes yes

The negotiation itself is rather difficult to analyze because what each participant says or intends to say is not necessarily immediately apparent in the data itself. However, what is evident is that the negotiation is initially triggered by Lisa's use of a similar-sounding-word in Japanese (*ryuu*) for "freedom" which translates as "dragon", a word that sounds completely out of context here. The host mother requests clarification of the word Lisa used in line 2 by repeating it twice with a question intonation. However, in line 3, Lisa

seems to interpret the word her mother uses *ryuu* as "reason" (*riyuu*) and asks the mother if she wants to know "why did they do it?". The host mother confirms this in line 4, and Lisa responds with the same mistake, using *ryuu* (dragon) for *jiyuu* (freedom) (line 5). Upon questioning Lisa about this negotiation, she said she was trying to explain that both the Catholics and Protestants were trying to take away each other's freedom and that she got confused between the word *jiyuu* (freedom) and *riyuu* (reason), which she mispronounced as *ryuu* (dragon). In the next line, 6, the host mother guesses that Lisa is trying to say "*riyuu*" (reason) and asks for confirmation, but Lisa does not confirm this in line 7, instead she expresses some frustration. The host mother repeats her guess in line 8. In line 9, in line 9, Lisa seems to realize what word is causing the trouble and that her previous attempts are not being understood. Therefore, she first code switches into English, then foreignizes the same word making it sound more "Japanese". In the next line, the host mother indicates her that she does not understand. This prompts Lisa to find another way to explain the word in line 11. She attempts circumlocution, describing "freedom" as "making your own decisions", but fails to use the potential form of the verb (*~rareru*) which would have been understood as "able to make your own decisions". This causes an embedded negotiation, where the focus shifts from deciphering the word "freedom", to trying to understand Lisa's statement in line 11. The mother asks Lisa if she means to say *kimerareru* (to be able to decide or make decisions) phrasing it in

a request for confirmation in line 12. Lisa repeats the form the mother models for her in line 13, and with the new form attempts the circumlocution again. The host mother finally picks up on what Lisa is trying to explain and offers her own circumlocution in line 14, "like a slave when someone else makes decisions for them?", and requests confirmation from Lisa that her interpretation is correct. Lisa confirms this in line 15, and then the host mother asks Lisa if she means "not being free?" in line 16. Lisa recognizes the word *jiyuu* (freedom) that the mother uses immediately and both she and the host mother repeat it a couple of times in lines 17 and 18 to confirm it. In line 19, she tries to explain that she mixes up *riyuu* (reason) and *jiyuu* (freedom) all the time. Finally, in line 21, Lisa is able to use the word that she just negotiated to convey what she wanted to explain from the very beginning, that the Protestants and Catholics were fighting to take each other's freedom in order to gain more power. The host mother indicates that she understands in line 22.

Excerpt 4.3 clearly illustrates the difficulty that a student may have trying to convey something abstract versus concrete. This particular recording session between Lisa and her host mother was laden with negotiations of this type. It was clear from the transcripts that the conversation was mainly difficult due to the numerous explanations of words like "freedom", "jealousy", and "regret", all abstract notions. This was also one of the longest

negotiations Lisa engaged in, so it seems that because abstract notions are more difficult to convey, they may result in more negotiation in general.

In the classroom setting students made few comments in their journals or in group discussions about the difficulty of explaining abstract notions. However, there were instances in the classroom when abstract notions were negotiated. This included abstract notions that came up during the debate discussion in Instructor Endo's class such as "pressure", "to depend on", "automatic", "freedom" and the like. However, the length of the negotiation itself was rarely affected by whether the word was abstract or not, mainly because both students and Instructor Endo used English to shorten what would otherwise have been a more difficult and no doubt lengthy negotiation (use of English is discussed later in this section). Negotiation over abstract notions were also a part of a "definition activity" in Instructor Hoshino's class, where students had to explain a word in Japanese. Oftentimes if the explanation was not understood it would trigger a negotiation. Below is one such negotiation that was triggered by a student who did not understand another student's explanation of the word, *rikai suru* (to understand). As a part of the "definition activity", in line 1, Susan (S) explains *rikai suru* (to understand) by using another word in Japanese that means the same thing, *wakaru* (to understand). However, another student, S2, indicates in line 4 that he did not understand the explanation. Instructor Hoshino (H) responds by repeating Susan's explanation, rephrasing it somewhat in line 5. S2 responds

by saying the word "wakaru?" (to understand?) requesting confirmation from Instructor Hoshino that he has understood correctly. She responds by confirming and then expanding her explanation of *rikai suru* (to understand) to say that it is more formal than *wakaru* (to understand), and explains the parts of the word. In response, S2 indicates his understanding, although Instructor Hoshino checks again to make sure he understands and he indicates that he does.

#### Excerpt 4.4 [Abstract entities and negotiation in the classroom]

- 1 S *rikai wa wakaru [onaji desu*  
'rikai' is same as 'wakaru'
- 2 H *un un un hn hn hn*  
*[uh hm uh hm uh hm*
- 3 S *sore wa rikai suru ka wakaru? ((addressed to class))*  
that is 'rikai suru', do you understand? ((addressed to class))
- 4 S2 *un uh*  
no
- 5 H *rikai suru to wakaru wa onaji imi desu*  
'rikai suru' and 'wakaru' have the same meaning
- 6 S2 *wakaru?*  
to understand?
- 7 H *un un un soo desu ne: rikai no hoo ga chotto formal desu kedo imi ga onaji desu rikai wa*  
*meeshi? noun desu verb wa rikai suru*  
yes yes yes well 'rikai' is a little more formal but the meaning is the same rikai is a  
noun? it's a noun the verb is 'rikai suru'
- 8 S2 *ah*  
a h
- 9 H *daijobu?*  
okay?
- 10 S2 *hai*  
yes

Although this negotiation is over the meaning of an abstract notion, it is kept fairly short through the use of a synonym. Undoubtedly, had there not been a synonym to compare it to, the negotiation would have been longer and

perhaps have required more effort on the part of the instructor and student to negotiate it. The use of English here to describe the word as more formal and to break down the word into its respective parts, noun plus verb, also may have effectively contributed to S2's understanding of the word and thereby shortened the negotiation.

In sum, one can perhaps say that negotiation over abstract entities may increase the difficulty and amount of negotiation students have to engage in to get their meaning across, but that the extent to which students engage in negotiation over abstract entities varies in both the host family and classroom setting depending on the topic of conversation and the activity. As such, it is difficult to say whether the host family setting or the classroom setting encourages more negotiation of abstract entities.

### **Describing Culturally-based Entities**

Students claimed that trying to explain or understand something that required cultural knowledge often caused difficulty in communication. This ranged from not being able to explain why something was funny to trying to explain a tradition such as midnight mass at Christmas-time, to talking about dating in college. On the receiving end, students commented that they had a hard time understanding Japanese holiday traditions, idioms, and things rooted in a "Japanese way of thinking" (as one student put it). Faerch and Kasper (1986) suggest that this type of content in conversations (i.e., cultural

entities) proves difficult for second language learners to deal with and is likely to require the use of communication strategies to convey the precise cultural denotations and connotations. Accordingly, incomplete understanding between participants about cultural objects or practices seems to promote negotiation.

While talk of this sort was observed most often in the host family conversations, sometimes cultural notions were discussed in the classroom as well. For example, in Instructor Endo's class one day, nicknames were talked about as an extension to a grammar drill practice. "Honey", "cutie pie", and "pumpkin" were offered as typical American nicknames for loved ones. This prompted a lot of negotiation because Instructor Endo did not understand the meaning of these nicknames and asked students to explain. For example, Excerpt 4.5 below is an example of a multi-party negotiation involving several students trying to explain the meaning of a particular nickname, "studmuffin".

**Excerpt 4.5 [Cultural entities and negotiation in the classroom]**

J= Jamie    E= Endo    M= Mandy    S4, S7 = individual students    SS= Entire Class

- 1 J *um watashi no haha wa watashi no ani er watashi no ani wa* [watashi no um haha ni=  
um my mom my older bother er my older brother was called=
- 2 E {un  
{un
- 3 J =*little stud muffin to yobarete imashita*  
=little stud muffin by my mom
- 4 SS *ah ahha ahah* ((laugh))  
*ah ahha ahah* ((laugh))
- 5 E *little stud muffin?*  
little stud muffin?

- 6 SS *ah ha hhah ahha* ((laugh))  
 ah ha hhah ahha ((laugh))
- 7 E *little ne*  
 little right
- 8 J *ah hah*  
 ah hah
- 9 E *stud wa nan desu ka*  
 what is stud?
- 10 J *like like stud like uh*  
 like like stud like uh
- 11 S4 *stud wa tsuyoi* ((flexes muscles))  
 a stud is strong ((flexes muscles))
- 12 E *e:h soo oniisan? oneesan?*  
 o:h yeah older brother? older sister?
- 13 J *um uh ani*  
 um uh older brother
- 14 E *little stud muffin muffin wa nan na no? nani otoko no hito dake?*  
 what is little stud muffin? what, only men?
- 15 SS *ah ahah ahahah* ((laugh))  
 ah ahah ahahah ((laugh))
- 16 S7 *amai tabemono*  
 sweet food
- 17 E *amai tabemono? kore wa ii kotoba desu ka*  
 sweet food? is this a good word?
- 18 SS *ah ahah ahah a* ((laugh))  
 ah ahah ahah a ((laugh))
- 19 E *isn't it about a nice butt?*  
 isn't it about a nice butt?
- 20 SS *ah ahaha haha stud muffin* ((laugh))  
 ah ahaha haha stud muffin ((laugh))
- 21 E *ah stud muffin jya onna no hito wa otoko no hito ni stud muffin?*  
 ah stud muffin well women are called stud muffin by men?
- 22 M *wakarimasen*  
 I don't know

In line 1 and 2, Jamie explains that her mother used to call her older brother “studmuffin”. It is after a lively response from the students on this point, Instructor Endo seeks to clarify the meaning of “studmuffin” in line 9, asking what “stud” means. When Jamie seems to have trouble answering Endo’s question, another student joins in the negotiation in line 11, trying to give a sense of what the word “stud” connotes, “strength”, which he indicates

by flexing his muscles. Endo responds with another request for clarification in line 12, asking if this nickname is used for Jamie's older brother or older sister. Jamie clarifies that the nickname is used for her older brother. However, in line 14 it becomes clear that Instructor Endo still does not grasp the meaning or connotation of "stud muffin". This is evident because he asks again what it is and if it is only used for men. In response, the entire class starts to laugh. In the next line, S7 tries to explain "stud muffin" using circumlocution, 'a sweet food', but the explanation does not help Instructor Endo to understand the implications behind the nickname and he responds to this explanation with a request for clarification in line 17, "sweet food? Is this a good word?". The class laughs at this question, and then in line 19, Instructor Endo asks whether the word refers to "a nice butt" (he has possibly heard this word used in such a context before). This prompts another laughing fit from the class without any particular clarification. Next, in order to clarify who uses the nickname "studmuffin", Instructor Endo requests clarification as to whether women are called studmuffin by men. In the last line, however, Mandy says she doesn't know (*wakarimasen*) or she doesn't understand. It is not clear what she means here, but this effectively ends the discussion about "studmuffin" and the class moves on to another discussion of a different nickname.

Later, after class during group discussion, Jamie, Mandy, and Amy talked about this discussion about nicknames, saying that it was extremely difficult to talk about nicknames and what they mean, when of course, there

really is no meaning per se, but rather a nuance or an indication of a level of affection between two people or a kind of a joke. They commented that classmates' various explanations of "stud muffin" as a "sweet food", and then again as something that meant "strong" and "macho" was confusing and no one could really explain it satisfactorily to Instructor Endo, who, even till the end, seemed perplexed by the meaning of the nickname.

In a host family negotiation involving cultural concepts, Mandy had bought a towel-like cloth with Japanese writing on it at a temple in Kyoto and her host family tried to explain to her what the cloth was used for and what the writing meant. Upon listening to the recording, it was obvious both sides were struggling to understand each other. Later in her journal, Mandy confided:

All I learned was that this is some type of towel that people wear around their heads. What was he explaining about the sky to ground stuff? I can't figure out why, if it's a towel, it has writing on it. None of the words he said sounded familiar, but I didn't know even know what to ask or how. If I knew more about Japanese religion maybe I would have understood better. (*Mandy , journal entry*)

In another journal entry, Jill, who had been talking about college dating with her host mother, wrote something similar:

I tried to tell my mom who I was dating and about my friend who has had three boyfriends in the past two years. It was kind of difficult and I don't think she understood me. Maybe they don't have as many dating traditions as we do and it's hard to explain how American dating traditions are. (*Jill, journal entry*)

In yet another journal entry, Lisa wrote about explaining the funny captions written under the students' pictures in a Summer Program Yearbook that she had just received:

It was funny translating the album phrases because I wasn't sure if my mom would find any of them funny. See, sometimes it's not the words, but the culture that makes me unsure of my words. *(Lisa, journal entry)*

She also commented on the time she tried to explain her favorite movie to her host mother. Essentially, according to her journal entry (below) Lisa's perception is that her host mother did not understand European religious conflicts and this is perhaps why it was so difficult to explain (see Excerpt 4.5 above). However most Japanese people do learn about such religious conflicts in school so Lisa's perception may have not been entirely correct.

Also, I couldn't explain to my mom the intricate details of the Protestant - Catholic conflict of the time, not so much because I don't know the vocab., but because I'm not sure my mom's Japanese mind could comprehend European religious conflicts. *(Lisa - Journal entry)*

The examples and comments give us a deeper look at negotiations and why meanings of words may be understood by the participants at some level, but not completely in terms of cultural implications and practices. Thus, as suggested above, these types of negotiations may have less successful outcomes than describing non-cultural based entities.

For this study, cultural concepts were more apt to appear in conversations in the host family as compared to the classroom. This was perhaps because students' conversations with their host family members often involved more "individualized" talk such as what their daily life was like, what they do on holidays, what movies they enjoy etc., which often lent itself more to describing things that may be rooted in culture. As for the classroom, topics were more controlled so talk about cultural entities rarely came up. Even when they did, because the instructors were quite knowledgeable about American culture, they rarely had trouble understanding something. However, instances in the classroom where cultural notions did become the object of negotiation were observed in Instructor Endo's class. This is perhaps because he went out of his way to individualize activities like grammar drills, so students talked about things that had to do with American culture, such as nicknames or types of parties they have etc.. Moreover, although Instructor Endo may have understood, given the length of time he has spent teaching in the United states, he seems to have made a point of asking students to explain things in Japanese on the pretense that he didn't understand.

Thus the frequency of cultural notions in conversations may have increased the amount of negotiation students engaged in in both the host family and classroom setting, but the host family setting gave students more opportunities to negotiate about cultural entities overall.

### **Participant Structure**

Another factor that may have influenced negotiation in the host family setting was the fact that the conversations between the student and host family members were more "symmetric". Thus participants had equal rights in the conversation to initiate topics, to take and relinquish the floor freely, and basically contribute equally to the conversation. This type of symmetric interaction has been shown to facilitate negotiation. For example, in a comparison of teacher-fronted and small group work tasks, negotiation researchers found that more negotiating moves were found in the small group work task because students had equal participation rights and were motivated to participate in the task (Doughty & Pica, 1984; Pica & Doughty, 1985; Rulon & McCreary, 1986). They also found that negotiation in general was inhibited in the teacher-fronted tasks because one expert to many novices limited the participation rights of students in number and scope in a lot of classroom interactions by controlling the interaction and giving students little opportunity to speak. Accordingly, interaction was more asymmetric and one person controlled who had the right to participate, who could take the floor, who initiated or closed exchanges. The symmetry of the conversations in the present study was obvious upon analysis of the transcript data. Students were able to participate freely in conversations with their host family members and less so with their teachers in the classroom. Students chose topics they were interested in, freely participated in turn exchanges, and were generally more

motivated to participate in conversation because they were actively contributing. In the classroom, topics were nominated by the instructor and even if students were interested in participating, their participation was limited by the teacher.

### **Individual Factors**

All three of the features discussed above are related to issues related to characteristics of the topic or of the conversation; unfamiliarity with the topic, interest in the topic, describing abstract concepts versus concrete ones, talking about cultural-specific entities, equal participation in interaction. It has been suggested that these factors play a role in increasing the amount of 'difficulty' students encounter when trying to explain or understand something, thereby increasing the amount of negotiation and even sometimes influencing the types of communication strategies used. However, there were some individual factors that were also found to influence the amount of negotiation included; (a) the NS's knowledge of English and their choice to use it, (b) the student's level of proficiency in Japanese, and (c) the student's level of talkativeness.

A NS's knowledge of English and their use of it during the recorded conversations affected the amount of negotiation in at least one host family situation, but most noticeably in the classroom setting. Although instructors were asked by the summer institute not to speak English to the students, it

was often used to ease difficult communication and hasten understanding when time was a factor. As for the host family situation, only Amy's host mother knew English well enough to use it often. Amy's host mother had been studying English conversation for the past several years. Although her level of proficiency in English was not high, perhaps intermediate, she often used English on the individual word level, paired with Japanese translations to help facilitate communication. As indicated in Table 4.3, for Amy, the number of negotiations per fifty minutes of conversation in the host family ranged from 13 to 17. Tied with Lisa, Amy engaged in the fewest number of negotiations of the five students. This is in part because Amy's host mother often interjected with English to clear up misunderstandings and also knew concepts and words associated with American culture so that Amy did not have to engage in a lot of negotiation to clear up incomplete understandings. At the same time, Amy could resort to English to avoid difficulty in communicating something. In her journal, Amy remarked the following:

If I'm unsure of a word, I can say what I think it is in Japanese and then in English. If I'm right she'll (host mother) tell me or she tells me the correct way to say it. I've also learned new vocabulary by having her translate from the English word. (*Amy, journal entry*)

An example of Amy's host mother using English to help Amy understand something is demonstrated in Excerpt 6, where the host mother

(M) is explaining to Amy (A) that beer and cigarette vending machines have become a problem in Japan.

**Excerpt 4.6 [Use of English and negotiation in the host family]**

- 1 M: *dakara ima yappari sou iu koto ga mondai ni natte kara wa un biiru biiru tabako no kana juusu no hanbaiki koka kooru toka no hanbaiki jidoohanbaiki*  
so now of course the fact that these beer beer cigarette juice vending machines coca cola and such vending machines are open all the time
- 2 A: *hanbaiki?*  
vending machine?
- 3 M: *bending machine*  
vending machine
- 4 A: *ah!*  
*ah!*
- 5 M: *un wa koka kooru toka nanka no juusu no bending machine wa aru de ichinichijuu*  
yeah the coca cola and the juice vending machines are there and all day

In line 1, the host mother uses the word *hanbaiki* or *jidoohanbaiki*, which Amy does not understand. Amy indicates that she doesn't understand by repeating the trigger, *hanbaiki* with a question intonation, asking for clarification. Then, in line 3, rather than explain the word in Japanese and perhaps trigger more negotiation work, the host mother opts to code switch into English using the word "vending machine". Amy immediately indicates that she understands, and in the next turn, the host mother continues to use English for "vending machine" rather than the Japanese word for it, even though Amy now knows the word.

This type of English use was common in the recordings with Amy's host family, but it did have some limitations, namely when Amy or her host mother came across difficult lexical items or phrases that Amy's mother

simply did not know. Thus, in Amy's case, negotiations were often prevented or shortened through the use of English. There were also instances in the other host families when host parents used English words that they happened to know from the media etc., but they were relatively infrequent and erroneous pronunciation often caused negotiation rather than stopping it.

In the classroom, the amount of English each instructor used depended on the instructor. Instructor Endo policy on using English in class was fairly liberal compared to Instructor Hoshino and Yoshimura. As such, he and the students used English on a regular basis. Consider the following excerpt where Jamie (J) asks Instructor Endo (E) how to say "to depend on" in Japanese.

**Excerpt 4.7 [Use of English and negotiation in the classroom]**

- 1 J *oh um to depend on*  
*oh um to depend on*
- 2 E *eh?*  
*huh?*
- 3 J *doo yatte to depend on to iimasu ka you can depend on*  
*how do you say to depend on you can depend on*
- 4 E *depend on someone?*  
*depend on someone?*
- 5 J *hai*  
*yes*
- 6 E *tatoeba donna sentence?*  
*for example what kind of sentence?*
- 7 J *like depend on your wife*  
*like depend on your wife*
- 8 E *donna koto? tatoeba keezaiteki na koto? toka shinriteki na koto?*  
*what kind of thing? for example economically? or psychologically?*
- 9 J *zenbu*  
*all of that*
- 10 E *zenbu zenbu wa ne soo ne izoo suru sore ka rely on someone tayoru*  
*all that all okay to be dependent on or to rely on someone is 'tayoru'*  
*((Instructor Endo moves on to the next pair group))*

In the above excerpt, code switching is found in no less than six times, in lines 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 10. Each instance of code switching seems to decrease the amount of negotiation that is needed to solve the incomplete understanding here, which probably would have been more extensive if neither party had access to English as a resource. Admittedly, a reduction in the amount of negotiation may be one of the goals for both parties, particularly in order to make more efficient use of time and language resources in a setting that has strict time constraints. This type of negotiation is not rare in Instructor Endo's class, but is rare in Instructor Yoshimura's and Instructor Hoshino's classes. In their classes, the rule of "Japanese only" was adhered to quite closely and students rarely used English with each other let alone with the teacher. There were times that strict adherence to this policy was evident in longer negotiations that resembled those that frequently occurred in the host family setting.

In short, the use of English in the classroom and the host family often makes negotiation unnecessary or shorter, therefore reducing the opportunities students have to engage in negotiation and use the L2 to the fullest extent. The use of English in negotiations has not been specifically addressed in the negotiation literature. This is probably because participants in negotiation studies are told that they are to speak in the L2, namely because the entire point of the study is to elicit negotiation. Even so, such a restriction, however strongly enforced, does not necessarily exclude the use of L1-based

communication strategies such as code-switching or foreignization, which are often found in negotiation studies, but rarely remarked upon in terms of how they limit negotiation opportunities. In this study, however, it was important to not control for the use of English in order to gain a realistic understanding of the opportunities students had to engage in negotiation in different contexts. What can be gleaned from the data then is that the use of English varies in both the classroom and the host family situation. In the classroom, the use of English depends on how closely instructors adhere to the "Japanese only" rule and how often they disregard the rule to speed up communication in order to meet strict time constraints. The use of English is also similar in *Amy's host family situation*, where it is the host family member's decision to use or not use English. This probably depends in part on how well they think the student is able to understand them if they speak in Japanese as well as their level of patience in terms of engaging in lengthy negotiations over something that could be quickly and easily dealt with by speaking English.

Another factor that seems to have affected the number of negotiations in the host family setting but not in the classroom was the student's level of proficiency. There is some support for this in the negotiation literature, in which a couple of studies have indicated that negotiations between NSs and students at a lower proficiency level yields longer and more frequent negotiation as compared to those negotiations with students at a higher proficiency level (Holliday, 1988; Pica, 1987). For this study, according to class

placement tests, Lisa's level was the highest at low advanced, then Jamie, Amy, and Mandy, who were in the same high intermediate class, and Susan was in the low intermediate class. If more negotiation is associated with lower proficiency level, one would expect this to be observed in the data for both settings. However, Table 4.4 (above) indicates that in general, there is very little difference between the number of negotiations that occurred in all three classes. This indicates that another factor overrides proficiency level in influencing the amount of negotiation that occurs in any particular classroom.

Unlike the classroom, the effect of proficiency level is observable in the host family data. Even so, like the classroom, one has to assume a certain level of interaction with other factors at work such as the NS's use of English in decreasing the amount of negotiation. What is observable in the data is that Susan, whose proficiency level is the lowest, averages more negotiations per fifty minutes of conversation (Table 4.3). On the other hand, Lisa, whose proficiency level is the highest, ties Jamie for the lowest number of negotiations. In Susan's case, the negotiation frequency data is highly indicative of her lower proficiency level. Her conversations are characterized by numerous lengthy negotiations with her host mother. Comments in her journal indicate that the source of trouble in a lot of her conversations is mostly over lexical items:

I have big problems saying what I want to say because I don't know a lot of vocabulary. (*Susan, journal entry*)

and,

I was trying desperately to explain my honest feelings but I didn't know the words. (*Susan, journal entry*)

Although indicating frustration at a lack of vocabulary to convey things was frequently commented on in all the students' journals, it was particularly frequent in Susan's. In fact, she wrote down almost every word that she was not able to say in the taping session (what she could remember anyway) and often looked them up later or asked the teacher what they were in Japanese. Out of all of the students' host family data, Susan's data often displayed negotiations one right after another. Just as one negotiation would occur, another unknown word would crop up which would have to be solved in order to proceed and so on. An example of this is given in Excerpt 4.8, where Susan (S) is telling her host mother (M) about a family tradition of giving ornaments to family members during Christmas.

**Excerpt 4.8 [Proficiency level and negotiation in the host family]**

- 1 S *ue ni ano ano a::h muzukashii kono* ((draws with finger in air then on paper))  
on top um um a::h difficult this ((draws with finger in air then on paper))
- 2 M *hoshi?*  
star?
- 3 S *hoshi wa ue ni*  
star on top
- 4 M *ki no ue?*  
on top of the tree?
- 5 S *un ue ka [ichiban ue ka [ano onnanohito no tori no=* ((gestures flapping 'wings'))  
*yes on the top or on the very top or um a woman bird's=* ((gestures flapping  
'wings'))
- 6 M {un {un =hane?  
{un {un =wings?
- 7 S *hane*  
wings

- 8 M *un*  
*un*
- 9 S *onnanohito? ga ue*  
*a woman? on top*
- 10 M *a::h tenshi? enjeru?*  
*a::h angel? angel?*
- 11 S *hai enjeru da*  
*yes an angel*
- 12 M *ah hai hai*  
*ah yes yes*

Excerpt 4.8 shows that the first negotiation is triggered because Susan does not know the word for “star” in line 1, which she attempts to convey by drawing a “star” in the air with her finger and then drawing it on a piece of paper. The host mother offers her the word in line 2, *hoshi* (star) requesting confirmation that she has understood correctly. In response, Susan incorporates the word into her original sentence, explaining that “a star is on top”. The host mother requests confirmation in line 4, asking if the star is put on top of the tree. Susan confirms this in the next line, 5, and continues to try to explain that a star or an angel can be put on top of the tree. However, she does not know the word for “angel”, so she uses word coinage and explains it as a “woman bird”, and then tries to convey the word by miming a bird’s wings flapping. Thus, the second negotiation starts with line 5 and is triggered by a gap in Susan’s interlanguage for the word “angel”. The host mother guesses that Susan is trying to convey the word, “wings”, so she requests confirmation in line 6. Susan repeats the word her mother offers, *hane* (wings), in line 7, but line 8 indicates that she’s aware that she may have gotten the word for “wings” rather than for “angel”. For this reason, she

approximates, using the superordinate term, "woman", that isolates the semantic feature she wants to highlight so she can elicit the word for "angel", rather than for "wings". She phrases this in an appeal for help, indicating that she is looking for a different word than "wings". Her host mother understands this and in line 9, provides the word for "angel" in Japanese, "tenshi". Then, using an English loan word, she says, "enjeru", requesting confirmation. Susan confirms that this is the word she's been trying to convey, and repeats the katakana word for "angel". She does not repeat the Japanese word for "angel", possibly because the katakana word is easier, more salient or recognizable because it is close to the English word.

This excerpt illustrates what often occurs in Susan's host family data, one negotiation after another, usually triggered by the lack of lexical items. Lexically triggered negotiations occur most frequently in the all of the data (discussed in the next section on trigger-types), however, Susan's data, her journal entries, and the comments she made in group discussion, indicate that her biggest problem seems to be a lack of vocabulary, perhaps one indication of her lower proficiency.

However, while Susan's low proficiency may effectively increase the number of negotiations she engages in, the reverse may not be true for Lisa, who has the highest proficiency and the fewest number of negotiations (tied with Amy). In fact, Lisa's host family data, although characterized by fewer negotiations, may not be indicative of her higher proficiency level, but may be

more indicative of the type of talk she engages in with her host mother and father, often a sort of chit-chat about everyday topics which is familiar and not very challenging for her. The only time in the data where she was observed engaging in a significant amount of negotiation, was when she attempted to explain her favorite movie and the plot to her host mother. The movie was about England and the battle between Protestant and Catholic members of the royalty to gain control of the throne (see excerpt 3 above). This proved to be fairly difficult for Lisa to explain to her host mother and ultimately required a lot of negotiation work on both parts.

In the classroom, proficiency does not appear to be a factor in increasing or decreasing the amount of negotiation that occurs. For the host family, the effect of proficiency seems to follow a general pattern, the lower the proficiency, the more frequent the negotiation. Overall, however, it is difficult to determine the effects of proficiency as a factor affecting the amount of negotiation in the host family setting because other factors such as familiarity or the use of English may override proficiency in influencing the amount of negotiation that occurs in any given conversation.

The last factor concerns the student's motivation akin to their level involvement in the conversation. Manifested in their level of talkativeness, motivation, or willingness to tackle difficult explanations and to use their linguistic resources to the utmost of their ability. This factor is not observed in the classroom mainly because no one student seemed to talk more than the

other students in their respective classes. In the host family setting however, there appears to be some effect for “talkativeness” and the fact that some students were more willing to talk than others. Notably, Amy’s host family data indicates that Amy’s level of involvement in the conversation and general talkativeness is lower than the other students’. She is not an active participant in the talk. She often pretends to understand when she doesn’t and allows her host mother to do most or all of the work, and rarely ventures beyond “i” in the i + 1 equation. The host mother often resorts to interpreting Amy’s minimal utterances, phrasing them as requests for confirmation and Amy has only to confirm or deny the interpretation offered by her host mother. Consider the following Excerpt 4.9 where Amy (A) and her host mother are talking about the cost of speeding tickets in the United States.

**Excerpt 4.9 [Talkativeness and negotiation in the host family]**

- 1 M: *u::n dono gurai haraimasu ka*  
u::n how much do you pay?
- 2 A: *u:::n (.) ah- (..)*  
*u:::n (.) ah- (..)*
- 3 M: *nanmanen gurai wa haraimasu ka*  
do you pay several tens of thousands of yen
- 4 A: *ah tie*  
ah no
- 5 M: *ah sonna ni harawanai?*  
ah you don’t pay that much?
- 6 A: *a:h (..)*  
*a:h (..)*
- 7 M: *ah motto takusan?*  
ah more than that?
- 8 A: *tokidoki*  
sometimes

- 9 M: *un*  
*un*
- 10 A: *a:h (..) a:h a:h (...) muzukashii*  
*a:h (..) a:h a:h (...) this is difficult*
- 11 M: *muzukashii desu ka*  
*Is it difficult*
- 12 A: *hai un*  
*yes un*
- 13 M: *u:n*  
*un*
- 14 A: *ah speed [ni yotte (..)]*  
*ah according to the speed (..)*
- 15 M: *[un ah a::h!]*  
*[un ah a::h!]*
- 16 A: *ah okane*  
*ah money*
- 17 M: *ah juukiro obaa to [nijuukiro obaa to [sanjuukiro obaa=*  
*ah if it's ten kilometers over or if it's twenty kilometers or a person=*
- 18 A: *[hai hai hai [hai]*  
*[yes yes yes [yes]*
- 19 M: *=no hito ga takusan [okane o haraimasu ka?*  
*who goes thirty kilometers over they pay a lot of money?*
- 20 A: *[hai hai]*  
*[yes yes]*

Without going into a lot of detail, what stands out in this negotiation is that Amy has done perhaps the least amount of 'work' possible in terms of language production to communicate what she wants to say to the host mother, yet through a series of guesses and interpretations, rephrases, requests for clarification and confirmation, the host mother is able to successfully interpret everything Amy is attempting to say until the negotiation is resolved. However, Amy gets by with short utterances, essentially the bare minimum in output and the mother is doing a significant amount of work in order to communicate her meaning as well as interpret Amy's minimal output. One might argue that the reason Amy's output in this particular

interaction is minimal is because she lacked the vocabulary and grammar to convey the meaning, which is reflected in the following entry:

It seems that when I need to talk, I freeze up. While running on days after having a long conversation with my family, I think back to what I have said. I think of so many things I should have said, patterns I should have used, and stupid mistakes I've made. (*Amy, journal entry*)

However, this particular type of negotiation where Amy's participation is minimal is not rare in Amy's data, but representative of most of the conversations with her host family members. In fact, during one group discussion session, Amy indicated that she felt her host mother thought that it was so much work to talk with Amy one on one, so the host mother invited the host father and the host sister to join the taping sessions so she (the host mother) would not have to carry so much of the conversation. Moreover, a description that would easily describe Amy even in her native English, would be "quiet". Amy herself realizes this and made the following entry in her journal:

I'm really glad I did this project. Because I'm kind of quiet, I'm not real motivated just to sit down and talk for fifty minutes. It's rare that someone can get me to say much in general. (*Amy, journal entry*)

On the other hand, Susan is quite talkative, often tackling difficult topics beyond her level of Japanese, and makes use of every available resource she has to communicate. Moreover, almost everything she doesn't

understand gets negotiated until she understands everything completely. This often results in long, detailed negotiations where she does as much work as her host family members. The following excerpt is an example of the high level of involvement Susan displays in the host family conversations. Susan (S) is trying to explain to her host mother (M) and grandmother (G) that water in the United States has fluoride in it.

**Excerpt 4.10 [Talkativeness and negotiation in the host family]**

- 1 S *uh ha o [uh shiro ni narimasu? [amerika de [mizu | no [naka ni [arimasu=*  
*uh your teeth become white? In America it's in the water=*
- 2 M *[un [un [un [un [un [un [un [un*  
*[un [un [un [un [un [un [un [un*
- 3 S *=sooshite mizu no nonda toki wa [totemo ha ii [desu=*  
*so when you \*drink (mistake in tense) it's good for your teeth*
- 4 M *[un =ii desu?*  
*[un =good?*
- 5 S *un hai*  
*un yeah*
- 6 M *u::n*  
*o::h*
- 7 S *sooshite un daijobu*  
*so it's okay*
- 8 M *ha o shiroku suru mono ga [mizu no naka ni haitte iru? =*  
*there is something in the water that makes your teeth white?*
- 9 S *[un =hai*  
*[un =yes*
- 10 M *mizu no naka ni mo haitte ru kara?*  
*because it's also in the water?*
- 11 S *hai*  
*yes*
- 12 M *u::n*  
*o::h*
- 13 S *nihongo de ano koto wa namae wa nan desu ka wakaru?*  
*what is that thing called in Japanese do you know?*
- 14 M *hamigaki? hamigakiko? sa- hamigaki no sekken?*  
*tooth paste? tooth powder? sa- tooth paste soap?*
- 15 S *za- floraido? tto u:n tatoeba haishya ((mimes rinsing mouth with fluoride))*  
*za- fluoride? u:n for example dentist ((mimes rinsing mouth with fluoride))*
- 16 M *u- ugai?*  
*to ga- gargle?*

- 17 S *ugai hai hai uh tatoeba [ah ugai ((mimes gargling again))*  
gargle yes yes uh for example ah gargle
- 18 M *(un ugai [ah*  
[un gargle [ ah
- 19 S *ugai hai*  
gargle yes
- 20 O *ah koo yaru no wa mina to yaru no wa ugai ugai o suru to iimasu ((clears throat and*  
then does a gesture indicating spitting something out))  
ah everyone does this doing this is called gargling gargling
- 21 S *ah chotto :*  
ah wait
- 22 M *ah ahha haha ((laugh)) furorido !*  
ah ah ha ha ha ((laugh)) fluoride!
- 23 S *hai ano florido?*  
yes um fluoride?
- 24 M *hontoo ni gambatta ne anata ga*  
you really worked hard didn't you (to explain fluoride)
- 25 S *hai mizu no naka ni?*  
yes it's in the water?
- 26 M *ireru n deshoo*  
they put it in right?
- 27 S *mizu no naka ni::?*  
in the wate::r? (appealing for help as to how to end the sentence)
- 28 M *haitte*  
it's in
- 29 S *hai*  
yes
- 30 M *haitte ah ah ha ha ha ((laugh))*  
yes in ah ah ha ha ha ((laugh))
- 31 S *hai hai hai*  
yes yes yes
- 32 G *haitte iru?*  
it's in?
- 33 S *hai*  
yes
- 34 M *ah ha ahha ah ((laugh)) furorido?*  
ah ha ah ha ah ((laugh)) fluoride?
- 35 S *hai florido*  
yes fluoride
- 36 M *un aru*  
un it's there
- 37 S *mizu ni aru*  
in the water
- 38 M *dakara ugai o suru to ii desu*  
that's why it's good to gargle
- 39 S *un un*  
unun
- 40 M *atarashii kotoba o oboemashita*  
you learned a new word
- 41 S *un*  
yes

- 42 M *ugai ugai*  
*gargle gargle*
- 43 S *ugai ugai*  
*gargle gargle*
- 44 M *mizu o* ((mimes gargle))  
*water* ((mimes gargle))
- 45 S *hai ugai wakatta*  
*yes I understand gargle*

This excerpt shows Susan doing everything possible to convey her message to her host mother and grandmother. From the use of circumlocution in line 1 to foreignizing *floraido* in line 15 to mime in line 15 and 17, Susan uses every available resource to make her meaning understood. Moreover, Susan is not just content to have the host mother provide her with a word for fluoride (*furorido*) (line 22 - not a common loan word in Japanese) but she continues with requesting clarification and confirmation from lines 23 to 33 of how to say "it's in the water". Toward the end of the excerpt, from lines 34 to 45, there is a more confirmation and repetition of what has been said previously which serves to solidify the understanding that has been created during the negotiation. This is representative of the way Susan approaches difficulties in her language production as well as any receptive problems she is faced with in conversations with her host family.

If one considers that there may be a continuum that represents students' motivation in terms of their willingness to participate to the utmost in a conversation, undertake difficult explanations to get their message across, and utilize their linguistic resources to the greatest extent, Amy would be on

the lower end, and Lisa, Mandy, and Jamie would be somewhere close to the higher end, with Susan on the highest end. Accordingly, a low level of 'talkativeness' was one contributing factor to a low number of negotiations in the data and a high level contributed to more negotiation work.

### Summary

To review, the data indicates that students participated in more negotiation in the host family setting both in terms of negotiation frequency and negotiation length. However, the extent to which both negotiation frequency and number of turns differed between the host family and classroom setting depended on certain aspects of the content of the talk. For example unfamiliarity with the topic being discussed, being interested in the topic, describing abstract versus concrete entities talking about things that were culturally based, as well as equal participation contributed to a higher number of negotiations in the both the classroom and host family data. However, having equal participation rights, as well as talking about unfamiliar topics, topics that students were interested in, abstract notions, and culturally based entities was more likely to be seen in the host family data due the nature of informal conversations where a variety of topics often arise spontaneously, requiring students to negotiate the gaps in their interlanguage. Additionally, individual participant factors such as the student's or NS's choice to use English, the student's proficiency level, and the student's level of

talkativeness as well as their willingness to tackle difficulties and participate in the conversation in general, were found to affect the amount of negotiation work that occurred in the host family setting, but did not seem to be factors that affected negotiation in the classroom setting to any discernable degree. The proficiency effect was most noticeable in Susan's case, where a lower proficiency might have contributed to an increase in negotiations over lexical items. Talkativeness as a factor was most notable in Amy's and Susan's case. Amy, who was the least talkative, engaged in the least amount of negotiation and Susan, who was the most talkative, engaged in the most negotiations. In addition, NS and student use of English seemed to lower the amount of negotiation in Instructor Endo's class and in Amy's host family, but other classes and host families did not use English enough for this to affect the amount of negotiation that occurred. All of these factors contributed to the amount of negotiation that the participants engaged in, however, whether one factor was stronger than another in its effect on negotiation could not be clearly discerned from the data. This indicates that the amount of negotiation is not an outcome of one single variable but an intersection of different factors that contribute differentially to the amount of negotiation that occurs.

**CHAPTER FIVE**  
**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION PART II:**  
**NEGOTIATION TROUBLE SOURCES**

After identifying and counting the negotiations in each recorded conversation, the nature of the "trouble source" was determined for each negotiation. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to provide a detailed examination of the types of trouble sources that triggered negotiations in both the host family and classroom setting. It specifically answers the following research question:

I. What are the similarities and differences in negotiation in the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family contexts in terms of:

b) The types of trouble sources that trigger negotiation and the factors that affect them.

This section will begin with a brief comparison of the percentages of different trigger types as they occurred in the host family and classroom setting. Following this comparison, each trigger type is discussed separately with excerpts from the data illustrating that particular trigger type in the host family and in the classroom setting. Within the specific trigger types, the analysis is divided between whose utterance triggered the negotiation, the student's or the NS's. After each section, factors are discussed in terms of how they affected the types of negotiations that occurred in the host family and classroom setting. Lastly, a comparison is made between the factors that

influenced the different trigger types in the host family and the classroom setting.

**Trigger Types in the Host Family vs. Classroom Setting**

Table 5.1 (below) shows the breakdown of all the different possible trigger types and the percentages at which they occurred in the host family and classroom setting.

**Table 5.1. Trigger types in the host family vs. classroom setting**

Trigger Types by percentage of total triggers	Host Family Setting	Classroom Setting
% Lexical Trigger by NS	18 %	15 %
% Lexical Trigger by Student	53 %	49 %
<b>Total % of lexical triggers</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>64%</b>
% Grammatical Trigger by NS	2 %	7 %
% Grammatical Trigger by Student	11 %	22 %
<b>Total % of grammatical triggers</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>29%</b>
% Undetermined Trigger by NS	6 %	3 %
% Undetermined Trigger by Student	10 %	4 %
<b>Total % of Undetermined triggers</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>7%</b>

Another coder was given transcripts totalling 100 negotiations (approximately 10% of the data) and was asked to code them according to the trigger types listed below, revealing an intercoder agreement coefficient of 92%. Most of the time what had triggered a negotiation was revealed in the process of the negotiation itself, however, there were instances when it was

unclear as to what had triggered the negotiation and these were labeled "undetermined". Twice as many undetermined triggers occurred in the host family setting than in the classroom. Overall, however, in both the host family and classroom setting, the majority of negotiations were triggered by lexical problems, although there were slightly more lexically triggered negotiations that occurred in the host family setting as compared to the classroom setting. In both settings the majority of lexically triggered negotiations were attributed to student difficulty producing a lexical item. The data also indicates that the percentage of negotiations triggered by grammatical problems is quite a bit lower than percentage of negotiations triggered by lexical problems. Moreover, in contrast to lexically triggered negotiations, grammatically triggered negotiations occurred more than twice as much in the classroom as they did in the host family setting. The fact that the majority of negotiations are triggered by gaps in grammatical and lexical knowledge is commented on in the negotiation literature by Pica (1994) who says, "...negotiation seems to work most readily on lexical items and larger syntactic units" (p. 518). She goes on to point out that this does not mean students cannot negotiate about other more detailed parts of language, but that students tend to pay greater attention to the more salient parts of language because they are the things that cause the biggest disruption in the flow of conversation. However, in this study, there were some negotiations triggered by pragmatic and sociolinguistic problems that occurring in the host

family setting. These types of negotiations have not shown up in negotiation studies thus far. They were rare, only found in the host family setting, and all four originated in the student's utterance. They appear to be not worth mentioning because of their low occurrence in the data, except for the fact that pragmatic and sociolinguistic trigger types have never been found in negotiation studies before and they might provide new insight into the types of negotiations students encounter in the target culture. Therefore, they will be discussed toward the end of this section.

### Undetermined Triggers

Although negotiations triggered by an undetermined trouble source were numerous in the data, they will not be discussed as in depth as the other trigger types primarily due to the fact that there is little information gleaned from them. However, as noted above, negotiations triggered by undetermined sources were much more prevalent in the host family than in the classroom. This is perhaps because communication breakdowns in the host family could be deeply embedded in the discourse and not immediately visible on the surface as lexical or grammatical mistakes but perhaps more about missing contextual information, which is difficult to determine. Breakdowns in classroom talk were usually more identifiable because the talk was not as complex as free conversation and topics were often treated rather superficially as a part of an activity or task. Nevertheless, for certain

negotiations in the host family and the classroom setting, it was extremely difficult to identify what it was that had caused the negotiation in the first place. This was especially the case when negotiations started with global strategies such as "eh?" or "what?" that did not give any indication as to what had caused the non-understanding, therefore it was often difficult to determine if comprehension problems were due to difficulty with sound-segmentation, lexical items, clause-level syntax, to difficulties on a discourse level, or all of the above. Accordingly, these negotiations, in which the trigger was not made evident in the negotiation itself were labeled "undetermined". Also subsumed under undetermined were those negotiations that occurred possibly because of hearing problems, as when someone simply did not hear an utterance and asked for repetition. Originally negotiations caused by such hearing problems were labeled as a separate trigger category, however, it was often difficult to determine whether a participant asked for repetition, clarification, or confirmation simply because they did not hear, or because they did not understand. Therefore, negotiations which may have been due to incomplete hearing were subsumed under "undetermined" to avoid miscategorizing them.

### Lexical Triggers

The fact that the majority of negotiations in both the host family and the classroom setting are triggered by lexical problems is not unusual.

Essentially, lexis is "the linguistic material with the highest information load" (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997, p. 7). As such, lexis has long been a focus of communication strategies and negotiation studies because it is so salient and abundant in the data. The issue of "awareness" of lexical difficulties also makes it possible to obtain retrospective comments from subjects on the strategies they used to overcome their lexical problems. In fact, even when students are asked to focus on other aspects of their interlanguage such as grammar, they are not always able to do so. One such study illustrates that this is indeed the case. In Glahn (1980), students were asked to provide retrospective comments on their adjective morphology and vocabulary, but were only able to provide comments on their choice of vocabulary even after they were given instruction on and asked to focus their attention on their adjective morphology. Similarly, in this study, the frequency data from the transcripts and the qualitative data from the journals suggests how important lexical knowledge is to communication in general and that difficulties in lexis are highly salient to learners. To illustrate, most of the lexically triggered negotiations in this study originated in the students' utterances and this was made evident in the data as well as commented on in the student journals, where students wrote about difficulties that occurred in conversations because they lacked the appropriate vocabulary to express what they wanted to say. The following comments show the students' awareness of the importance of lexical knowledge in communicating in Japanese.

I found that I struggled throughout the conversation because I didn't have the vocabulary needed to express my point. *(Amy, journal entry)*

For all the words I didn't know I went straight to the definitions because for the life of me, I didn't know the vocab. *(Lisa, journal entry)*

I just have to tell you how frustrated I get because I don't know certain vocab. words. It really makes conversation hard - and at times uncomfortable - especially when both people are talking and don't know what the other is saying. *(Jamie, journal entry)*

Similarly, a comment often made by the students in group discussion sessions was that if they knew the vocabulary they could say just about anything, even if they didn't know the grammar. Thus, what may serve as a testament to the saliency and frequency of lexically-triggered negotiations is the fact that students were able to clearly remember a lot of the vocabulary items they had trouble with during the recordings and often wrote them down in their journals, looked them up in their dictionaries later, or asked someone about them.

Because student triggered lexical negotiations were more frequent in the data, this section breaks down the description of lexical negotiations first between student triggered lexical negotiations in the host family and classroom setting and then between NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family and classroom setting. In each particular subsection, factors found to influence lexical negotiation are discussed. Lastly a summary and comparison of the factors found to affect lexical negotiation in the host family and classroom setting is presented.

### Student triggered lexical negotiations in the host family and classroom.

The majority of lexical negotiations in the host family setting originated in the student's speech. This means that students encountered more problems when they tried to produce a lexical item than when they didn't understand a lexical item in the NS's speech. In the host family lexical negotiations were so common often two or more lexically-triggered negotiations would occur one right after the other and negotiations often become embedded one inside another. While this occurred in all of the students' data, it was especially common in Susan's case. Her lexical negotiations were frequent and often occurred one after the other as she tried to convey one word, only to get caught up using other words that she did not know in order to explain the first word. An example of this is in Excerpt 5.2 below, where Susan (S) is trying to explain to her host mother (M) and her host sister (N) about a Christmas light show in her home town but runs across several words that she does not know.

#### Excerpt 5.2 [Student triggered lexical negotiation - host family]

- 1 S *anoo wasuremashita demo kurisumasu hi [ mina takusan taberu ato de {neru no wa=*  
well I forgot but on Christmas after everyone eats a lot because it's =
- 2 M *[un [uh hm [un [uh hm*
- 3 S = *muzukashii [kara warui kimochi ga totemo onaka ippai [mina netakunai=*  
=difficult to sleep you feel bad your stomach is so full you don't want to sleep=
- 4 M *[un [uh hm [un [uh hm*
- 5 S =*sooshite app- soto wa totemo ookii denki [matsuri janai demo tatoeba* ((gestures in  
air indicating lights hung up))  
=*app- outside there is a big light festival not really but for example=* ((gestures in air  
indicating lights hung up))

- 6 M [un  
kazatte  
[uh hm  
decorated prettily  
=un kiree ni  
= un hm
- 7 S kiree ja ano nan to iu ki tatatoeba kyoo watashi wa kono kotoba wakarimasen deshita  
watashi no ie naka ni [takusan ki to ano ((gestures the shape of Christmas/pine tree))  
pretty well what is that tree? for example today I didn't know this word in my house  
there are lots of trees and that ((gestures the shape of Christmas/pine tree))
- 8 M un chokoku?  
uh sculpture?
- 9 S chokoku ?  
sculpture?
- 10 M un  
yes
- 11 S okay oh ano ah botanic gaaden wakaru? ((to N - host sister))  
okay oh that ah do you know botanic garden? ((to N - host sister))
- 12 M nan no niwa da tte? ((to N - host sister))  
what kind of garden did she say?
- 13 N shokubutsuen?  
a botanical garden?
- 14 M shokubutsuen?  
a botanical garden?
- 15 S hai to omoo sooshite kuruma no naka ni ano: teepu o moraimasu ah uh teepu teepu wa  
kurisumasu ongaku ga arimasu  
yeah I think. so in the car um you receive a tape ah uh on the tape tape is  
Christmas music
- 16 M unun  
uh hm uh hm
- 17 S sooshite ano teepu wa kuruma no um nan to iu irete? [sono ato de [ano nan to iu? sho-  
soto=  
so the tape what do you call it? put? it in the car um [after that [that what do you call  
it? sho- outside=
- 18 M [unun [un  
[uhhm uh hm [uh hm
- 19 S =[desu ano teepu o kuruma no naka ni irete [unten shimasu ano teepu [o kikinagara  
denki o=  
=[you put that tape in the car and while you listen to the tape you drive and
- 20 M [unun [un [un  
[uh hm uh hm [uh hm [uh hm
- 21 S =mimasu  
=see the lights
- 22 M u::nununun  
hm:: uhuhuh
- 23 S sooshite tatoeba [um koko hajimarimasu [o koko owarimasu ((gestures a beginning &  
end point))=  
so for example it starts here and ends here ((gestures a beginning and ending point)) =
- 24 M [un  
[uh hm
- 25 S =[o kuruma naka ni tanoshimimasu  
=[you can enjoy it inside your car

- 26 M [un  
[uh hm
- 27 S *o um naka sore wa denki santa claus to iroiro na koto o kuruma wa naka ni ikimasu?*  
o um inside that is lights santa claus and other things the car can go inside?
- 28 M *unununun*  
uhhm uh hm uhhm
- 29 S *sooshite wa naka soto desu ah eigo de light show?*  
then it's inside outside ah in English light show?
- 30 M *un raito sho ununun*  
uhhm light show uhhm uhhmuhhm
- 31 S *sore wa kiree umi mo*  
that's pretty, the ocean too
- 32 M *doko no machi demo shimasu ka*  
do they do it in every town?
- 33 S *ah hah dokodemo shimasu*  
ah hah they do it everywhere

In line 1, 3, and 5, Susan is trying to describe a light show that is set up for Christmas-time viewing in her hometown. The first lexical problem she runs into is "light show", which she tries to describe in line 5 by using circumlocution, "*totemo ookii denki matsuri*" (a very big light festival). In this same line, to illustrate what she is talking about, Susan tries to convey "lights strung up", but does not know the words for it so she gestures in the air indicating lights strung up on something. The host mother seems to understand what Susan is talking about and in line 6 provides Susan with the necessary vocabulary "*kiree ni kazatte*" (decorated prettily). In line 7 however, it is clear that Susan wants to convey more about the light show. She wants to know the name of a tree, presumably a pine tree, so she makes the shape of a pine tree or Christmas tree in the air. Her host mother guesses in line 8 that Susan is trying to say "sculpture" (*chokoku*). Susan repeats the word in line 9 with a request for confirmation that she has heard the word correctly and the

host mother confirms in line 10. Then, in line 11, not quite through with what she wants to convey, Susan code switches into English, asking her host mother and sister if they know what a "botanic garden" is. In line 12, the host mother, who has recognized the English word "garden" asks the host sister what type of garden Susan is referring to. The host sister, who knows a little bit of English, guesses that Susan wants to say "*shokubutsukan*" (Botanical garden) in Japanese, and in line 13, asks for confirmation from Susan whether this is the word she's trying to convey. The host mother repeats the word in the same fashion in line 14. In line 15, Susan responds that she thinks this is the word she's looking for and goes on with her explanation of how viewing the light show works. In line 17, Susan comes across two words that she is not sure of, "*irete*" (to put in) and "*soto*" (outside). She prefaces each word that she is unsure of with, "*nan to iu*" (how do you say/what do you call it?) and then says the word that she thinks it is, asking for confirmation by using a question intonation as she says the word. Both times, the host mother confirms, in lines 18 and 20, that Susan has used the correct word. Susan continues to explain, and in line 27, when she is unsure of another word "*ikimasu*" (to go), she again checks her accuracy with a request for confirmation. The host mother confirms that she has understood in line 28. After explaining all the details of the light show in order to give her host mother and sister an idea of what it is, in line 29, Susan finally comes back to the original trigger, her lack of a vocabulary item for "light show". This times,

instead of circumlocution, Susan code switches into English saying, "*eigo de light show*" (it's called a light show in English). Her host mother indicates that she understands the phrase "light show" by repeating it in foreignized Japanese pronunciation in line 30, ending the series of negotiations.

Although the phrase "light show" is not a loan word found in a Japanese loan word dictionary and most Japanese may not have ever heard this phrase, it consists of two well known English words, "light" + "show" so most Japanese would be able to figure out what it means. In fact, along with Susan's original circumlocution in line 5, "*totemo ookii denki matsuri*" (a very big light festival) and her detailed explanation, the host mother and sister probably understood without having to know the exact word for "light show".

Susan's negotiation above illustrates the extreme end of lexical negotiations in the host family setting. This occurs when the student, trying to explain a concept etc., comes across one unknown word after another, only to have to negotiate all of the words in order to get their initial meaning across. As in this negotiation, it happened every so often that students would go to great lengths to explain something, making use of several different strategies, only to discover at the end that if they had said the word using a katakana-Japanese pronunciation the host family member may have been able to recognize it based on their extensive knowledge of English loanwords.

Careful analysis of the data suggests that there were several factors that

affected student triggered lexical negotiations in the host family. First, as noted above, lexical knowledge plays an important role in communication and therefore lexical negotiations in general are most likely to dominate the types of negotiations that get triggered in any setting. However, other factors that may have contributed to student triggered lexical difficulties and consequently more lexical negotiation include, student proficiency level, knowledge of English, talkativeness, and the type of topic being discussed.

In order to first look at proficiency level as a possible factor in lexically triggered negotiations, it is necessary to break the data down further by individual students. Thus, Table 5.2 shows the percentage of lexical triggers per student in the host family setting. It goes from left to right in order of increasing proficiency of the students and illustrates a comparison of each student in terms of the percentage of lexical triggers.

**Table 5.2. Proficiency & student triggered lexical negotiations - host family**

<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Susan</b>	<b>Amy</b>	<b>Jamie</b>	<b>Mandy</b>	<b>Lisa</b>
<b>% Lexical Trigger by Student</b>	68.4	30.4	51.5	40	45
<b>% Lexical Trigger by NS</b>	13.1	23.9	10.6	21	31
<b>Total % of lexical triggers</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>62.1</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>76</b>

The data shows that Susan has the highest percentage of student triggered lexical negotiations at 68.4%. As could be seen in Excerpt 5.2 (above), Susan's speech to her host family members is abundant with lexical difficulties, often cyclical in nature, one occurring right after the other. It is

not surprising that beginning students may rely more on lexis to communicate since their command of structure is still relatively insufficient. However, beyond the beginning level, proficiency does not appear to be a factor in the amount of student triggered lexical negotiations. In fact, if proficiency were the overriding factor, Lisa, who has the highest proficiency level of the five students, who undoubtedly has a better command of lexical knowledge, should have experienced fewer lexically triggered negotiations. However, this was not the case. Lisa ranked third highest in percentage of lexical negotiations, indicating that proficiency was not a major factor in her case. Similarly, even though Amy has the second to the lowest proficiency of all the students, the percentage of her negotiations caused by her lack of lexical knowledge is the lowest, when by all accounts it should be higher if proficiency is the overriding factor. In other words, there may be some indication that proficiency level played a role in student triggered lexical negotiations for Susan, a beginning level student whose lack of lexical knowledge may have increased the amount of lexical negotiations she had to engage in to get her message across. However, other factors seem to be overriding proficiency in the other students' cases.

The reason Amy has the lowest percentage of lexically triggered negotiations is almost certainly due to the fact that Amy's host mother speaks English and whenever Amy was confronted with a word she didn't know she often inserted the English word for it and her host mother generally

understood, often making negotiation unnecessary. Her host family data as well as the following comments in Amy's journal and during group discussions illustrate this:

(During this particular recording session with her host mother and father, the host mother got up to answer the phone and left Amy talking to her host father. Amy commented:) I said the word 'bone' in English to my host dad. Up until that point it usually has been okay because my mom understands a lot of English and I can just say a word I don't know in English. However, even though I said the English word it didn't help matters, so I had to find a way around it. (*Amy, journal entry*)

I couldn't remember the words for public/private colleges. After I said "*\*shuugakkoo*" (\*state - school), she immediately said "public school" in English so I knew she understood. (*Amy, group discussion*)

I've also learned new vocabulary by having her translate. When I say the English word, she'll give me the word in Japanese. (*Amy, journal entry*)

These comments indicate that Amy is well aware of the differences between talking to a NS who knows English versus someone who doesn't know English and the amount of work that she needs to put forth in either situation. She does not have to negotiate lexical items as much as the other students, precisely because she can use English when she has trouble producing or understanding a word. No doubt, this makes communication more efficient in terms of speed and reduces the number of misunderstandings that occur, but does not encourage Amy to use the L2 to solve difficulties as they arise.

Other factors that may have played a role in student triggered lexical negotiations in the host family are related to topic. For example, Lisa has the highest level of proficiency but the percentage of negotiations triggered by difficulties in lexical production for her are fairly high. An investigation into this revealed that the types of words Lisa had trouble with are slightly different than the types of words the other students had trouble conveying. Table 5.3 (below) provides a list of all the words from the negotiations that students had difficulty producing. For the most part, the words that caused trouble for the other four students could be characterized as concrete entities or words that could easily be conveyed through gestures or relatively simple negotiation, with a few exceptions. However, Lisa's data reveals that about 25% (marked with an asterisk) of the words she negotiated are abstract concepts such as "peace", "freedom", "influence" etc.. Such words reflect the topic complexity and perhaps the amount and level of production required to convey them. The topic that evoked the majority of these abstract words was "the fight for power between Protestant and Catholic Royalty in Eighteenth Century England". Abstract concepts of this type may be considered difficult for lower level learners, especially when the learner has trouble conveying even basic lexical items. Consequently topics that elicit such difficult words are likely to be avoided by lower proficiency learners simply because of their lack of interlanguage resources to be able to convey them even through such strategies as circumlocution or word coinage.

**Table 5.3. Words that triggered student lexical negotiation - host family**

Susan	Amy	Jamie	Mandy	Lisa
toothpaste	to have	gym	to stay (at hotel)	materials
fluoride	6 months	oak	placement test	suddenly
itchy	to see	*to be angry	to paint one's nails	to enter the army
by one's self	same age	red loincloth	treadmill	Iraq
modern dance	short	costume	to cut	military
hand stand	curry rice	last week	alligator	cream corn
acrobat	bone	hand-held fan	zoo	to clean up
to lift someone up	uncle	air conditioning	safari	king
hold hands	grandmother	batteries	skin	wife
twirl	to bite	bum (homeless)	to tan	queen
* to be angry	*to be angry	obi	mid-month	*peace
to bump into	ground	* to receive	broadway play	*freedom
same		sports day	science	skit
ice		* skit	roller coaster	moose
* make a mistake		game host	throw up	to drill for oil
salty		to decorate	equipment	documentary
to heat up (something)		fight	sled	* influence
to turn in (something)				* to be popular
hippie				summer cottage
arm				totem pole
to tan				*Protestant
muscles				
*to tell (someonesomething)				
year end present giving (oseebo)				
mash potatoes				
light show				
angel				
star				
decoration				

Essentially, the word list above represents those lexical items which the students did not know, but for which they had enough interlanguage resources or strategic ability to be able to convey closely enough for the NS to figure out what they were trying to say. Thus, for advanced students with a good command of vocabulary, conveying such abstract words may not be easy, but feasible in the sense that they may be able to compensate for what they

lack in lexical knowledge by using their interlanguage resources to circumlocute or negotiate difficult lexical items.

While it may not be possible to determine all the different factors affecting the frequency of student triggered lexical negotiations in the host family setting, the data suggests that proficiency may play a role at least for beginning level students. However, the student's use of English may tend to decrease the amount of negotiation, especially at the lexical level, where it is easy to insert an English word here and there for the sake of trouble-free conversation. Moreover, the type of topic being discussed may have an effect on the amount of lexical negotiation that is engaged in. This may be the case particularly if the topic is a difficult one and requires the use of abstract words that the student doesn't know, but has enough interlanguage resources to be able to grapple with.

Lexically triggered negotiations in the classroom were different from those that occurred in the host family setting for a couple of reasons. First of all, recall that a lot of negotiations in the classroom were peripheral, in which the student was not directly, but indirectly involved. In addition, classroom negotiations were multi-partied, where the entire class participated in the negotiation. Lastly, unlike the host family setting, sometimes instructors feigned comprehension problems to encourage students to modify their utterances. This meant that the communication breakdowns that occurred in

the classroom may have been more about enforcing pedagogical goals than about solving real comprehension difficulties.

Consider the following excerpt taken from Instructor Hoshino's class that illustrates a lexical negotiation originating in the student's utterance. Instructor Hoshino (H) is asking the class to give an example of something that is considered "yawarekai" (soft). Student 8 (S8) offers "butter" as an example but pronounces it wrong, triggering a lexical negotiation.

**Excerpt 5.3 [Student triggered lexical negotiation - classroom]**

- 1 H *hontoo ni yawarakai mono wa?*  
what is something really soft?
- 2 S8 *anoo buta? ((pronounced as bu- in butter))*  
*um buta?((pronounced as bu- in butter))*
- 3 H *un?*  
what?
- 4 S8 *bata*  
*bata*
- 5 H *bata wa nan desu ka?*  
what is "bata"?
- 6 S8 *uh bata:a*  
*uh butte:r*
- 7 H *soo desu ne bataa nobasu ne tabemono wa- tabemono janakute yawarakai mono wa?*  
that's right butter. you draw it out. food- something that is not food that is soft is?

The excerpt begins with Instructor Hoshino asking the class to give an example of something that is "soft". In line 2, then, S8 offers the word for butter, "buta", which is supposed to be pronounced, "bataa" as a Japanese loan word. This results in Instructor Hoshino's request for clarification in line 3, "un?" (what?). In response, S8 makes another attempt at pronouncing the word, this time saying "bata" (butter), which is a bit closer to the way it would

be pronounced in Japanese, but still a bit off. Instructor Hoshino responds in line 5 by saying *"bata wa nan desu ka"* (what is *"bata?"*), essentially asking for clarification again. Thus, S8 attempts again to say butter with the correct pronunciation in Japanese and finally succeeds in saying *"bata:a"* (butte:r). Instructor Hoshino confirms that this is the right pronunciation in line 7, thereby ending the negotiation.

It is not clear at what point Instructor Hoshino begins to understand that S8 is trying to say "butter". In fact, it could be that Instructor Hoshino knew all along what S8 was trying to say but feigned non-understanding to prompt S8 to correct his pronunciation. These types of lexical negotiations where students say something that the instructor does not understand are typical in the classroom data. However, as in this negotiation, it is not always clear if there is a real comprehension problem or not.

As could be seen from the excerpt above, lexical negotiations in general could be very different in the classroom than they were in the host family setting. This necessitated looking at some factors that may not have been considered in the host family setting. Specifically, while issues of proficiency, topic related factors, and use of English are factors similar to those found in the host family setting, other factors such as teaching style, participant roles, participant structure, and concerns for face may have played a more significant role in the classroom setting. Each of these factors will henceforth

be discussed in terms of how they influenced lexical negotiation in the classroom setting.

**Table 5.4. Percentage of student triggered lexical triggers per class**

<b>Instructor name</b>	<b>Hoshino (Susan)</b>	<b>Endo (Amy, Jamie, Mandy)</b>	<b>Yoshimura (Lisa)</b>
<b>% Lexical Trigger by Student</b>	41.3	57.14	28.9
<b>% Lexical Trigger by Instructor</b>	21.74	4.8	6.67
<b>Total % of lexical triggers</b>	<b>63.04</b>	<b>61.94</b>	<b>35.57</b>

Similar to the host family setting, the data for the classroom also indicated that proficiency level may have had some effect on the amount of student triggered lexical negotiation in certain cases. Table 5.4 (above) illustrates the percentage of lexical negotiations in the classroom by class. Recall that Instructor Hoshino was the low intermediate instructor, Endo, the high intermediate instructor, and Yoshimura, the low advanced instructor. Instructor Endo showed the highest percentage of lexical negotiations overall, next was Instructor Hoshino, and lastly, Instructor Yoshimura had the lowest percentage of lexical negotiations. Just considering Instructor Hoshino's and Instructor Yoshimura's data, there was some indication that proficiency may have had an effect on the amount of lexical negotiations students engaged in. However, if proficiency were the major factor affecting lexical negotiations in the classroom, the percentage for Instructor Endo's class would have been somewhere between 41.3% and 28.9%, but this was not the case. This made

Instructor Endo's classroom appear to be the outlier here, perhaps suggesting a variable stronger than that of proficiency level. Instructor Endo's high percentage of student triggered lexical negotiations as compared to the other classes was especially perplexing because Instructor Endo was the one who allowed the use of English in class more than the other instructors and this would suggest fewer negotiations rather than more. As in the case of Amy's host family, the use of English in the classroom undoubtedly had some effect on the amount of lexical negotiations students engaged in, mainly because it was easy to replace a single lexical item in the L2 with its equivalent in English. In the classroom when students came across a word that they don't know, they often simply codeswitched into English to prompt the instructor to give them the word in Japanese. It has been remarked upon in the literature that this type of interaction in the classroom, where students use teachers as "walking dictionaries", is common (Haastrup, 1982; as described in Holmen, 1985). It may be done simply to avoid a breakdown or shorten a negotiation in the interest of time. An example of this is given below in Excerpt 5.4, where Student 5 (S5) is trying to explain to Instructor Hoshino (H) that s/he got caught in the rain going home yesterday and became wet.

**Excerpt 5.4 [Student use of English to elicit lexical items - classroom setting]**

- 1 S5: *uuh uh kaeru uh* [kaeru toki wa [ano um ooame furimashita=  
when I was going home there was heavy rain=  
2 H:                    *[un*                    *[un*  
                          *[uh huh*                    *[ uh huh*

- 3 S5: = *watashi wa konna um wet?*  
=I um this wet?
- 4 H: *nuremashita*  
got wet
- 5 S5: *nuremashita?*  
got wet?
- 6 H: *hai* ((writes on board)) *ame ga furu to sore mo nuremashita*  
yes ((writes on board)) when it rains etc. you get wet
- 7 S5: *nuremashita*  
[*nuremashita*]
- 8 H: *hai, ja S6 san*  
yes, then Student 6

The lexical trigger comes in line 3, when the student code switches into English and says “wet?”, as an indirect appeal for help from the instructor to provide the word. Instructor Hoshino then provides the word in line 4, “*nuremashita*”(got wet). In response, the student repeats the word and requests confirmation that it is the correct word. The instructor responds in line 6 by confirming and then writes it on the board and explains it in the context that the student wants to use it, “when it rains etc. you get wet”. The student repeats it again in line 7, and Instructor Hoshino confirms again in line 8.

This type of negotiation was common in the classroom setting. It was found in all three classes, however, Instructor Endo tended to allow the use of English more often in his classroom, often allowing students to simply substitute English words for Japanese words that they did not know, thereby making negotiation unnecessary. Thus, students’ use of English did have some effect on lexical negotiations. For the most part, the use of English

reduced the length and complexity of negotiations and sometimes made negotiation unnecessary.

The fact that Instructor Endo allowed frequent use of English in his classroom did not explain why his class had the highest percentage of lexical negotiations. A closer look at the data revealed that Instructor Endo's teaching style, the types of topics he choose for classroom drills and tasks may have influenced lexical negotiation. More specifically, Instructor Endo tended to personalize or individualize topics, which often led to tangential talk where the students would talk freely about such things as nicknames, pop culture and the like. Personalizing interaction in the classroom as well as engaging students in a lot of tangential talk was a unique characteristic of Instructor Endo's class. There was very little of this type of interaction in Instructor Hoshino and Instructor Yoshimura's class. In the following journal entry, Jamie comments on the tendency in Instructor Endo's class toward tangential talk:

Sometimes we go off on too many pointless discussions. I wanna learn grammar and how to interpret readings. A little discussion is fine but most of the time it's way too long and other students start to day dream and not really think about or use Japanese. (*Jamie, journal entry*)

This sentiment was not shared by Amy and Mandy, who agreed that although there was a lot of tangential talk during class, it was often interesting and informational. They said they learned new words and felt like they were speaking "real" Japanese. The data seemed to support Amy and

Mandy's view, basically revealing that when the students and instructor engaged in tangential talk there was more negotiation, particularly of the lexical type. This was most likely because the tangential talk brought up topics that the students had never talked about in Japanese as well as topics that were personalized, and often culturally-based or abstract in nature.

**Table 5.5. Description of content for all three of Instructor Endo's classes**

Instructor Name	Endo #1	Endo #2	Endo #3
Features of Content: cultural, unfamiliar topics, abstract entities	N/A (Reading comprehen- sion)	Culturally based & abstract entities (Practice of passive tense)	Unfamiliar Topics & abstract entities (discussion of debate topics)
% of total negotiations per class (total neg. for all 3 classes = 42)	9.5% (4 neg.)	35.7% (15 neg.)	54.8% (23 neg.)
% of total neg. per class session of student triggered lexical neg.	4.8% (2 neg.)	23.8% (10 neg.)	28.6% (12 neg.)
% of student triggered lexical negotiations per class session	50% (2/4)	66.6% (10/15)	52.2% (12/23)

Table 5.5 is a breakdown of the type of activity or content of talk in all three of Instructor Endo's classes. For example, the first class indicates that they focused on reading comprehension, and that the total number of negotiations for that class was four, indicating minimal opportunities for students to engage in negotiation. In the second classroom session, however, although the activity was a structure drill on the passive tense, Instructor Endo chose to practice the passive tense by asking students what nicknames their friends, family, girlfriend, boyfriend etc. called them. The type of talk

that ensued involved talking about culturally-based abstract entities such as the meaning or nuance of certain nicknames or labels such as “pumpkin”, “princess”, “studmuffin”, “womanizer” and the like. Consequently, this particular class session yielded 35.7% of total negotiations for all three classes, 66.6% of which were triggered by lexical difficulties by the student. The third class focused on an initial discussion of possible debate topics for a final debate project. In this case, the discussion of unfamiliar topics and abstract entities also contributed to a higher frequency of negotiations. The types of topics discussed included the pros and cons of living in a high-tech society versus non-high-tech society, country versus city living, single versus married life, and the American education system versus the Japanese education system. The types of lexical items the students had to convey included words such as “opinion”, “to depend on”, “societal pressure”, “automatized living”, “gossip”, “freedom”, “mother/father-in-law”, “terrible”, “taxes”, and “to be lonely”. This particular class session accounted for the highest percentage, 54.8%, of negotiations for Instructor Endo classroom data. Of the 23 negotiations that occurred in this class session, 52.2% were lexical negotiations triggered by the students. Although the percentage of total negotiations is higher for class session #3, the percentage of those negotiations attributed to lexical negotiations triggered by students, 52.2%, is lower than the percentage for class session #2, which is 66.6%. This observation suggests that the students may have been more motivated to

negotiate when talking about topics that were personal in nature, such as nicknames. Describing cultural entities that were also abstract in nature, such as slang words, terms, or phrases used in pop culture, may have forced students to make the most use of their interlanguage resources. Moreover, the level of student interest increased when they talked about both personalized topics and culturally based entities such as slang words, as was indicated by the level of laughter that often ensued after trying to explain words like “studmuffin” or “womanizer”. Thus, when the students seemed interested in a topic they put forth more effort into talking about it and this may have increased negotiation in general.

While the previous paragraph discusses the nature of the topic and how it relates to the frequency of lexically triggered negotiations, other aspects of interaction specifically in Instructor Endo’s class related to participation structure may have played a role in increasing lexical negotiations. First, Instructor Endo often relinquished control of the floor and allowed the students to talk freely, particularly during tangential talk. Such instances as Excerpt 5 below were common in his classroom. Here, the class (SS) is practicing the passive form, “*~to iwarete imasu*” (is called ~). Instructor Endo (E) asks the students to make a sentence using “*~to iwarete imasu*” and a negotiation ensues about Jamie’s use of the pattern to call President Clinton a “womanizer”, which is a word Instructor Endo (E) claims not to know. Therefore, Jamie (J), Mandy (M), and another student (S6) explain it to him.

### Excerpt 5.5 [Tangential talk - classroom]

- 1 E *soo desu ka wakarimashita ii desu ne ja desu ne ja kondo wa to iwarete imasu kono bun o tsukutte kudasai tatoeba:*  
is that right, I understand. that's good. well well this time "is called" make a sentence with this, for example
- 2 J *kurinton daitoryoo wa womanizer*  
President Clinton is a womanizer
- 3 E *eh? nan desu ka*  
eh? what's that?
- 4 J *womanizer to iwarete imasu*  
(he's) called a womanizer
- 5 E *kurinton ga womanizer da to iwarete imasu womanizer wa nan desu ka*  
Clinton is called a womanizer what is a womanizer?
- 6 S6 *pureeboi*  
playboy
- 7 M *asobu asobu*  
play play
- 8 E *playboy*  
playboy
- 9 S6 *jissho ga arimasu pureeboi*  
I have a dictionary (it says) playboy
- 10 E *uun playboy womanizer hantai wa arimasu ka*  
uun playboy is there an opposite to "womanizer"?
- 11 M *it's like slut*  
it's like slut
- 12 J *slut man slut*  
slut, man slut
- 13 SS *ah ahah ahahaha ((laugh))*  
*ah ahah ahahaha ((laugh))*
- 14 E *hu::n chotto:: ah ja tatoeba sore kara ja amerika ja tookyoo wa? they say tookyoo is?*  
hu::m we::ll ah well for example then well America well what about Tokyo? they say Tokyo is?

In line 1, Instructor Endo prompts the students to come up with a sentence using, "*~to iwarete imasu*" (is called ~). Jamie responds in line 2 by saying "President is a womanizer". In line 3, Instructor Endo asks for repetition of what Jamie has said, this is possibly because she left off the passive part of the sentence that they are supposed to be practicing. Therefore, in line 4, Jamie repeats her initial utterance, adding on the passive "*~to iwarete imasu*" (is called ~). However, Instructor Endo indicates in line 5 that

he does not know the word, “womanizer”, and asks for clarification. In line 6, student 6 responds, using the katakana word for “playboy”. Mandy joins in the negotiation in line 7, trying to translate “playboy” into Japanese, perhaps thinking that the word does not exist as a loan word in Japanese. Instructor Endo then repeats the word “playboy” in line 8. Then Student 6 responds in line 9 that he has a dictionary and that it says “playboy”. In line 10, Instructor Endo seeks clarification by asking if there is an opposite word for “womanizer”. Assuming that instructor Endo wants to know what “womanizers” who are women are called, in line 11, Mandy codeswitches into English and offers the word “slut”. Then in line 12, Jamie, also codeswitching into English, uses Mandy’s word to give another definition of “womanizer” by equating it to “man slut”, sending the entire class into a fit of laughter in line 13. In line 14, Instructor Endo prompts everyone to move on to the next use of “*~to iwarete imasu*” (is called ~) by using Tokyo in the example.

This excerpt is a good example of what happened when Instructor Endo engaged the students in tangential talk. Essentially, the activity was turned into half structured and half unstructured (free) talk. Instructor Endo prompted students to use a pattern and when the student responded with a word or something that he didn’t know (or pretended not to know), Instructor Endo often asked about the meaning of the word, prompting students to take the floor and explain. Thus, participant structure and

participant roles were somewhat turned upside down during tangential talk. The traditional relationship between teacher and student generally tends to be more asymmetrical, where the teacher initiates the topic, controls the turn-taking, and determines when to move on and such. Likewise, the traditional role of teacher is usually one of expert, the one who has all the knowledge, and the role of the student is the novice. Although some of these aspects were still maintained, when Instructor Endo personalized topics, allowed or encouraged tangential talk, and asked students to explain things that he did not understand (or pretended not to understand), the students became the experts, explaining the meanings of nicknames, slang words, culturally based concepts that came up in the relatively unstructured talk that ensued. As a result, turn taking was less controlled and the talk resembled what one might have encountered in a non-classroom situation. In addition, this type of talk may have increased negotiation simply because students were not only in control of the topic and considered the experts, but they were also interested in the topic. Consequently, this may have increased their motivation to talk more, use their interlanguage more, and overcome difficulties in the talk to convey their message. Thus, how Instructor Endo approaches classroom activities is perhaps a good example of how activities such as simple structure drills can be changed to give students maximum opportunities for negotiation and participation.

How task related features affect what triggers negotiations was also evident in Instructor Hoshino's class, where the class often engaged in a "definition-formulating activity". This particular activity had an obvious effect on the number of lexically triggered negotiations. It consisted of giving students two or three new vocabulary words for homework and asking them to define the word in Japanese in front of their classmates. The actual activity of defining was not considered to be a negotiation since the criteria of "incomplete understanding" was not met. However, this activity often resulted in lexical negotiations when the initial student-given definition of the word was not understood by the instructor or by the other students. The following excerpt (5.6) illustrates a negotiation arising out of the "definition-formulating activity". Here, a student (S7) is trying to define the meaning of "honmono" (something real/authentic) but Instructor Hoshino (H) does not understand the student's definition and asks her to clarify.

**Excerpt 5.6 [Definition-formulating activity - classroom]**

- 1 S7 *hamana ham-ham- hamano ((error in pronunciation)) wa um megane o kakenai  
megane? me ga ii  
hamana ham- ham- hamano ((error in pronunciation)) wa um to not wear glasses  
glasses? good eyes*
- 2 H *((she puts hand on chin and tips head in non-understanding))  
((she puts hand on chin and tips head in non-understanding))*
- 3 S7 *watashi no uh otoosan shimashita demo hitsuyoo ga nai kono o gankoo wa ((holding a  
piece of paper) hamano?  
my uh gather did it but it is not necessary this publication ((holding up a piece of  
paper)) hamano?*
- 4 H *S7san sumimasen kedo eigo no imi wa nan desu ka  
Excuse me S7 san but what is the meaning in English?*
- 5 S7 *good eyes desu?  
it's good eyes?*

meaning is wrong, and that *“honmono”* means “something that is real or authentic”. S7 requests clarification in line 7 by repeating what Instructor Hoshino has said with a question intonation. In line 8 then, Instructor Hoshino clarifies her definition by giving an example of a diamond, that if it’s real, it’s expensive. Still confused, in line 9 S7 asks if *“honmono”* (something real) means *“hontoo”* (really). Instructor Hoshino then corrects her by saying the complete phrase, *“hontoo no mono”*. S7 repeats the same mistake again in line 11 by saying *“honmono wa hontoo desu”*. This time, in line 12, Instructor Hoshino does not correct her, although seems hesitant to accept the definition as it is, but she is cut off when S7 in line 13 asks what the meaning is. Instructor Hoshino assumes that S7 wants to know the meaning of *“honmono”* so she replies, *“hontoo no mono”* (something real/authentic). S7 clarifies in line 14 that she wants to know what *“hontoo no mono”* means in English. Instructor Hoshino opens that question up to the other students in line 15, and S9 answers in line 16 that *“hontoo”* means “really”, which is another meaning of *“hontoo”*. Lastly, probably not wanting to spend more time on the definition, Instructor Hoshino tells the students to look it up in the dictionary later.

The above example indicates that activities focused on learning lexis such as the “definition-formulating activity” or word games are likely to stimulate negotiations triggered by lexical gaps. Such activities as these put students in the role of “expert” if only for a short time during the activity. It

was observed often during this activity that if someone did not understand a student's explanation, that they would request clarification and initiate a student-student negotiation. Although student - student negotiation was not the focus of this research, these attempts to clarify often brought Instructor Hoshino into the negotiation and this resulted in NS - NNS negotiation that could be included in the data. However, perhaps the main point to be made here is that when a student is given the role of expert and the other students are required to know the information provided by their classmates (as in a two-way information exchange), the motivation is high to negotiate comprehension problems.

In contrast to Instructor Endo and Instructor Hoshino's class, the activities recorded in Instructor Yoshimura's class were almost always about grammar and learning to use certain grammatical patterns. This is perhaps evident in the weekly schedule handed out to the students where activities were labeled for each "period" of class time. For Instructor Yoshimura's class, the majority of class periods were spent focusing on grammar and were labeled as such on the schedule. Even when the schedule indicated other things such as listening, conversation, or reading, the class mainly focused on the grammar that was introduced in each of these. Thus, the heavy focus on grammar may have encouraged more negotiation over grammatical aspects of language and this partly explains why lexical negotiations were not as prevalent in Instructor Yoshimura's class. Moreover, as students in a higher

level class they may have had a better command of lexis and therefore didn't need to negotiate lexical gaps as much.

Thus, examining the activities of all three classes indicated that not only the type of activity, but also the way the activity was structured had an effect on the negotiations that were likely to occur. This is consistent with findings of negotiation studies that look at participation patterns and task related factors that influence negotiation (Pica, 1992, Pica, 1987; Pica & Doughty, 1985, 1988). Generally, these studies found that task related factors such as a one way versus two way exchange of information, participant roles, and participation structure affected negotiation. Generally speaking, tasks where no one person controlled the information but where participants were required to share information resulted in more negotiation because of the two way flow of information (Pica, 1987). This suggests that when students are allowed to share ideas and communicate with their teacher on a fairly equal footing as in Instructor Endo's class, more negotiation may result. Similarly, when all the students in Instructor Hoshino's class had to define a word for their classmates, who were then responsible for knowing the word, they were more motivated to negotiate when there were comprehension problems. Moreover, studies on task and participation pattern that have compared teacher-fronted and small group work found that students made more negotiation moves in the small group work task because the teacher tended to control the talk in the teacher-fronted interaction and gave students little

opportunity to speak (Pica & Doughty, 1988; Rulon & McCreary, 1986). Accordingly, if teachers work to increase the conversational rights of students, as Instructor Endo seemed to do, it would not be surprising that more negotiation would result. One other aspect of task that is frequently overlooked is student interest in the topic. In his study of task and participation pattern in negotiation, Foster (1998) found that task and participation pattern seemed to have little effect on negotiation, but noted that students who were more interested in a topic showed an increase in the amount of talk they produced and were more motivated to negotiate limitations in their interlanguage. It is not unusual then that Instructor Endo's attempts to individualize topics as well as engage in tangential talk may have motivated students to talk more because they were interested in what they were talking about. To clarify, task factors such as participation structure, student interest, and a one way or two way flow of information may have affected negotiation more than the actual task itself.

However, there is something else that may also have affected negotiation in Instructor Endo's class that was not evident in Instructor Yoshimura's and Instructor Hoshino's classroom data. Namely, Instructor Endo often pretended not to know or not to understand something in order to encourage students to explain things in Japanese. This was confirmed through an interview, when Instructor Endo was asked about particular negotiations in the data when it appeared that he was pretending not to

understand. He admitted that he often feigned ignorance of some English and even Japanese words in order to try to get students to use more Japanese to explain things in class. This may have been the case in the above “womanizer” example, but a more obvious example of this is illustrated in the following Excerpt 5.7, where Instructor Endo (E) pretends not to know the previous emperor of Japan, Hirohito, in order to get his students to speak more in Japanese. Jamie (J), Mandy (M), and one other student (S6) try to explain who Hirohito is.

**Excerpt 5.7 [Feigned non-comprehension - classroom]**

- 1 E *minnasan doo desu ka ichiban shirarete iru nihonjin*  
everybody how about it, who is the most well known Japanese person
- 2 S8 *ano ne (??) ((inaudible))*  
well (??) ((inaudible))
- 3 E *dare?*  
who?
- 4 S8 *wakaranai*  
I don't know
- 5 J *oh hirohito what was that one?*  
*oh hirohito what was that one?*
- 6 S6 *that's the one I'd chose*  
*that's the one I'd chose*
- 7 E *eh?*  
eh?
- 8 J *hirohito a:h =*  
Hirohito a:h
- 9 S6 *=mukashi no=*  
a long ago=
- 10 M *=how can you not know for christ's sake ah aha ahha ((laugh))*  
*=how can you not know for christ's sake ah aha ah ha ((laugh))*
- 11 E *wakaranai*  
I don't know
- 12 S6 *wa general*  
a general
- 13 M *dainiji taisen no general*  
world war II general
- 14 E *ah Showa?*  
ah Showa period?

- 15 J *hai*  
yes
- 16 E *emperor wa nihongo de*  
what's emperor in Japanese?
- 17 M *no clue*  
no clue
- 18 E *tenno eh demo hokani takusan arimasu kara tatoeba ne sanban minna de ichiban*  
emperor eh but there are a lot of others for example number three ((referring to  
handout) everyone all together "the most....

This classroom activity is again about practicing the passive tense in Japanese. In this case, Instructor Endo provided a handout that asked students various questions posed in the passive tense, such as, "what is the most well-known song in America, the most eaten food in Japan etc.". The question that they were focusing on in this excerpt is stated in line 1, when Instructor Endo asked, "who is the most well-known Japanese person?". In line 5, Jamie suggests that the most well-known Japanese person is Hirohito (the Emperor of Japan during World War II). This choice is supported by another student (S6) in line 6. In line 7, it is not clear at first whether Instructor Endo has not heard the response and is asking for repetition, or is requesting clarification of the response. It is taken by Jamie and S6 as a request for clarification and in lines 8, Jamie repeats the name, "*Hirohito*", and seems to be attempting some sort of explanation when S6 jumps in with the explanation of Hirohito as someone who lived "long ago" in line 9. He is interrupted by Mandy in line 10, who says in English, "how can you not know for Christ's sake" and then laughs. In line 11, however, Instructor Endo insists that he doesn't know who Hirohito is. In line 12, S6 finishes his initial explanation of who Hirohito is by

code switching into English, stating that Hirohito was a “general”. Mandy contributes to this explanation in line 13 by adding on that Hirohito was a “World War II general”. Instructor Endo responds in line 14 by asking for confirmation that Hirohito is connected to the Showa period. Jamie confirms this in line 15. Then, in line 16, the class arrives at what seems to be the whole point of the negotiation, to elicit the word “emperor” in Japanese, which up until now, no one has used to explain who Hirohito was, so Instructor Endo asks pointedly, code switching into English, “*emperor wa nihongo de*” (what is emperor in Japanese?). After Mandy claims that she has “no clue” in line 17, Instructor Endo finally provides the word in line 18, “*tenno*” (emperor) and moves quickly on to the next example number three.

If Instructor Endo’s contributions to the above negotiation are considered, the whole negotiation seems to have revolved around eliciting an explanation in Japanese of Hirohito as the emperor of Japan during the Showa period. This brings up an interesting aspect of Instructor Endo’s teaching, which is the elicitation of negotiation under “false pretenses”, so to say. His feigned ignorance was sometimes easy to detect, but more often than not, it was not clear whether he really understood or not. The students were aware that he speaks fluent English and that he teaches at a university in the United States, but they were unaware that he has lived, studied, and taught in the United States for more than ten years. Thus, especially when they thought he really didn’t understand, as in the case of American slang words or

culturally-based entities, they often responded in earnest to his feigned ignorance by explaining in Japanese (for the most part). This particular teaching strategy seemed to work well in terms of increasing negotiation and getting the students to use more Japanese, but also in terms of encouraging the use of communication strategies such as circumlocution, "*dainiji taishen no general*" (a WWII general = Hirohito), even in cases where Instructor Endo was obviously only pretending not to understand.

#### Summary of student-triggered lexical negotiations.

While it may not have been possible to determine all the different factors affecting the frequency of student triggered lexical negotiations, the data suggests that proficiency played a role at least for beginning level students in the host family setting and for the beginning and higher level students in the classroom setting. In both settings lexical negotiations were frequent for Susan and her classmates, because as beginning students, they tended to have a limited command of lexis and therefore experienced a lot of problems related to lexis. On the other hand, as the higher proficiency student, Lisa engaged in more lexical negotiations in the host family setting and less in the classroom. This was because in the host family setting, Lisa's conversations with her host mother involved conveying difficult, abstract words related to religion. Thus, regardless of proficiency, lexical negotiation increased in the host family setting if the topic was a difficult one and required the use of

abstract words. However, in the classroom Lisa and her classmates rarely participated in such difficult discussions and the focus on grammar did not lend itself to a lot of lexical difficulties.

In both the classroom and the host family setting, student use of English tended to shorten or negate the need for negotiation over lexical items because English could be used as a resource. It was easy to insert an English word here and there for the sake of trouble-free conversation. The amount of English students could use differed in the host family and classroom setting however. For the host family setting, only Amy could use English on a regular basis because only her host mother knew English. However, in the classroom setting, all the students had access to and used English. Nevertheless, the use of English was especially evident in Instructor Endo's class, who allowed the use of English more than the other instructors. Other factors that affected the classroom setting but did not play a role in lexical negotiations in the host family included teaching style and task related factors such as participant structure, task type, and topic type. First, if a particular activity focused on lexis like the "definition-formulating" activity did, lexical negotiations increased as a result. Similarly, when activities encouraged discussion on topics that were personalized, interesting, abstract, or culturally based in origin as in Instructor Endo's class during talk about "nicknames" and "debate topics", this may have increased the amount of lexical negotiation. Moreover, students seemed to be more motivated to

negotiate when activities involved less teacher-controlled talk and more unstructured, individualized talk where students could contribute actively. It also seemed to make a difference in the amount of negotiations students engaged in if the instructor encouraged activities where the students took on the role of expert and were motivated by interest in the topic. Teaching style also seems to have played a role in encouraging lexical negotiation. For example, as a part of his teaching style, Instructor Endo often feigned ignorance of lexical items in order to elicit explanations in Japanese. In such cases, students were pushed to negotiate and the amount of lexical negotiation increased as a result.

**NS-triggered lexical negotiations in the host family and classroom.**

The percentage of negotiations caused by the NS using a lexical item that the student didn't understand was low in comparison to those caused by the student having difficulty with lexical production (Table 5.1). In the host family setting, 18% of all negotiations were caused by NS using a lexical item that the student didn't understand. For the classroom setting NS triggered lexical negotiations made up only 15% of total negotiations. This is compared to those negotiations triggered by students' difficulty in lexical production, 53% for the host family data, and 49% for the classroom setting. This difference can perhaps be attributed to a variety of factors that are equally important in both settings. First, it is no surprise that students had less

difficulty and understood more when listening than compared to when they had to use their interlanguage to produce spoken utterances. This observation is based on the understanding that listening is a receptive skill and speaking is a productive skill. Although both are highly complex processes that draw on a variety of cognitive, linguistic, and world knowledge, using receptive skills generally requires less cognitive effort than using productive skills does. Essentially, learners may be able to decode L2 input using their interlanguage knowledge, but that does not necessarily mean they have enough control over forms etc. to be able to produce what they hear. Thus, lexical negotiations that originated in the NSs' utterances were understandably less than negotiations that originated in the student's utterance. Second, students did not always negotiate everything they didn't understand, and third, NSs in both the host family and classroom often adjusted their speech to avoid difficult lexical items that they felt the NNS may not know. These all played a role in reducing the amount of lexical negotiation that NSs and NNSs must engaged in in order to clear up lexical difficulties.

The purpose of this section then, is to discuss NS triggered negotiation in the host family and classroom setting. First, examples are given of NS triggered lexical negotiations that occurred in the host family and then classroom setting. Factors that affected these types of negotiation are discussed in both sections. Then, a comparison is made of the two settings.

There were several instances in the host family data where students had trouble understanding a lexical item their host family member used. What seemed to be fairly common about these instances was that students did not hesitate to elicit clarification from their host members especially when the word in question was important for comprehension. For example, in the following excerpt, Mandy's host father has asked Mandy what she normally eats for dinner at home. Here he specifically asks her if she eats "pig". The negotiation is triggered because Mandy (Ma) does not understand her host father's (D) use of the English loan word for "pig" which he pronounces as "piku" in Japanese. The host mother (M) realizes that the problem is that the host father is trying to use English but his pronunciation is wrong.

**Excerpt 5.8 [NS triggered lexical negotiation - host family]**

- 1 D: *piku wa?* (pronounced more like a 'k' than a 'g')  
what about pig?
- 2 Ma: *nani?*  
what?
- 3 D: *piku*  
pig
- 4 Ma: *piku wa nan desu ka*  
what is "piku"?
- 5 M: *ah [hah hah ((laugh))*  
*ah [hah hah ((laugh))*
- 6 D: *[buta*  
*]pig*
- 7 Ma: *ah oh [oh buta buta wakarimashita piku nani?*  
*ah oh [oh pig pig I understand. what is "piku"?*
- 8 M: *[ah hah hah ha ha ((laugh)) nihongo de yutta hoo ga ii [yo ne*  
*[ah hah hah ha ha ((laugh)) it's better to say it in Japanese [right?*
- 9 Ma: *[right hai ah ha ha*  
*((laugh))*  
*((laugh))* *[right yeah ah ha ha*

The topic of the conversation for this excerpt is what type of foods Mandy eats. Therefore, in line 1, Mandy's host father asks Mandy if she eats pig, using a katakana pronunciation for "pig" which he pronounces as, "piku". For some reason, the host father pronounces the "g" like a "k". Mandy asks for repetition in line 2, so the host father repeats the word in line 3 again. This does not seem to help because in line 4, Mandy asks specifically what "piku" is. The host mother starts laughing in line 5, and in line 6, the host father says the word "pig" in Japanese, "buta". Mandy indicates that she understands "buta" but asks again what "piku" means, not drawing the connection between "buta", "piku", and "pig", perhaps because of the pronunciation difference. The host mother laughingly remarks in line 8 that it is better to say it in Japanese (rather than use katakana Japanese), and Mandy agrees with her in line 9.

It is interesting to note that Mandy's request for repetition in line 2 was probably a global request for clarification, although the host father treated it as a request for repetition. This is why Mandy made her request more specific the second time, by pointing out that rather than a repetition of the word, she wants a clarification of it in line 4. It is in response to this that the host father modifies the word so that Mandy can understand it. However, although Mandy understands the word "buta" (pig), she does not draw the relationship between "buta" and the word her host father used, "piku", probably because the pronunciation is too far off for her to recognize it as "English". In the end,

Mandy is left not understanding what her host father was trying to ask in the first place.

Comments in the students' journals and group discussions as well as analysis of the recorded data itself indicated that there were three main factors affecting NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family setting. These were; the host member's tendency to adjust their speech to the student's level of comprehension, the presence or absence of the host father during recordings, and the student's concern for face as well as the desire to keep conversations as unimpeded as possible.

First, host parents tended to not use words they thought the students would not know and this may have accounted for the lower number of lexical negotiations in the host family setting that originated in the NS's utterance. It is not rare for NSs to adjust their speech to accommodate non-native speakers. This type of accommodation is commonly known as foreigner talk (FT) (see Long, 1992 for a review of Japanese FT). Studies on foreigner talk show that one of the ways NS adjust their speech to nonnative speakers is by using a narrower range of high frequency vocabulary items (Arthur et al., 1980; Tweissi, 1990). On study in particular, Iino (1996), looked at the foreigner talk of native Japanese speakers in a study abroad context and found that host family members were very adept at adjusting different aspects of their speech to their host students. Besides adjusting the level of their vocabulary and grammar, Iino (1996) noted that host family members tended

to modify their language to comply with the standard Tokyo dialect and used more personal pronouns than they would with native speakers of Japanese. Iino (1996) called this type of modification the “*gaijinization*” of language use (language used for foreigners) Japanese. Although it was not the goal of this study to examine the different foreigner talk characteristics in depth, as in Iino’s (1996) study, instances in the data point to the fact that host family mothers were well aware of what their students knew and did not know in terms of Japanese vocabulary and grammar. This sense came from a combination of having had previous experience with other students, having spent a lot of time with the students getting used to the limitations of their interlanguage, and having been able to pick up on cues such as facial expressions and utterances that indicated a student did not understand. Therefore, for the most part, host family mothers were able to avoid difficult words and grammar that they thought the student would not understand, which may have accounted for the lower number of negotiations caused by difficulty in lexical items introduced into the conversation by the NSs. Statements to this effect were evident in journal entries and group discussion comments such as the following:

My okaasan (mother) knows how to talk to me really well. She knows exactly what I’m trying to say and she knows that I’ll repeat it like 3 times until I get it right. (*Lisa, group discussion*)

Yeah, well most of the time in class somehow teachers are really good at using the language that students understand so there aren't too many instances where I don't understand. (*Lisa, journal entry*)

There was one exception to this, however. Out of all the host family participants, Jamie's host mother had the least amount of experience with host students and this seems to have been reflected in her conversations with Jamie. Unlike the other students, Jamie's comments during group discussions and in her journals revealed that her mother often spoke too fast, used vocabulary and grammar that she didn't know, and often failed to notice when Jamie didn't understand something.

I'm still having difficulty understanding her because she talks fast and I don't understand all the vocab. she uses. (*Jamie, journal entry*)

Also, how fast she speaks and the intonation she uses sometimes confuses me. I think it's because I'm not used to being around native speakers who only know Japanese. (*Jamie - Group discussion*)  
She still talks so fast but I'm learning how to pick up words that I know and put them together with the context of our conversation. It's good and it's bad that she talks fast. It's bad because sometimes I don't understand her vocab. or pronunciation, but it's good because my thinking process and my Japanese skills have to work double time to keep up with her. (*Jamie - Group discussion*)

Jamie was the only host student to comment negatively on her ability to understand her host mother. However, it was perplexing because the percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiation in Jamie's host family situation was actually the lowest of all five students (refer to Table 5.5 below).

Therefore, even though Jamie complained that her host mother talked too fast and used a lot of vocabulary that she didn't know, this did not necessarily translate into more NS triggered lexical negotiations for Jamie. This suggests that perhaps there was another factor to consider in Jamie's case, but it was not immediately apparent in the data.

A factor that may have increased NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family had to do with host fathers being present during the recordings. Specifically, although host mothers seemed to be able to adjust their speech to avoid comprehension difficulties, the data and comments from students indicate that host fathers were less likely to be able to correctly assess what words or grammar that student didn't understand. Similar data from Iino (1996) shows that 24% of the students in his study reported that the reason they spent more time talking to their host mother was because the host mother spoke clearly and used easy vocabulary. One can indirectly assume then, that compared to talking to their host mother, at least some students thought that talking to their host father was more difficult. To see if host fathers made a difference in the number of NS triggered lexical negotiations, the percentage of lexical negotiations originating in the NSs' utterances was calculated for each student in Table 5.6 below.

**Table 5.6. Percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family**

<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Susan</b>	<b>Amy</b>	<b>Jamie</b>	<b>Mandy</b>	<b>Lisa</b>
<b>% Lexical Trigger by NS</b>	13.1	23.9	10.6	21	31

Of those students on the high end, Lisa's data shows that she encountered the highest percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations. Next was Amy, then Mandy. It is perhaps no coincidence that for these three students, the host father participated in the recording sessions, while the other two students conversed only with their host mothers during recordings. It is interesting that in Amy's case, even though her host mother would often use English words when speaking to Amy, the percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations was the highest. This is because 87% of these negotiations were triggered by difficult words that the host father used. It just so happened that twice during Amy's conversations with her host mother and father, her host mother was called away to the phone and was not there to help Amy understand what the host father was saying and Amy had no recourse but to negotiate in Japanese about words that she didn't understand. The following interview comments and journal entries attest to the fact that host fathers tend to be less aware of what their host student's limitations are in Japanese:

My host dad thinks my Japanese is better than it really is, maybe because I sound fairly fluent, so he tries to bring up these difficult topics all the time. Last night he was trying to explain about the history of the town festival and I didn't understand about every other word. I had to keep asking him what certain words meant and at the end I'd say I had a pretty good gist of what he had said, but I wouldn't bet my life on it.  
*(Lisa, journal entry)*

Dad speaks so fast, mumbles, and uses a lot of informal stuff that I have a hard time understanding. He uses a lot of big words and it doesn't

usually help for him to repeat it because I still can't understand. He never explains like my okaasan (mother) does. *(Amy, journal entry)*

Today just mom, dad, and I talked. It was a lot better having her present so when I didn't understand what he was saying, she could rephrase or repeat it. *(Amy, journal entry)*

I know okaasan (mother) understood my question because she repeated it. But none of the words otoosan (father) used sounded familiar but I didn't really know how to ask. *(Mandy, journal entry)*

Sometimes my mom, who spends the most time with me, has to translate what I say to my dad, and that makes me think that my nihongo (Japanese) must be really stinky. *(Lisa, group discussion)*

Usually I don't understand when he (host father) talks so I just tune him out ((laugh)) *(Amy, group discussion)*

My host dad drove me someplace and tried to talk to me the whole time and I didn't understand a word he was saying and he'd look at me and say 'ne?' and I'm like "uhhuh" and then he just keeps talking and I have no idea. *(Susan, group discussion)*

I don't get it. For the most part, my host mother knows exactly how to talk to me and understands almost everything I say, but my host father will go off on these really difficult topics and I have no clue what he's saying and it's clear that I don't understand a word but he just keeps on going. *(Amy, group discussion)*

I don't understand my host father as much as my host mom. If I ask my host father about a word or something, he will try to explain it but my host mom will cut in and explain it in a way I understand. *(Mandy, group discussion)*

The above comments indicate, for the most part, that host mothers were well aware of their student's level of comprehension in Japanese. In fact, host mothers seemed to know what students may or may not understand in a given circumstance and they were able to "translate" the host father's difficult utterances into comprehensible input for them. In some instances, host

mothers had to translate what the student was saying when the host father did not understand. Part of the reason host fathers were less aware of a student's comprehension level is because they spent less time with the student on a daily basis. The topic of conversation with the host fathers tended to be different as well. Oftentimes, host fathers brought up difficult topics that required a higher level of lexical and grammatical knowledge than the students possessed. While the topics discussed with host mothers tended to include daily activities, places visited, holidays, cultural practices, and friends and family, topics between host fathers and students included politics, recent news events, philosophy, history, science, idioms, and dialectal differences etc.. Thus, host mothers tended to focus on topics that were personal and student-centered, and host fathers tended to focus on topics that were abstract and often outside the realm of students' personal experience. Students commented above that sometimes when they talked to their host father, topics were difficult and beyond their knowledge of the L2. As a result, students sometimes pretended to understand even when they didn't.

The following excerpt is a good example of a situation in which a host father (D) tried to explain a difficult concept, "physics", to the host student, Mandy (Ma), and the host mother (M) had to point out to him that his explanation was too difficult for her to understand.



the host mother in lines 5, 7, 13, and 19 indicate that the mother is well aware that the words the host father is using are too difficult for Mandy. She tries to tell the host father this several times by saying, "that's difficult to understand", "she doesn't understand all that...", " it is difficult, that's a little (too difficult) ri::ght", and "you don't understand that stuff like theory right? She said she doesn't understand". This type of negotiation happens fairly often in the data that includes host fathers. The mother's role in any interaction seems to be one of "monitoring" the comprehension level of the conversation by frequently interpreting what the student is saying, letting the host father know that he's going beyond what the students understands, and often "translating" what the host father is saying so the student can understand it.

Another factor that may have lowered the amount of NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family was that students did not pursue every opportunity to negotiate over words they did not understand. The students themselves indicated that even when they did not understand something the NS said, they did not always ask for an explanation. Students gave three main reasons to explain as to why they sometimes did not pursue an explanation of something they did not understand. First, students claimed that they could often figure out what they did not understand through the context or subsequent utterances that might explain the utterance in question. Second, if they felt the utterance in question was something that they really didn't have

to understand or it was not important, they chose to let it go without pursuing an explanation of the meaning. Third, students often decided not to pursue an explanation of something in order to avoid unpleasant side effects such as embarrassment or deviating too far from the main point of the conversation. The following comments from group discussion sessions and journal entries attest to these three reasons:

She (host mother) still talks extremely fast, but I'm learning to pick up words that I know or don't know and put them together with the context of our conversation - and usually I understand pretty much what she's saying. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

Based on context, I can usually understand what they're saying even if I don't understand every word they use. (*Mandy, journal*)

Sometimes, for the sake of blending in, I'll just nod my head and laugh and say "uh-huh". If I'm among a big group of Japanese people all speaking fast and occasionally looking my way to see my reaction even if I have no idea or just a partial idea most likely what's being said. If I stopped, then I'd pull all the focus my way by asking questions and risk embarrassing myself. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

Sometimes I understand meaning by what I expect people to say in a situation. (*Lisa, journal entry*)

She'll (host mother) say 'blah blah blah' and I'll understand one grammar but I don't know what the hell she said. I don't let on because I don't think it was important. Like last night she said something about the TV show and started laughing. I had no idea but I started laughing with her. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

I don't have to pay attention when we're eating ever. And when we're watching TV or when my dad makes a comment about the TV show - and he laughs and I laugh then I can get back to the TV show. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

If I really don't understand and I really want to know the word, I ask. Like today I asked. But I think if I don't ask then I really don't care, like an animal name. Like I don't think it's an important word, so if I don't think it's a useful word for me I don't bother. (*Susan, group discussion*)

Otoosan (father) and Okaasan (mother) were explaining about the towel to me for about five minutes and I didn't understand what they said. I feel like if I ask questions I may be asking questions about something they already answered. Then you're like, 'yeah I was paying attention but didn't understand a word you said'. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

The thing that is going to help you decide if you're going to ask what it (a word) means is if it's going to completely throw off the conversation - 'wait a minute, wait a minute, what's that *hanseikai* thing?'. And she (host mother) has to stop and explain and she forgets what she's saying and then you don't get the actual answer. But I figure if I say 'uh huh, *hanseikai*.' and she goes on and says for instance, 'we have cooking classes and dancing and etc. etc.', then I say, 'oh, that makes perfect sense'. (*Lisa, group discussion*)

If you interrupt, and she (host mother) goes into defining the word and into the circle of defining, then define it really quick or get back to the conversation or they're going to get lost in the definition and the conversation is gone. We can never have a regular conversation every time I try to interrupt and say, 'wait a minute, I don't understand this word right here.' (*Lisa, group discussion*)

The above comments from the students illustrate that there are several reasons for not pursuing an explanation when something is not understood. It is in this aspect of negotiation that notions of "face" and "communicative efficiency" come into play, in terms of why something gets negotiated and why it does not. According to the students comments, negotiating every time they didn't understand something was not feasible and made for difficult conversation. Moreover, students indicated that if they negotiated all

comprehension difficulties they would have drawn attention to the deficiencies of their interlanguage and possibly embarrass themselves. Thus, "face saving" seemed to be a main concern in what got negotiated and what did not. Similarly, "communicative efficiency" determines that not all linguistic gaps will be negotiated simply because it is too cumbersome to do so. As a result, students attempt to solve comprehension problems in other ways, either by "pretending" that they understand or by trying to guess from the context what the lexical item in question may mean. In either case, students are opting to save face and at the same time maintain smooth conversation.

To review, the data reveals that there were several important factors influencing NS triggered lexical negotiations in the host family setting. First, when NS adjusted their speech to the student's level, fewer breakdowns were likely to occur and negotiation tended to be minimized. However, there were exceptions to this especially when host fathers were involved recording sessions. Specifically, while host mothers were quite competent at adapting topics and vocabulary to their host student's level of comprehension, host fathers did not seem to share this ability. They frequently brought up difficult topics and used vocabulary beyond the student's level of comprehension. Moreover, they often failed to notice even overt signals indicating that students were having difficulty understanding. This general inability of host fathers to modify their speech to the student's level offered an explanation of

the higher percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations in three out of five of the student's data. The last major point to be made here is that students did not always pursue explanations when they didn't understand something. Their comments made a convincing case for the effect of "face" and communicative efficiency on the amount of negotiations they actually pursued in conversations with their host family members. On one hand, students wanted to maintain a high level of comprehension but realized that requesting clarification of every word they didn't understand may have made them look incompetent on one hand and impede conversation on the other, so they compromised by trying to guess from the surrounding context or just pretended that they understood what was being said even when they didn't. This meant that although there could possibly have been more NS triggered lexical negotiations, they were sometimes limited by students' concern for face and desire to maintain smooth communication.

As for the classroom, there were some obvious differences between NS triggered lexical negotiations in the classroom versus the host family setting. First, as with student triggered lexical negotiations in the classroom, there was the potential for NS triggered negotiations to become multi-partied, depending on how the instructor chose to use the students in the classroom as a resource for solving a breakdown. Second, rather than asking the instructor about the meaning of a word they did not understand, students often asked their classmates for help so as not to interrupt the flow of the

class. Consider the next excerpt illustrating a lexical negotiation that originated from the instructor's utterance. In this negotiation, Instructor Hoshino (H) utters a common katakana word, "*abekku*" (couple). Susan (S) as well as another student (S3) request clarification of the word. Subsequently, Instructor Hoshino (H), Student 8 (S8), and Student 4 (S4) try to explain it.

**Excerpt 5.10 [NS triggered lexical negotiation- classroom]**

- 1 H *hai abekku abekku*  
okay "abekku" "abekku"
- 2 S *nan to iu ?*  
what is it called
- 3 H *abekku*  
"abekku"
- 4 S3 *nan desu ka*  
what is that?
- 5 S *eego de nan desu ka*  
what is it in English?
- 6 S8 *eego janai*  
It's not English
- 7 H *eego janai desu ka abekku tte kappuru no koto desu*  
Isn't it English? "abekku" is "couple"
- 8 S4 *otokonohito to onnanohito desu*  
a man and a woman
- 9 S *couple to iu?*  
it's "couple"?
- 10 S8 *uh huh*  
uh huh
- 11 S *couple?*  
couple?
- 12 H *kappuru no koto wa abekku desu ne etto ja S5 san*  
couple is "abekku" right, well then S5 san

The negotiation is triggered in line 1 by the word "*abekku*", uttered by Instructor Hoshino. Susan requests a repetition of the word so Instructor Hoshino says it again in line 3. However, S3 does not know the word and asks for clarification in line 4, "*nan desu ka*" (what is it?). Joining in, Susan asks

for the English definition in line 5. S8 replies in line 6 that it is not an English word. However, Instructor Hoshino's response "*eego janai desu ka*" (isn't it English?) indicates that she thought it was an English loanword. Next however, she gives the katakana version of the word "couple" (*kappuru*) to explain the meaning. S4 adds on to this explanation by using circumlocution to explain further, describing "*abekku*" as "a man and a woman", in line 8. In the next line, Susan repeats what Instructor Hoshino said and requests confirmation of the word, only she uses the English pronunciation of "couple" rather than the katakanaized version, "*kappuru*". In line 10, it is S8 confirms that this is the correct meaning. However, perhaps not satisfied with a confirmation from another student, Susan repeats her request for confirmation again in line 11 and finally, in line 12, Instructor Hoshino confirms that the meaning of "*abekku*" (couple) is "*kappuru*" (couple).

This type of multi-party negotiation is without a doubt a characteristic of negotiation in classrooms where teachers encourage group participation when questions or problems arise. Essentially, teachers give up a certain amount of the "floor" to encourage students to solve problems in the L2. However, it is noticeable that Susan repeats her original request for confirmation in line 9 again in line 11, even though another student (S8) has already confirmed it in line 10. This suggested that even though group behavior was encouraged in solving problems or answering questions, the

final confirmation was expected from the instructor because s/he is considered the expert.

The factors that affected NS triggered negotiation in the classroom were as varied as they were in the host family setting. To illustrate, Table 5.7 (below) is a comparison of NS triggered lexical negotiations for each of the three classrooms.

**Table 5.7. Percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations per class**

<b>Instructor Name</b>	<b>Hoshino (Susan)</b>	<b>Endo (Amy, Jamie, Mandy)</b>	<b>Yoshimura (Lisa)</b>
<b>% Lexical Trigger by NS</b>	21.74	4.8	6.67

It shows that opportunities to negotiate lexical items in the instructor's speech were rare in Instructor Endo and Instructor Yoshimura's class, but comparatively speaking were abundant in Instructor Hoshino's class. Such a big difference between Hoshino's class versus Endo and Yoshimura's classes begs inquiry into the possible reasons for such a difference. First, similar to the host family setting, instructors tended to modify their speech in the classroom and aim their language at 100% student comprehension. This view is supported in the literature on teacher talk, which indicates that teachers tend to slow down their rate of speech, adjust the level of vocabulary they use and generally adjust their speech to avoid frustrating their students (see Ellis, 1990 for a review). A couple of students' comments during a group discussion session also confirmed this:

I understand what he (Instructor Endo) is saying almost 100% of the time. He never uses words we don't understand and if he does, he immediately explains it to us. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

Hoshino sensei (teacher) tries not to use words we don't know unless it's new vocabulary. (*Susan, group discussion*)

These comments indicate that students were well aware of the fact that their teachers went out of their way to make sure they understood everything. Something else that may be inferred from these comments is that the teacher's behavior in this regard was almost expected and somehow appreciated by the students. One may assume then that part of the reason opportunities to negotiate words in the instructor's speech were limited is because the instructors themselves made attempts not to confuse students by using vocabulary beyond their comprehension.

Other factors that may have further limited NS triggered lexical negotiation in the classroom tended to be common practice in the three classrooms. First was the use of English. In their study of teacher's language use in the classroom, Polio and Duff (1994), found that most teachers were unaware of the extent to which they used English in the classroom and that English was commonly used at the word level to help students with comprehension. The use of English was most notable in Instructor Endo's class, who tended to replace single lexical items in Japanese with English ones perhaps in order to avoid spending time negotiating or in an attempt to avoid frustrating students. In addition, students were able to use one another as

resources when the instructor used a lexical item they were not familiar with and this made negotiating with the instructor unnecessary. Moreover, similar to the host family setting, students often chose not to negotiate words they did not understand because they either did not consider the word to be important enough or because they did not want to risk interrupting the classroom talk or embarrassing themselves. As Pica (1992) points out, "learners are reluctant to initiate negotiation as signalling a lack of understanding" because "it might suggest a lack of competence or loss of attention on their part" (p. 450).

These factors may explain to a large extent the low percentage of NS triggered negotiations in Instructor Endo and Instructor Yoshimura's class, however, they don't explain the higher percentage of negotiations in Instructor Hoshino's class. Besides the fact that reliance on lexis may be more common in a beginning level class and this may increase the amount of lexical negotiation, the data indicates that the reason behind the higher percentage of NS triggered lexical negotiations in Instructor Hoshino's class can be explained by the type of activities that the students engaged in. Just as the "word defining activity" in Instructor Hoshino's class sparked numerous student triggered lexical negotiations, listening activities often sparked questions regarding the words used in the listening. However, there was an element of these listening activities that differed from other typical NS triggered lexical negotiations. Because audiotapes of NSs were used, the students' questions were often about words they did not understand from the

taped listening rather than about words that Instructor Hoshino herself may have used. Nevertheless, it was with Instructor Hoshino that they negotiated the meaning of the word and came to a solution. So, theoretically, because the negotiation was triggered by a NS and the negotiation itself was of the NS - NNS variety, it was labeled as such for purposes of analysis. This may explain why the percentage of NS-triggered lexical negotiations Hoshino's was so much higher than the other two classes.

To review, a few factors seemed to contribute to a low number of NS triggered lexical negotiations. First, teachers often adjusted their speech to avoid breakdowns and ensure student comprehension. Also, students were sometimes reluctant to interrupt the ongoing talk to request clarification because they were perhaps embarrassed to let it be known that they didn't understand something. Moreover, students could use each other as a resource to reduce the amount of negotiation they engage in with the instructor. On the other hand, certain factors may have increased NS triggered lexical negotiation in the classroom. One of these was the type of activity. For example, the listening exercises in Hoshino's class prompted student questions about the meaning of lexical items in the listening and this resulted in more lexical negotiation. This was perhaps because the students in Instructor Hoshino's class were still at the beginning level where lexical knowledge is most important for comprehension.

### Summary of NS-triggered lexical negotiations.

To review, the factors that affected NS triggered lexical negotiations in the classroom were somewhat similar to those found in the host family setting with regard to NSs adjusting their speech in order to avoid breakdowns and ensure student comprehension. However, an important difference was noted between the classroom and the host family setting. Specifically, although host mothers (with the exception of Jamie's host mother) were very adept at adjusting their speech and avoiding the use of difficult vocabulary, host fathers were not as capable at modifying their speech, tended to use difficult words, and were often not able to recognize students' limitations, thereby causing a lot of comprehension problems. Another similarity between the host family setting and the classroom was that sometimes students were reluctant to interrupt the ongoing talk to request clarification of a lexical item because they were embarrassed to draw attention to their inadequate command of the L2. Consequently, students in the classroom often relied on classmates as a resource so as not to interrupt the flow of classroom talk or embarrass themselves. In the host family however, students often tried to understand a word through context or pretended that they had understood in order to save face and maintain smooth conversation. Other factors seemed to be inherent in the classroom setting but not in the host family. For example, the type of activities students participated in in the classroom, such as listening exercises, may have

prompted more negotiation with the instructor about lexical items especially because the students' proficiency level was low and they still relied heavily on lexical knowledge for comprehension.

### **Grammatical Triggers**

The purpose of this section is to examine grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family versus the classroom setting. First, a comparison of the frequency of grammatically triggered negotiations that occurred in both the host family and classroom setting is presented. Next, grammatical negotiations and the factors that affected them is discussed for the host family and then for the classroom setting. Lastly, there will be a comparison of the similarities and differences in grammatical negotiations in the host family and classroom setting.

Negotiations triggered by the student's lack of grammatical knowledge are considerably lower in frequency than negotiations caused by lack of lexical knowledge (see Table 5.1). In a study of American host students and their Japanese host families, Iino (1996) also found that most communication breakdowns were over the meaning of words and that negotiating the meaning of words was a characteristic of host family dinner conversations. As for breakdowns caused by grammatical mistakes or misunderstandings, Iino (1996) found that both the host family members and students perceived grammatical aspects of their communication to be less important than

vocabulary and reported that there was not a lot of emphasis on grammatical correctness during their dinnertime conversations. Likewise, in communication strategy and negotiation studies, the majority of the analysis is devoted to lexis simply because of the high frequency of occurrence, ease of analysis, and ability to obtain retrospective comments on lexical difficulties (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997).

It is important to specify here that the grammatical trigger category only includes those instances when a student's lack of grammatical knowledge led to comprehension problems and subsequent negotiation to solve those comprehension problems. There were in fact, several instances when students made grammatical mistakes or perhaps did not understand a grammatical aspect of the NS's utterance, but negotiation did not occur as a result. Particularly in the classroom, students' grammatical mistakes were often corrected by the instructor rather than negotiated. These correction sequences are not considered negotiations because they are missing a critical component of negotiation, which is the element of 'incomplete understanding'. Varonis and Gass (1985) make the following statement about correction and negotiation:

If a NS understands a NNS well enough to correct their linguistic mistakes, perhaps they understand them well enough to continue the conversation without correcting it. (Varonis & Gass, 1985, p. 59)

To explain further, when a NS overtly corrects a NNS, it is likely that the NS does not have a comprehension problem, but has a problem with the form, pronunciation, etc.. and this is not negotiation. On the other hand, sometimes instructors pretended not to understand a student's ungrammatical utterance in an attempt to prompt the student to modify their utterance. This "perceived" comprehension problem and the exchange that usually followed is called a "didactic" negotiation, essentially negotiation over form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Therefore, even a perceived lack of understanding may trigger a negotiation, but when there is no indication of a lack of understanding or a perceived lack of understanding the exchange that follows is usually considered to be a type of correction.

According to the data illustrated in Table 5.8 below, there is a considerable difference in the total frequency of negotiations triggered by grammatical problems in the host family as compared to the classroom setting.

**Table 5.8. Grammatically triggered negotiations - host family and classroom**

Trigger Types by percentage of total triggers	Host Family Setting	Classroom Setting
% Grammatical Trigger by NS	2%	7 %
% Grammatical Trigger by Student	11 %	22 %
<b>Total % of grammatical triggers</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>29%</b>

The total percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family setting is 13%, compared to over twice that many for the classroom

setting at 29%. Also shown in the table above is the percentage of negotiations triggered by grammatical problems in the student's utterance versus those triggered by the NS. As shown, negotiations triggered by students' utterances is higher than those negotiations triggered by something grammatical in the NS's utterance and student triggered grammatical negotiations in the classroom occurred twice as much in the classroom as they did in the host family setting. Certain factors may have played a role in lowering the number of negotiations triggered by the NS's utterance. Namely, similar to the findings in the lexical negotiation section, one might expect such results due to the difference between production and reception. To explain, producing the correct grammar when speaking is more likely to tax the students' mental processes than hearing that same grammatical structure used in the NS utterance and trying to understand it. Also, as mentioned in the lexical section, instructors and host family members try not to confuse students or hinder comprehension by adjusting their speech both lexically and grammatically to the students' level. The instructors' and host family members' familiarity with and ability to adjust to the student's interlanguage essentially discourages NS triggered lexical and grammatical negotiations.

#### **Grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family.**

Grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family setting seem to be affected by a number of factors. Unlike the classroom, where the focus was

often on accuracy and students were made to modify their utterances, communication in the host family did not always require the participants to adjust their output or negotiate grammatically, especially when the meaning of the utterance was clear without relying on the morphology or syntax that was used to express it. Students recognized that when the focus was on communication, their grammar did not have to be perfect for them to be understood. Below are some comments students in this study made about their view of grammar in the host family setting:

Sometimes when I'm talking with my host family I don't care if I'm using the grammar correctly or that I've learned in class, I just want to get through the conversation and be understood. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

Yeah, sometimes I don't even care if I say things right, I'm just trying to get my point across and that's all that matters. (*Susan, group discussion*)

If I try to say everything using the right grammar it would take me forever. And my homestay parents seem to get it even when I think, 'there's no way they're going to understand this'. (*Lisa, group discussion*)

The comments indicate that students were aware of the fact that grammar played only a small part in comprehensibility in the host family setting and that attempting to use correct grammar all the time was almost impossible when the focus was on communication. The expectations and goals in the host family setting were such that students focused on communicating their message and were perhaps not expected to produce

utterances that were grammatically correct as long as their message was comprehensible to their host family members. It is in this sense that goals and expectations factored into the low number of grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family setting.

Another factor that undoubtedly contributed to low or shortened NS triggered grammatical negotiation in the host family was the host family members' ability to adjust their speech so as to limit comprehension problems for the student. Japanese native speakers' tendency to adjust their speech for their host students was found to be an important part of Iino's (1996) findings in his study of interaction between Japanese host family members and their host students. He maintained that host family members often "*gaijinized*" their speech (i.e., adjusted their speech) to their host students by trying to use only standard Japanese, overusing certain pronouns and basically using speech geared toward "foreigners". To a small degree, this also rang somewhat true in the host family data for this study as well. There were several instances of grammatically triggered negotiations where NS's clarified their utterances by replacing the informal verb ending in their original utterance with a formal verb ending in their subsequently modified utterance. Consider, for example, the following grammatically triggered negotiation between Susan (S) and her host mother (M) in which the host mother rephrases her original utterance from the informal form to the formal form.

**Excerpt 5.11 [Clarification and rephrase: informal to formal - host family]**

- 1 M: *koori ageyoo ka* ((to Susan)) (informal form)  
shall I give you some ice?  
2 S: *uh mo ichido itte kudasai*  
uh please say that again  
3 M: *ko- koori koori agemashoo ka* (rephrase to formal form)  
should I give you some i- ice ice  
4 S: *ah hai hai hai*  
ah yes yes yes

In line 1, Susan's host mother used the informal form of "shall I give" (*ageyoo*). Susan asks for repetition in line 2. At first glance, it is not clear if Susan asked for repetition because she did not hear what her host mother had said, or because she did not understand one of the words. When asked in group discussion why she asked her host mother to repeat what she had said, Susan replied, "What is that last part she asked me 'ageoo'?" (*Susan, group discussion*).

This indicated that the problem was due to Susan's unfamiliarity with the informal form of "shall I give" (*ageyoo*). Thus, in line 3, when Susan's host mother clarifies her utterance by rephrasing it into the formal form, Susan seems to understand immediately. The fact that Susan has the lowest proficiency level may be the reason she is not as familiar with the informal form as the other students. Textbooks usually introduce the formal form first, then later introduce the informal form. Therefore, the informal form seems to cause problems for beginning students simply because it has not been introduced yet, or the student has not had time to master it, even recognize it in conversation. In fact, in an interview, Susan's host mother remarked that

she often rephrased things into the formal form because she knew that it caused Susan comprehension difficulties. Her comments were as follows:

*anoo yapari minna san soo datta to omoo n dakedo. futsuu no hanashikata ga dekinai ryuugakusei ni taishite 'wakaru?' toka to itte saigo ni 'wakarimasu ka' to iwanai to tsujimasen. taitee no ryuugakusee wa 'wakaru?' toka 'wakaranai?' toka wakaranai. gobi o hakkiri iu to wakaruu kedo . 'wakarimasu ka', 'wakarimashita ka' gobi hakkiri iu to wakaruu kedo. yappari koo anoo ryuugakusee to hanashi suru toki chanto koo hakkiri hanasanai to 'wakarimasu ka', wakarimasen ka' toka saigo no gobi o hakkiri iwanai to shitsumon no imi ga wakaranai. demo nihonjin dooshi da to 'oishii?' toka u:n iu n deshoo. u:n de Susan san ni gobi o hakkiri itte agenai to wakarimasen. sore wa itsumo ne koo itsumo hanasu koto yoo ni 'tabemasu?' kikun da kedo taitee no ryuugakusee wa sore de 'e:h?' tte imi ga wakaranai mitai dakara mo ichi do 'tabemasu ka' chanto gobi o tsukete, sore de wakaruu. (Susan's host mother, interview)*

Um of course everyone is like that I think, but you can't really talk in a normal way with the foreign exchange students. When you say, 'understand?' (informal form), then at the end if you don't say 'do you understand?' (formal form), then they don't get it. The average foreign student doesn't understand, 'understand?' (informal form), 'don't understand?' (informal form). If you say the ending clearly though, they understand. 'Do you understand?' (formal form), 'did you understand?' (formal form), if you don't say the ending clearly they don't understand the meaning of the question. But if it's two Japanese (NS) then they say just 'good?' (informal form) right? U:m if you don't say the ending clearly for Susan, she doesn't understand. So I always ask in the way I'm used to talking, like 'eat?' (informal form), and most foreign students respond with, 'e:h?' and look like they don't understand the meaning, then I say 'will you eat?' (formal form) and say the ending properly and they understand. (Susan's host mother, interview)



7 A: *ah hai hai hai*  
ah yes yes yes

In line 1, Amy is telling her host mother that in bars, eighteen year olds can smoke cigarettes. However, Amy doesn't use the potential form of the verb "smoke" (*suemasu/suu koto ga dekiru*) in her sentence. Therefore, in line 2, the host mother does an interpretive summary of what Amy has said, using the correct potential form of the verb (in the informal form), and requests confirmation. Amy responds in line 3 by asking for repetition, and the host mother repeats what she has said in line 4. It is clear that Amy still doesn't understand in line 5, when she repeats the word "*dekiru*" (can) with a question intonation asking for clarification of the word. In line 6 then, Amy's host mother clarifies her utterance by rephrasing it into the formal form, "*dekimasu*" (can). Amy then signals her understanding and this ends the negotiation.

Similar to the negotiation between Susan and her host mother (Excerpt 5.11), this negotiation indicates that students were often not familiar enough with the informal form to even recognize it, but also that host family members were familiar with this phenomena among host students. The fact that the host mother responded in line 7 by rephrasing her utterance into the formal form rather than giving some explanation of the meaning of "*dekiru*" (can), indicates that the host mother was perhaps aware of the limits of Amy's interlanguage, and that one thing that caused difficulties for her was the use

of informal form. The data shows that, except for Lisa's host parents, the other students' host parents were somewhat used to their students' difficulties with the informal form. It is perhaps because Lisa was an advanced speaker of Japanese that no grammatical negotiations related to the informal style occurred in her interactions with her host family. In Iino's (1996) study however, NSs tended to overuse the formal form even with more advanced students of Japanese. Iino (1996) maintained that this is one of the characteristics of a '*gaijinized code*' (a code used when talking to foreigners or nonnative speakers). This is also supported by Hiraike-Okawara and Sakamoto (1990) who found that NSs made modifications in their informal interviews with learners of Japanese. Among the modifications NSs made was the overuse of *~masu* or formal verb forms. This different set of rules applied when talking to nonnative speakers is undoubtedly one explanation for the use of formal style over informal style. Another explanation is that when NSs realize through extensive interaction with their host family students that using the informal form often causes comprehension difficulties they are likely to adjust their speech accordingly. Thus, it is not surprising that NSs adjusted their speech from informal to formal style either initially or in response to host student's signals of comprehension difficulties. However, switching from the informal form to the *~masu* or formal form may also signify a change in social roles. Cook (1997) points out that Japanese parents, in particular mothers, often switch to the formal (*~masu*) form when

they are engaged in matters that relate to a caregiver's responsibility such as serving food or teaching a child what is appropriate or right. Thus, in the host family situation the reason the host mother changes from the informal to the formal form may be because she is taking on the role of "teacher", essentially teaching the student to understand what is and is not correct in the target language.

Iino (1996) asserted "*gaijinization*" (Iino, 1996) not only affected how NSs adjusted their speech to their host students, but also extended to expectations of students' speech or behavior. For example, Iino (1996) found that host family members did not expect students to know difficult grammar or polite ways of speaking and were often not held accountable for mistakes that might have been considered serious if a Japanese native speaker had committed them. Although not a negotiation, the excerpt below is an example of how host family members may even encourage incorrect ways of speaking. Here, Mandy (Ma) makes a mistake involving adjective morphology and the host mother (M) repeats it as if it were entirely correct.

**Excerpt 5.13 [Gaijinization and students' mistakes]**

- 1 Ma *amari kirekunai to omoo*  
I don't think it's not very pretty
- 2 M *soo ne kirekunai ne*  
yes it's not pretty is it
- 3 Ma *uh hm*  
yeah

In line 1, Mandy makes a mistake in adjective morphology with the nominal-adjective, "*kiree*" (pretty), essentially adding on the wrong ending. However, in line 2, rather than reformulating the utterance with the correct form and requesting confirmation as is often done in such cases, the host mother repeats Mandy's mistake in her own utterance as if it were the correct way to say it. Later, when the host mother was asked why she didn't use the correct version in her own response, but instead repeated the mistake as Mandy had said it, the host mother said that she understood exactly what the student was trying to say and thought the mistake was "cute", so she just repeated it. It stands to reason that sometimes host family members feel that they don't have to go to the trouble of negotiating mistakes that do not cause difficulties in comprehension, but it is perhaps less expected that a host member may repeat the mistake as if it were correct, simply because the mistake was "cute". The "cute factor", as one might call it, has been noted before in Iino's (1996) study as an aspect of "*gaijinization*". He found that certain types of errors made by students were often not corrected by their host members because they were thought of as cute or as something the student shouldn't be held responsible for knowing. In fact, as in Iino's (1996) study, host family members in this study relayed anecdotes based on the 'cute' mistakes that previous and current host students made and the stories were often a source of humor among the network of host family members. The host family members indicated that none of the students in these stories were

ever told about the mistakes they had made that had prompted such humor. Although the cute factor may affect what gets negotiated and what does not (in the host family setting), I believe its role is only minimal in problems in grammar. What usually occurs in the case of a garden-variety student-triggered grammatical negotiation is that even if the host family member generally understood what the student was trying to say, they would often reformulate the student's utterance as a request for confirmation. The reformulation usually involved modeling the correct grammar and then the student confirmed or rejected the NS's version and sometimes modified their initial utterance to reflect the feedback the NS provided in the reformulation. This is illustrated in Excerpt 5.14 below, in a negotiation between Mandy (Ma) and her host mother (M).

**Excerpt 5.14 [NS reformulations of students' grammatical mistakes - host family]**

- |   |     |  |                                   |
|---|-----|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Ma: | <i>un soo ano: X daigaku kara tomodachi ga nai areba [nai nareba =</i><br>yes, if there were no friends from ah University X=  |                                   |
| 2 | M:  | <i>[un = na- na- inai to?</i><br><i>[uhhuh =na- na- if they</i><br><br><i>weren't here?</i><br><i>X daigaku no tomodachi ga inai to?</i><br><i>you mean if there were no friends from University X ?</i> | <b>(request for confirmation)</b> |
| 3 | Ma: | <i>hai inai to</i><br>yeah if there were none  | <b>(repeat - confirmation)</b>    |
| 4 | M:  | <i>un tomodachi ga inai to</i><br>yes if there weren't friends   | <b>(repeat-reconfirmation)</b>    |

Not knowing what the correct form is, Mandy tries a series of grammatically wrong forms known as retrieval in line 1. Unsuccessful, the

host family mother tries to guess what she is saying in line 2. She first says the form alone and then repeats the same sentence that Mandy uttered previously, but with the correct form, modeling it for Mandy as a request for confirmation. In response, in line 3, Mandy repeats the corrected form her host mother has given her and then in line 4, the mother confirms that it is correct.

This type of negotiation over grammar is very common in the host family situation. Specifically, Mandy's utterance in line 1 provides enough information to enable her host mother to decipher what she is saying. The host mother then repeats it back to her in the correct form as a request for confirmation as if to say, "You mean...?". Then, Mandy uses the host mother's feedback to modify her original utterance. While the last step of modifying one's own utterance may vary, the first two steps, grammatical problem and correction/guess as request for confirmation seems to be the usual sequence in grammatically-triggered negotiations that occur in the host family setting. Different from an outright correction, which is not considered negotiation, the way host family members handled students' grammatical problems by modeling the target-like version in the form of a request for confirmation seemed to serve three functions. First, the request for confirmation cleared up any possibilities that the NS's interpretation was incorrect. Second, it served as an "off-the-record" or implicit correction, as a recast might do in a classroom setting, and gave the student feedback on their

interlanguage. Third, the request for confirmation was a way of avoiding threats to the student's positive and negative face. Essentially, the NS's model of the correct grammar as a request for confirmation gave the student the chance to confirm or disconfirm the NS's interpretation, save face, and modify their own utterance in response to the NS's feedback.

Another factor that may have played a role in increasing or decreasing the number of grammatical negotiations students engage in was proficiency. In order to look at proficiency as a factor, the data was broken down into individual students. Table 5.9 below shows the percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations per individual student in the host family setting as well as the total number of grammatically triggered negotiations (in parentheses) in the total two and half hours of data.

**Table 5.9. Percent of grammatically triggered negotiations per student in the host family setting**

<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Susan</b>	<b>Amy</b>	<b>Jamie</b>	<b>Mandy</b>	<b>Lisa</b>
<b>% Grammatical Trigger by Student</b>	6.6% (5)	4.4% (2)	16.7 % (11)	13.5% (7)	15.2% (7)
<b>% Grammatical Trigger by NS</b>	0% (0)	8.7% (4)	3% (2)	1.9% (1)	0% (0)
<b>Total % of grammatical triggers</b>	6.6 % (5)	13.1% (6)	19.7 % (13)	15.4 % (8)	15.2% (7)

The students are arranged from lowest proficiency level to the highest. The data indicates that the relationship between proficiency level and

frequency tended to be the opposite of what was observed for lexically triggered negotiations. That is, for lexical negotiations, barring any other factors, lower proficiency students tended to have a higher percentage of lexically triggered negotiations than higher proficiency students, but for grammatical negotiations the relationship appears to be reversed. According to the table, Susan and Amy, the two lower proficiency students, have a lower percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations compared to the higher proficiency students Jamie (16.7%), Mandy (13.5%), and Lisa (15.2%). Jamie's data shows the highest percentage and number of grammatically triggered negotiations. This is perhaps due to the fact that Jamie's host mother had the least experience with host students out of all the host family members. On the other hand, while experience with host students may override proficiency factors somewhat, proficiency still may play an important role in the frequency of grammatically-triggered negotiations. It has been suggested that when students' lexical knowledge is sufficient enough to process sentences at the structural level rather than at the word level, that it is then that students may start noticing the gaps between the L2 and their interlanguage. That is, their awareness of and focus on grammaticality increases along with their proficiency. They are able to go beyond the word level and 'notice' the gaps in their grammatical competence. The discussion group comments and the journal entries indirectly verify this. While all the students commented about their lack of vocabulary knowledge in their journals and in group

discussions, Susan in particular made frequent comments that her lack of vocabulary was the biggest obstacle in interactions with her host family. This is perhaps because her proficiency level was the lowest and she still had to rely mainly on lexis to understand her host family members and to convey what she wanted to say. Only the two highest proficiency students, Mandy and Lisa, seemed to be aware of and be able to comment retrospectively on grammatical trouble they'd had in conversations with their host family members. For example, Mandy's journal excerpts below indicate that she "noticed" the gaps in her grammatical competence.

I have a tendency to leave out my past tense endings, so my sentences sound kind of weird. (*Mandy, journal entry*)

Every now and again I say next week or next year instead of last week. The trouble is I end up sounding like a moron because my sentence contains two different tenses. Based on context, the listener can generally understand what I'm saying. They'll usually say, "you mean last week?" or something like that. (*Mandy, journal entry*)

During the conversation tonight, I was trying to explain that when you go to college you get fat because you're not used to not living with your folks, so you eat bad. Then the 2nd or 3rd year you get used to cooking for yourself so you eat better. That was hard to explain because 'get used to' (*ni nareru*), but 'if you get used to' is, '*ni nareba*', then I wanted to make that 'if you're not used to..'. And then to say, ' the

2nd and 3rd year you get used to not living with your parents...'. It gets a little bit hard to add on all the conjugations then negatives etc... (*Mandy, journal entry*)

These journal entries indicate that Mandy was not only aware of the grammatical problems she had when trying to get a message across, but that she could pinpoint exactly where the problems were. The following excerpt illustrates a grammatical negotiation between Mandy (Ma) and her host mother (M).

**Excerpt 5.15 [Grammatical negotiation - host family]**

- 1 Ma *watashi wa mada tegami o moraimasen deshita*  
I didn't receive the letter yet
- 2 M *dare kara? ah! ichido mo tegami ah mada moratte inai?*  
from who? ah! you haven't received a letter ah even once yet?
- 3 Ma *hai mada moratte inai*  
yes I haven't received it yet

In line 1, Mandy is trying to say that she hasn't received any letters from home yet. However, the verb form she uses makes her mother think she is waiting for a letter from someone but she hasn't received it. Therefore, the host mother asks Mandy whose letter she hasn't received yet, but before Mandy can answer, the host mother figures out that Mandy is actually trying to say that she has not received any letters at all from home yet, so she models the correct verb form in a request for confirmation. In line 3 then, Mandy confirms that this is indeed what she is trying to say and she repeats the correct form of the verb.

The fact that Mandy realized from her host mother's feedback that her verb form was wrong and subsequently incorporated it into her utterance perhaps reveals that Mandy's interlanguage was at a level where she could

focus on gaps in her grammatical competence as opposed to just gaps in lexis. Grammatical negotiations in the host family were often short and simple like this one, leading one to believe that when grammatical problems were not compounded, the NS probably understood what was being said, but followed up with a model of the correct grammar and request for confirmation so that they knew their interpretation was correct. Moreover, as stated above, the model in the form of a request for confirmation allowed the NS to give helpful feedback on grammatical problems and was less of a threat to face than overtly correcting the student, which rarely happened in the host family situation.

Like Mandy, Lisa's journal comments (below) indicated that she was also very aware of her grammatical shortcomings:

Susan came over to visit tonight. It was strange to listen to her though. I was trying to remember when I talked like that. I think I was probably like Susan (with less of a *bunpoo* (grammar) base) when I left Japan the first time. Anyway, I continue to hear my own mistakes and cringe. And I continue to have moments when I know exactly what I want to say and just can't wrap my mouth around it. (*Lisa, journal entry*)

Boy, when I started talking about "Lady Jane" (a movie), I didn't know it was going to require so much passive, causative, and causative/passive. I still don't feel very confident with them. When I had to use one, I would try to guess what was correct, but my host mother had to help me out with them a lot. (*Lisa, journal entry*)

These excerpts from Lisa's journal show that she was aware of the shortcomings of her command of grammar because she comments about her own grammar mistakes and where her grammatical competence fell short. In the second journal entry, Lisa wrote specifically about relaying the story of "Lady Jane" to her host mother and of the trouble she had with passive, causative, and causative-passive. In fact, in this particular conversation, four negotiations were the result of a lack of grammatical knowledge of causative and passive forms. They included the following sentences, "She was made to be the queen", "They tried to made her quit", "Her power was taken from her", and "He was made to marry her". The following negotiation is an excerpt from that conversation where Lisa (L) is trying to tell her host mother (M) that the son of the advisor was made to marry 'Lady Jane', the queen.

**Excerpt 5.16 [Grammatical negotiation - host family]**

- 1 L *un chikai hito [wa ano edwaado no adovaizaa no ah musuko wa lady jane to kekkon shita? um sase?*  
yes someone near um Edward's advisor's son married? Lady Jane um made?
- 2 N *un* *saserareta?*  
*[yes* *was made to*  
*marry?*
- 3 L *un saserareta sooshite sore de ano sono futari ga anoo otagai kirai datta*  
yes was made to marry so then um those two um hated each other
- 4 N *e h*  
yes

In line 1, it is obvious that Lisa does not know how to say, "he was made to marry Lady Jane", so she attempts a couple of incorrect forms, making an indirect appeal for help. In line 2, the host mother guesses that

Lisa wants to say, "he was made to.." and provides Lisa with the correct form to say it, requesting confirmation that she has interpreted Lisa's utterance correctly. In response, Lisa confirms that this is indeed what she wants to say and repeats the feedback her host mother has provided, then goes on to finish her explanation of the story.

Both Mandy's and Lisa's negotiations above were perhaps more indicative of students who were at a higher level of proficiency, were aware of what their own interlanguage lacked in terms of grammar, and were able to incorporate the feedback that their host family members gave them. This does not mean that lower proficiency students were completely unaware of gaps in their grammatical competence and therefore did not modify their utterances in response to NS feedback, rather, problems with lexis were so prevalent as to demand more attention thus perhaps overriding concerns for grammatical problems in their speech.

In sum, there were several factors that seemed to contribute to the number of grammatically triggered negotiations students engage in. First, the focus on communication in host family conversations may have limited the number of negotiations triggered by grammatical problems in general. A focus on communication meant that regardless of the grammatical mistakes that occurred, when the meaning of an utterance was clear, there was little need to negotiate. Moreover, when students' focus was on communication, they were not necessarily concerned about the accuracy of their message, but

just that their message had been understood. Another factor that seems to have played a role in reducing the number of NS triggered grammatical negotiations was the NS's ability to adjust their speech to their host student's level. Familiarity with the student's interlanguage meant that host family members could aim their speech at the student's level of comprehension. At the same time, some host parents seemed to engage in "*gaijinization*", a process of adjusting their speech toward "foreigners". Although this did not occur at the level that Iino (1996) found in his study, in this study host family members were found to modify their speech by replacing informal verb forms with formal ones. Also, sometimes host family members accepted students' blatant grammatical mistakes because they thought they were "cute".

However, typically NSs responded to students grammatical mistakes by reformulating them into a corrected target-like model and requesting confirmation from the student as to whether it was what they had intended to say. Providing a corrected model and requesting confirmation seemed to serve several functions in grammatical negotiations. First, it allowed the NS to check on their understanding of the student's unclear utterance. At the same time a corrected version cast as a request for confirmation allowed the NS to give implicit feedback on what was wrong with the student's utterance without trespassing on students' concerns for face. The last factor thought to have some effect on grammatical negotiations is proficiency. Specifically, if a student was at a lower proficiency level, the more likely that gaps in their

lexical knowledge were still so significant as to cause more problems in communicating with their host family than their lack of grammatical competence. In contrast, higher level students whose lexical knowledge was sufficient enough to allow them to pay more attention to gaps in their grammatical competence may have engaged in more grammatical negotiation. However, another factor that may have somewhat overridden proficiency effects was the NS's lack of familiarity or experience with NNSs. As previously discussed, host family members with a lot of experience with host students were used to the types of mistakes students made and were able to adjust their grammar to the student's level. However, if the host family member had less experience with host students, as we saw in Jamie's case, it might have been unavoidable to engage in more grammatical negotiation to order to reach a satisfactory level of comprehension.

#### **Grammatically triggered negotiations in the classroom.**

As indicated above in Table 5.8 (above), similar to that found in the host family setting, most grammatically triggered negotiations in the classroom originated in the student's utterance (22%). However, grammatical negotiations in the classroom often occurred in different circumstances as compared to those that occurred in the host family setting. To begin, talk in the classroom often focused on grammar and the goal was often to learn new structures, whereas the goal of conversation in the host family setting was

primarily communication. As Pica et al. (1992) point out in their study, when the task requires attention to form and structure, as is often the case in the classroom, it is then that students have to adjust their output both grammatically and lexically. In this study, most negotiations in the classroom occurred during structure drills when the student tried to use a particular pattern or form and was either not sure of the meaning or of how to use the new pattern or form to convey a certain meaning. Consequently, a sort of metalinguistic negotiation between the student and the instructor about the structure and its meaning often followed. Toward the end of such a negotiation, the student was often expected to use the structure correctly. This type of metalinguistic negotiation was rarely seen in the host family data, probably because stopping to ask metalinguistic questions about a specific meaning or usage would have halted the ongoing communication. An example of a classroom grammatical negotiation is given in Excerpt 5.17 below, where the class is engaged in a structure drill and Student 4 (S4) and Instructor Yoshimura (Y) are negotiating about the meaning and use of a pattern, "X nara mada ii" (X is preferable (to 'Y' but only a little better)).

**Excerpt 5.17 [Metalinguistic focus in grammatical negotiation - classroom]**

- 1 Y: *soo ja gogo ni ikoo ne ja kyoo no gogo dekaenai S4 san?*  
well, let's go in the afternoon. Won't you come out with me this afternoon S4?
- 2 S4: *um kai- ano:*  
um kai, we'll
- 3 Y: *kyoo no gogo*  
this afternoon
- 4 S4: *da kara saishoo no paato wa onaji 'kyoo no gogo nara?'*  
so, the first part is the same 'if it's this afternoon' ?

- 5 Y: *sore wa mada benkyoo shite imasen*  
we haven't studied that yet
- 6 S4: *ah! soo*  
okay
- 7 Y: *ima X nara mada ii*  
now (we're studying) "X nara mada ii" - X would be a bit better (than Y:)
- 8 S4: *oh um X nara mada ii (.1) no hoo ga ii?*  
um, then is "X nara mada ii" like "no hoo ga ii" ?
- 9 Y: *uun kyoo no gogo ja dekaenai nani to nani o kurabemasu ka*  
hum, (you) aren't going out this afternoon, what are we comparing here?}
- 10 S4: *dekakeru*  
to go out
- 11 Y: *dekakeru ka dekaenai ka mo ii shi sore kara(0.3) ja kyoo no gogo dekaenai? kyoo no gogo ka hokano hi o kurabemasu kyoo no gogo wa yokunai hokano hi mo yokunai kedo*  
to go out or not to go out is also okay. Then, won't you go out this afternoon?"  
This afternoon or another day is what we're comparing. Today is not good, and another day is not good, but
- 12 S4: *ashita nara mada ii?*  
tomorrow is a little better?
- 13 Y: *mada ii*  
a little better
- 14 S4: *mada ii*  
a little better

In line 1, Instructor Yoshimura guides the structure drill by posing invitations. In his response, Student 4 is supposed to use the new structure, "X nara mada ii" (X is preferable (to 'Y' but only a little better). However, he does not understand what pattern he is expected to use, so after Instructor Yoshimura repeats part of her invitation prompt in line 3, S4 directly requests clarification about whether he is supposed to use "kyoo no gogo nara" (if it's this afternoon). She responds in line 5 that they haven't studied that pattern yet, and tells him in line 7 that the pattern they are practicing now is "X nara mada ii" (X is preferable to 'Y' but only a little better). Still unclear of the meaning of "X nara mada ii" (X is preferable to 'Y' but only a little better), he requests clarification of the pattern and whether it is the same as "X no hoo ga

*ii*" (X is better). Instructor Yoshimura responds by breaking the problem down and getting to the core of what he doesn't understand by asking him what two things are supposed to be compared in this particular use of the pattern. He replies that what is being compared is "going out" or "not going out". In line 11, she explains that while his interpretation might work, what she is looking for is a comparison between "going out today" versus "going out another day", citing that the pattern is used when comparing two fairly equally bad options, but one is a little better than the other. In line 12, he attempts to use the pattern and requests confirmation that his usage is correct. Instructor Yoshimura then confirms his usage of the pattern in line 13 by repeating what he has said. He repeats it again in the line 14 again as a sort of reconfirmation.

In contrast to what happened in most grammatical negotiations in the host family setting, Instructor Yoshimura did not provide S4 with the model of the pattern in question during the negotiation. Rather, she negotiated the use or meaning of the pattern without resorting to English and broke down S4's non-understanding by posing a series of questions to get S4 to think actively about the structure, its meaning, and the way it is used in the sentence. Unlike Yoshimura's class, however, Instructor Hoshino and Endo did not often negotiate the meaning or use of grammar in Japanese. Table 5.10 below shows the percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations from each class, which are presented from lowest to highest class level.

**Table 5.10. Percentage of grammatical triggers per class**

<b>Instructor name</b>	<b>Hoshino (Susan)</b>	<b>Endo (Amy, Jamie, Mandy)</b>	<b>Yoshimura (Lisa)</b>
<b>% Grammatical Triggers by Students</b>	8.7% (4)	4.76% (2)	31.11% (14)
<b>% Grammatical Triggers by Instructor</b>	2.17% (1)	0% (0)	17.78% (8)
<b>Total % of grammatical triggers</b>	<b>10.87%</b>	<b>4.76%</b>	<b>48.89%</b>

Instructor Endo's class showed the lowest percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations. Instructor Hoshino's class was the next highest and showed twice as many grammatical negotiations as in Instructor Endo's class, while the percentage of grammatical negotiations in Instructor Yoshimura's class was the highest of all three. The fact that Instructor Endo's class showed the fewest grammatical negotiations was undoubtedly due to the use of English when problems arose. Although Instructor Endo often feigned understanding with lexical items, he did not do so as often when grammatical problems occurred, but often resorted to the use of English perhaps to quickly clear up what might otherwise have been a lengthy negotiation. The percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations in Hoshino's class was a bit higher than in Endo's class, but if one considers the raw numbers of grammatical negotiations, 5 in Instructor Hoshino's class and 2 in Instructor Endo's class, the difference does not seem that great. There may have been more grammatical negotiation in Instructor Hoshino's class than in Instructor Endo's class because Instructor Hoshino did not allow the use of

English and this may have increased negotiation in general. However, grammatically triggered negotiations were still quite low in Instructor Hoshino's class compared to Instructor Yoshimura's class, which had the largest number of grammatical negotiations. This suggests that proficiency might have played a role in the frequency of grammatical negotiations. In Instructor Hoshino's class, the beginning level class, students may not have had enough language ability to negotiate difficult grammatical mistakes or problems in Japanese. As indicated by the high percentage of lexical negotiations in Hoshino's class, 61.9%, students were still very much at a level where lexical knowledge played a more important role in their comprehension. This is not to say that students in Hoshino's class did not make abundant errors in grammar or that they understood everything their instructor said on a grammatical level, but that these errors or problems in comprehension did not result in a lot of negotiation. On the whole, however, in Endo's and Hoshino's class, errors or problems tended to be dealt with swiftly through error correction, which did not usually involve negotiation. Another 'strategy' students used to avoid negotiation in general was to use one's classmates as a resource. Using classmates as a resources was common and was often engaged in for the sake of not wanting to interrupt the instructor to ask questions, as well as a way of saving face when one does not entirely understand what was said. This would partially explain the low percentages of grammatically triggered negotiations that originated in the

instructor's utterances, which was 2.17% for Hoshino's class, and 0% for Endo's class. Conversely, Instructor Yoshimura's class showed the highest percentage of grammatically triggered negotiations with 48.89%, a percentage that was higher than the percentage of lexical negotiations for her class, 35.57%. There were several factors that contributed to this. First, Instructor Yoshimura rarely allowed the use English in her class. Second, because her students were at a higher proficiency level, they knew how to speak Japanese well enough to be able to negotiate things in Japanese and Instructor Yoshimura often took the time to negotiate problems and errors rather than simply correcting errors or resorting to English to explain things. Third, students were metalinguistically aware of the gaps in their grammatical knowledge and often questioned when they did not understand something that was said (as illustrated in Excerpt 5.17 above). Fourth, students seemed to be more likely to ask Instructor Yoshimura when they did not understand, rather than turning to their classmates. This may have been due to the fact that the students did not feel at all embarrassed to ask questions or make mistakes, as Lisa points out in her journal entry:

One of the greatest things about Yoshimura sensei (teacher) is that she turns every mistake into a compliment - 'Oh I'm glad you brought that up. Now, what Lisa just said was this..... The reason you can't do that is this.....That was a good question.' (*Lisa, journal entry*)

Moreover, in an interview, Lisa pointed out that the grammar they studied in class tended to be so complex that in order to ask a classmate when one did not understand, one would have to engage in a lot of side-talk that would probably disrupt the class and would result in missing what was going on while you were talking to your classmate. Thus, students tended to ask Instructor Yoshimura when they didn't understand rather than turn to their classmates.

Another factor that undoubtedly contributed to the higher frequency of grammatically triggered negotiations in Instructor Yoshimura's class was that no matter what the activity was, listening, reading, role plays etc., the focus was mainly on learning the grammatical patterns within those activities. Although this factor seems to be the one that may have played the most influential role in increasing the number of grammatically triggered negotiations, without the first four factors, negotiation would not be imminent. Instructor Hoshino's classroom also included a variety of activities such as grammar drills, listening, discussing an interview project, pronunciation practice, defining new vocabulary, and free talk. However, problems and mistakes during the grammar drills and other activities tended to be dealt with either through error correction, or sometimes through the use of English. Similarly Endo's class consisted of activities ranging from grammar drills to reading practice to free talk to discussions about debate topics. However, grammar drills and other activities tended to be less

structured in Endo's class as compared to Yoshimura's class. Instructor Endo tended to personalize topics to practice grammar thus grammar drills often ended up leading to tangents of free talk. Consequently, what would have resulted in more of a metalinguistic negotiation of the introduced pattern and its usage resulted in more lexical negotiation and less grammatical negotiation. Consider the following excerpt, where, in order to practice the passive, Instructor Endo (E) has asked the students to talk about their nicknames. The student (S5) is telling Instructor Endo that he himself does not have a nickname, but that he calls his girlfriend "rabbit". Because they have been practicing "I am called X by so and so", Instructor Endo is confused by the way S5 starts out his sentence "my girlfriend (is called) by me....".

**Excerpt 5.18 [Grammatical negotiation - classroom]**

- 1 S5 *watashi wa uh gaarufurendo wa watashi ni*  
I uh my girlfriend by me
- 2 E *eh? gaarufurendo ni watashi wa?*  
what? you (are called) by your girlfriend?
- 3 S5 *ha hah hai demo watashi wa amari nai kara*  
ha hah yes but because I don't have many (nicknames)
- 4 E *hai*  
okay
- 5 S5 *ah watashi wa gaarufurendo de ni yobarete imasen ga kanojo wa watashi ni usagichan*  
*to yob- yobarete imasu*  
ah I am not called (anything) by my girlfriend but she calls me 'little rabbit'
- 6 E *eh ah hah hah ((laugh)) usagichan? kanojo wa?*  
eh ah hah hah ((laugh)) 'little rabbit?' your girlfriend?
- 7 S5 *hai*  
yes

In line 1, the student (S5) starts out by saying, "I uh my girlfriend (is called) by me", which confuses Instructor Endo because up until this point, each person had been talking about what nicknames their friends and family call them. Thus, thinking that S5 has made a mistake in particle usage, Instructor Endo reformulates S5's utterance to mean, "I am called by my girlfriend.." and requests confirmation of it. S5 then tries to explain in line 3 and 5 that his girlfriend doesn't have many nicknames for him, but that he calls her "*usagi chan*" (rabbit). In line 6 then, Instructor Endo again requests confirmation that he has understood S5 correctly by saying "little rabbit? your girlfriend?", and S5 confirms this in line 7.

Unlike most grammatical negotiations in the classroom that were metalinguistic ones about the meaning or usage of certain patterns or forms, this one was similar to what might have actually occurred in the host family setting. First, rather than using a display question or a prompt to let S5 know that he thinks he made a mistake (or so Instructor Endo thought), Instructor Endo modeled the correct particle placement and requested confirmation, thus allowing S5 to confirm or reject the interpretation. Moreover, to make sure that he ultimately understood correctly, Instructor Endo requested confirmation again in line 6, asking if it was the girlfriend who was called "little rabbit". Perhaps the difference between a typical classroom negotiation where display questions, prompts, and negotiation tended to be on a metalinguistic level was that in this case, the purpose of the talk was twofold,

to communicate a message and to practice a particular form. In addition, the S5 was conveying information only known to him, whereas in a lot of structure drills, the context (in the form of pictures or a sentence in a textbook) is already decided. Not knowing what the student is trying to say makes for an authentic transfer of information instead of one when the teacher knows what the student is going to say and how they should say it. Perhaps this is what prompted Instructor Endo to request confirmation rather than just correct what he thought was a grammar mistake.

In sum, the result of a focus on learning grammar in the classroom is likely to have contributed to more grammatical negotiations. However, the type of grammatical negotiation that occurred in the classroom in general was more metalinguistic in nature about the meaning and the use of particular grammatical structures. Instructors rarely provided "the answer" so to say, by providing a correct grammatical model and requesting confirmation. Rather, through display questions and prompts, instructors often negotiated with students so that the student was forced to modify their own utterance and use the given structure correctly. However, an exception to this may have been when the instructor went off on communicative tangents, where the primary focus was on communication and secondary focus was on practicing a particular grammatical pattern, as in Instructor Endo's class. Similar to the host family setting however, proficiency might have played a factor in grammatical negotiations in the classroom. Namely, whether grammatical

negotiations occurred frequently or not may have depended on whether students were at a high enough level to be aware of gaps in their grammatical competence and whether they were able to negotiate these gaps with their instructor or not. Factors that may have outweighed these proficiency effects, however, were; the use of English, the use of correction rather than negotiation to solve grammatical problems, and students using each other as a resource when problems occurred. If the use of English was allowed, negotiation was often not necessary. By the same token, the need for negotiation was also reduced when a student had a grammatical problem and the Instructor decided to correct it or have the student correct it themselves by using some sort of prompt. The last point to make here is that an inevitable consequence of the classroom is that when comprehension problems occurred because of grammar problems, students were apt to turn to one another for help so that they didn't have to interrupt the whole class or embarrass themselves by displaying their lack of comprehension. This was not always the case however. In fact, in Yoshimura's class, the atmosphere was such that students are encouraged to ask when they didn't understand and Instructor Yoshimura took the times to negotiate with them in Japanese.

**Summary of grammatically triggered negotiations in the host family and classroom.**

To review, more than twice as many grammatical negotiations occurred in the classroom than in the host family setting. However, there

were more student triggered grammatical negotiations than NS triggered grammatical negotiations in both the host family and classroom setting. This may be because, cognitively speaking, it is easier for students to listen to and understand a NS's utterance without understanding all of the grammatical structures than to produce those same grammatical structures. Thus, more grammatical negotiations are likely to be triggered by problems originating in the student's speech. Moreover, in both the host family and classroom setting, NSs tended to adjust their speech to the student's level. Instructors often adjusted their speech in the classroom so as not to frustrate students. Similarly, host family member's familiarity with and willingness to adjust their speech to their host student's level may have discouraged grammatical negotiation. Furthermore, the host family member may have thought that student's mistakes were "cute" or they may have believed that the student did not have to be responsible for difficult grammar. As a result, rather than starting a negotiation by modeling the correct grammar in the form of a request for clarification, the NS might have just decided to let mistakes go. Thus, factors affecting grammatical negotiation in the classroom were in some ways different from and similar to those in the host family setting. While the focus on grammar in classroom activities may have encouraged grammatical negotiation, the focus on communication in the host family may have discourage grammatical negotiation, simply because it may have been possible to understand a student's utterance regardless of the

grammatical mistakes made in it. Proficiency level might also have affected the number of grammatical negotiations in both the classroom and the host family setting. Students at a lower proficiency level may have been less likely to engage in grammatical negotiation because they still relied mainly on lexis. On the other hand, students at a higher proficiency level may have been more aware of their grammatical competence and at the same time were able to use the L2 to negotiate grammatical aspects of utterances. However, certain factors may have outweighed proficiency effects and lowered the amount of grammatical negotiation in the classroom including the use of English, the use of correction over negotiation to solve grammatical problems, and students using each other as resources. In contrast, activities in the classroom that focused on grammar and an atmosphere that encouraged questions could have increased grammatical negotiation. In sum, the factors that influenced the frequency of grammatical negotiations in both settings were similar in some respects and different in others. However, in both the host family and classroom setting there seems to have been no dominant factor, but a combination of several factors that affected the frequency of grammatical negotiation.

**CHAPTER SIX**  
**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION PART III:**  
**COMMUNICATION STRATEGY USE IN NEGOTIATION**

Communication strategies are the tools that participants use in negotiation to overcome difficulties in communication. The use of CS in negotiation not only facilitates comprehension, but is also thought to play a role in second language acquisition (see Chapter Two). As such, communication strategies are an indispensable part of any analysis of negotiation. For accurate analysis of CS use in interaction, Yule and Tarone (1991) point out the importance of looking at both sides of a negotiation in order to understand how both participants, in this case, the NS and the students, use communication strategies and work together to solve difficulties as they arise. Keeping this in mind, the purpose of this chapter is to compare CS use in the host family and classroom settings in terms of the frequency and types of CSs used in negotiations and the factors that may have influenced CS use. It specifically addresses the following research question:

- I. What are the similarities and differences in negotiation in the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family contexts in terms of:
  - c) The frequency and types of communication strategies used by the participants and the factors that affect that use.

Thus, the chapter is divided into three main portions. First, there is an overall comparison of the frequency and types of CS used in the host family

setting versus the classroom setting. Next, the most frequently used CSs and the factors that affected their use are discussed for the host family and then for the classroom setting. Lastly, there is comparison of CS use and factors in the host family and classroom settings.

### **Frequency and Types of CS Use in the Host Family vs. the Classroom**

After the initial CS analysis by the researcher, another coder was asked to code 100 negotiations for the use of CS within those negotiations, revealing an intercoder agreement of 87.3%. For ease of analysis, every communication strategy used in a negotiation was broken down into those used by the student versus those used by the NS. Table 6.1 shows the frequency of student and NS CS use in the host family and classroom setting. The table indicates that the total number of communication strategies students used in the host family is more than twice the total number they used in the classroom setting.

However, this may be misleading because the total amount of data for the host family setting is fifteen, approximately fifty-minute recorded sessions, whereas for the classroom, there are only nine, approximately fifty-minute sessions. The last column shows the number of CS used per fifty-minute recording session. This reveals that students used an average of 15 more strategies in the host family setting per fifty-minute recording session than they did in the classroom.

**Table 6.1. Frequency of student and NS CS use in the host family and classroom**

<b>Student/NS - Setting</b>	<b>Total Number of CSs in data</b>	<b>Number of 50 min. recording sessions</b>	<b>Number of CSs per 50 min. recording session</b>
<b>Student- Host family</b>	1062	15	70.8
<b>Student- Classroom</b>	502	9	55.78
<b>NS- Host family</b>	903	15	60.2
<b>NS- Classroom</b>	387	9	43

Similarly, the frequency of NSs' use of communication strategies in the host family setting is higher than in the classroom setting. In fact, per fifty-minute recording session, host family members used approximately 17 more communication strategies than instructors in the classroom setting did for the same amount of time. Moreover, a comparison of the students' and NSs' use of CS indicates that in both the host family and classroom settings, students used more CSs than the NSs did. Specifically, in the host family setting students used approximately 10 more CSs per fifty minutes than their host family members did. In the classroom students used approximately 13 more CS per fifty minutes than the instructors did.

To summarize, both students and NSs used more communication strategies (per fifty minutes) in the host family setting than they did in the classroom setting. Moreover, in both the host family and classroom students used more CSs than the NSs did. However, more than the total amount of CSs used in both settings, a detailed view of the types of strategies students

and NSs used provides a deeper look at how strategy use differs in the host family versus the classroom setting.

### **CS Use in the Host Family Setting**

The purpose of this section is to discuss and analyze student and NS use of CSs in the host family setting. Table 6.2 below juxtaposes the communication strategies that made up approximately 5% or more of students' and NSs' total strategy use for the host family setting. As the table indicates, students used a range of about six strategies frequently enough to represent 5% of total strategy use. NSs used about eight strategies that represented at least 5% of total strategy usage. Thus, NSs used a slightly wider variety of strategies than the students did. The "others" category represents those strategies that were not used frequently enough to represent 5% of total strategy use (for a breakdown of these, refer to the Appendix). However, the major point in any analysis of CS use within negotiation is to look at both sides of the conversation and see how the student and the NS interactively use CS to overcome difficulties. It is precisely this juxtaposition of NSs' and students' use of strategies in both settings that allows us to glean important information about the use of strategies in interaction. Thus, the side by side arrangement of the students' and NSs' (host family members') most frequently used strategies in the table reveals some obvious relationships in terms of the use of certain strategies essentially eliciting the use of other

strategies almost like “adjacency pairs”. Examples of this include requests for confirmation followed by confirmations and requests for clarification eliciting clarifications.

**Table 6.2. Percentage & types of CS used by students and NSs - host family**

Student use of CS	% of total CS use	Host members' use of CS	% of total CS use
1. Confirmation	20.06%	1. Request confirmation	24.70%
2. Other repetition	13.28%	2. Interpretive summary	13.73%
3. Appeal for help	10.64%	3. Rephrase	9.97%
4. Request clarification	8.29%	4. Clarification	7.97%
5. Foreignizing	5.08%	5. Request clarification	7.42%
6. Circumlocution	4.99%	6. Confirmation	7.42%
7. Codeswitch	4.80%	7. Complete sentence	6.42%
8. Rephrase	4.71%	8. Code switch	5.54%
9. Trailing off	4.33%	9. Circumlocution	4.87%
10. Clarification	4.25%	10. Others (below 4%)	19.93%
11. Mime/gesture	4.05%		
12. Others (below 4%)	15.52%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Specifically, the data indicates that host family members used more “requests for confirmation” than any other strategy. The data also indicates that students made frequent “confirmations” in response to host members’ “requests for confirmation”. Likewise, students’ frequent “requests for clarification” undoubtedly elicited host family members’ frequent attempts at “clarification”, often achieved by “rephrasing” their original utterance. With this in mind, it is important to analyze NSs’ and students’ strategies in terms of whether the use of one strategy tends to give rise to the use of other

strategies or if certain strategies tend to be paired together in use. Therefore, in the next section, excerpts illustrating the use of the most frequent CSs will be analyzed and discussed in terms of how they were used by the NSs and students within negotiations in the host family setting. Taken from Table 6.2 (above), the most frequently used student and NS CSs have been listed and will be discussed as much as possible in the order of most frequent to least frequent. Where applicable, student and NS CSs have been paired together to show how their mutual use is related.

1. NS use of request for confirmation and student use of confirmation
2. NS use of interpretive summary
3. *Student use of other repetition as request for clarification and NS use of clarification and rephrasal*
4. Student use of appeals for help
5. NS use of request for clarification and student use of clarification
6. NS and student use of codeswitching
7. NS use of sentence completion
8. Student use of circumlocution

**NS use of request for confirmation and student use of confirmation.**

The data shows that host family members used more requests for confirmation (24.70%) than any other strategy. Similarly, the strategy students used most often was confirmation (20.06%). As discussed above, the relationship of these two strategies is obvious. Namely, that host family members' frequent requests for confirmation prompted student responses of confirmation. Qualitative analysis of the data indicates that host family members use requests for confirmation to confirm their interpretation of a

student's unclear utterance, as if to say, "you mean...?". Host family members' frequent use of requests for confirmation indicates that as listeners and active participants in the conversation, they are constantly monitoring their comprehension of students' utterances, interpreting them, and interjecting requests for confirmation to confirm their understanding of what the student is trying to say. In turn, students are given the opportunity to confirm or disconfirm the host family members' understanding. To illustrate, when a student experiences trouble saying something, such as when they do not know a particular lexical item, host family members may help by offering the lexical item or a series of lexical items that they think the student is trying to say. Frequently, the word the host member offers will be said with a question intonation, indicating that the host family member is requesting confirmation to make sure that they have understood what the student intends to say. In response, students may confirm or disconfirm the host family members' understanding.

In Excerpt 6.1 below, Jamie (J) is asking her host mother (M) about a Japanese celebration, "Girl's Day". However, Jamie's hesitation and question intonation (line 1) indicate that she is unsure of how to say it. Her host mother (M) provides assistance by providing the word that she thinks Jamie is attempting to say, "*ohinasama*" (a common name for "Girl's Day") and requests confirmation of it (line 2). In the next line then, Jamie confirms that that is the holiday she is referring to. Continuing with her utterance, Jamie

tries to ask about the dolls that are used as decorations in the celebration, but cannot seem to remember the word for “doll” (*ningyoo*), so she attempts to use a similar sounding word, “nyuu”, and mimes the shape of a doll to indicate that she is not sure that the word she has used is the correct one. Jamie’s question intonation and her use of mime indicate that she is appealing to her host mother for help. In response, the host mother provides Jamie with the word “*oningyoo*” (doll) that she is trying to say and requests confirmation.

**Excerpt 6.1 [NS request for confirmation and student confirmation]**

- |  |   |    |   |
|--|---|----|---|
| (appeal for help)                                | 1 | J: | <i>oh sooshite um hokano o matsuri wa onna no- onna no ko no hi?</i><br>oh so um the other festival is gir- girl’s day?             |
| (req. confirm.)                                  | 2 | O: | <i>ohinasama?</i><br>girl’s day?  |
| (confirm/sim. sound word / mime/appeal for help) | 3 | J: | <i>hai kono nyuu? ((makes shape of doll)) um</i><br>yes this “nyuu”? ((makes shape of doll)) um                                     |
| (req. confirm.)                                  | 4 | O: | <i>oningyoo?</i><br>doll?   |
| (similar sounding word/ appeal for help)         | 5 | J: | <i>u:m nuugyoo?</i><br>u:m “nuugyoo”?   |
| (req. clarif./rephrase/ req. confirm.)           | 6 | O: | <i>eh? ningyoo oningyoo ningyoo?</i><br>what? doll doll doll?   |
| (confirm)  | 7 | J: | <i>hai hai hai demo kono matsuri wa sukoshi- sukoshi shirimasu kara</i><br>yes yes yes, but I know a bit- a bit about this festival |

However, rather than confirming the word, which indicates that perhaps she does not recognize the word as the one she is trying to say, Jamie repeats her strategy of using a similar sounding word and appeals to the host mother for help again. The host mother responds by requesting clarification, “eh?” (what?) and then offers a series of rephrases of the word “doll” in

Japanese by saying it with an honorific prefix "o" first, then leaving it off, and requests confirmation. Jamie finally is able to recognize the word provided to her by her host mother and she confirms that this is the word she has been trying to say.

Looking at the excerpt, it is evident that the host mother's use of requests for confirmation is in response to Jamie's difficulty in formulating her utterance due to a lack of lexical knowledge. Essentially, the host mother is able to provide Jamie with the lexical item that Jamie needs in order to say what she wants to and, at the same time, monitor her own understanding of Jamie's utterances by requesting confirmation. By providing Jamie with the help she needs and monitoring her own comprehension of what Jamie is trying to say, the host mother's use of request for confirmation and Jamie's subsequent confirmation or disconfirmation is an effective way of interactively overcoming or preventing difficulties in communication. The analysis also included a slightly different type of request for confirmation that NSs often used when confronted with several unclear utterances. Called "interpretive summary", this strategy was often used with requests for confirmation and is discussed below.

#### **NS use of interpretive summary.**

The second most commonly used NS strategy was interpretive summary, making up 13.73% of total strategy use. Interpretive summary

(Willems, 1987) occurs when the listener essentially summarizes the speaker's message in order to check that it has been understood correctly. Usually, the reason the listener provides an interpretive summary is because something in the speaker's utterance was not clear to them and they need to confirm their understanding before moving on. Not surprisingly, host family members used interpretive summaries with requests for confirmation in order to confirm their interpretation of a student's utterances. Although it is a bit different from simply requesting confirmation of a lexical item for example, because it involves "summarizing" a series of unclear utterances. Because they are essentially a form or request for confirmation, interpretive summaries are normally followed by the students' subsequent confirmation or disconfirmation of the interpretation. The following excerpt illustrates Jamie's host mother's use of interpretive summary cast as a request for confirmation to confirm her understanding of what Jamie is trying to say. In this excerpt, Jamie (J) is trying to explain to her host mother (M) how the weather might affect her and her friend's plan to go to a restaurant to eat lunch. The negotiation begins with Jamie trying to explain to her host mother that if the weather is good tomorrow, she, Amy, and Mandy will go to a restaurant to eat lunch, but if the weather is bad, Mandy can't go to the restaurant because she lives in the opposite direction of the restaurant. However, upon explaining this, Jamie fails to use the conditional verb ending "*~tara*" (if). Instead, Jamie says, "*tenki ga warui kara*" (because the weather is

bad) instead of “*tenki ga warukattara*” (if the weather is bad), and this causes the host mother’s confusion and triggers a negotiation. The host mother responds by saying, “*eh?*” (what?), essentially a request for clarification and an indication that she doesn’t understand what Jamie is trying to say. Jamie responds by trying to clarify what she means. As Jamie continues clarifying her meaning in line 5, the host mother completes Jamie’s sentence and requests confirmation that her interpretation is correct. Jamie, however, continues on with her clarification and makes the same mistake of failing to use the conditional verb ending (*~tara*) in line 7 (her word order is wrong as well), saying, “*ii tenki ga arimasu kara*” (because there is good weather) rather than, “*tenki ga yokattara*” (if the weather is good). However, this time the host mother does not address the error and Jamie continues her clarification until line 9.

#### Excerpt 6.2 [NS use of interpretive summary - host family]

(explanation of tomorrow’s plan)	1	J:	<i>hai hai [kono amy san wa [hokano resutoran ni ikitai [so watashi to=</i>
(backchannel)	2	O:	<i>yes yes this amy wants to go to a different restaurant so me=</i>
			<i>[un [un [un</i>
			<i>[yes [yes [yes</i>
(continued explanation)	3	J:	<i>=mandy wa [watashitachi to issho ni [iku tsumori desu [demo tenki wa=</i>
(backchannel)	4	O:	<i>=and Mandy plans on going together with us but the weather=</i>
			<i>[un [un [un</i>
			<i>[yes [yes [yes</i>
(trigg. -gramm)	5	J:	<i>=warui desu kara [u::m amy san to watashi dake [kono mandy san wa=</i>
			<i>=is bad so u::m only me and Amy this Mandy=</i>
(req. clarif/ comp. sent/ req. confirm.)	6	O:	<i>[un? [un =kaeru no?</i>
(clarify)	7	J:	<i>[what? [yes =she’ll go home?</i>
(backchannel)	8	O:	<i>hantai no- hantai ni [sunde imasu kara [demo ii tenki ga arimasu kara=</i>
			<i>lives in the opposite direction so because it’s good weather=</i>
			<i>[un [un</i>
			<i>[yes [yes</i>

(cont. clarify) 9 J: =*kono mandy to issho ni [iku tsumori [desu =*  
 =we plan on going with Mandy=  
 (interp. summ./10 O: [un [ah! =*tenki ga warukattara*  
 req. confirm.) *mandy san ga kaeru shi tenki ga yokattara issho ni iku tte koto?*  
 [yes [ah! =if the weather is bad,  
 Mandy will go home, but if the weather is good, you'll all go together?  
 (confirm) 11 J: *hai hai hai*  
 yes yes yes  
 (expresses 12 O: *u::n wakatta wakatta*  
 understanding) *h::m I get it I get it*  
 (confirm) 13 J: *hai hai hai*  
 yes yes yes

Meanwhile the host mother begins to understand and indicates so line 10, where she provides an interpretive summary of all that Jamie has been trying to say, using the conditional form that Jamie failed to use in line 5 and in line 7. The host mother subsequently requests confirmation that she has understood Jamie correctly and Jamie confirms the host mother's interpretation in line 11, saying "hai hai hai" (yes yes yes). After that, the host mother indicates that finally she has understood and then Jamie reconfirms this in the last line.

This negotiation illustrates how interpretive summary paired with request for confirmation is used by the NS in the host family setting as a strategy to confirm their understanding of what they think the student has said. Essentially, the host mother summarizes everything she thinks Jamie has been trying to say then asks Jamie if her interpretation is correct. Jamie can then confirm or reject the interpretation. It is a fairly effective strategy that works well to maintain a level of comprehension especially when host family members are fairly certain that they understand what the student is

saying but just want to confirm their interpretation before they continue the conversation.

NNS' use of requests for confirmation, interpretive summaries, and students' use of confirmation were the most dominant strategies in the host family setting. There are perhaps several explanations as to why these were the most commonly used strategies, including adherence to universal principles of communication, concerns for face, and listener behavior norms. The tendency to try to guess and then request confirmation of students' unclear utterances is undoubtedly because the former is easier and is less disruptive to the conversation, consistent with the Principle of Clarity and Economy (Poulisse, 1997). In fact, a noted characteristic of foreigner talk is the preference for asking yes and no questions, questions that require the NNS to simply confirm or deny, over asking *wh*-questions (e.g., why, when, what), so as to minimize the work the "work" the NNS has to do in the conversation (Long, 1983). We see similarities here in this study with requests for confirmation and requests for clarification, the former requiring less work for the student, and the latter requiring more. This is where universal principles of communication come in. The Principle of Clarity dictates that interlocutors' utterances be clear and understandable and the Principle of Economy dictates that the processing efforts interlocutors' put into producing and deciphering utterances be kept to a minimum (Poulisse, 1997). Both of

these principles provide a reasonable explanation as to why host family members used more requests for confirmation and interpretive summary than any other strategies when confronted with students' unclear utterances. When using both of these strategies, rather than simply requesting clarification, "eh?" (what?), host family members tried to ascertain the students' unclear utterance then provided a target-like model of the utterance for the student to confirm or disconfirm. It may be that interpreting what the student is trying to say and then asking them to confirm that interpretation is the simplest and fastest way to deal with difficulties so as not to disrupt the flow of conversation. If one compares the use of request for confirmation and request for clarification, it is easy to see that when a NS requests clarification of a student's unclear utterance, the process can be quite drawn out and complicated. In response to a request for clarification, the student has to clarify their utterance which they may not be able to do. Thus, the resulting modification may still not be comprehensible enough for the NS to understand, especially if the student's proficiency level is quite low and they are unable to clarify their utterance sufficiently because of an inadequate command of the target language. As such, the chances that difficulties will be cleared up easier and faster are higher when the NS simply tries to interpret what the student is saying based on the input and then requests confirmation that the interpretation is correct. The same two principles can explain students' frequent use of confirmation and low use of clarification or

rephrase. For confirmation, it is simply easier and more efficient for the student to simply confirm host family members' requests for confirmation with a "yes" than to take the time to modify their utterance to reflect the feedback the host family member has provided through the target-like model cast as a request for confirmation.

Although the Principles of Clarity and Economy offer a likely explanation for the high frequency use of requests for confirmation and interpretive summaries, it is also less face threatening to use requests for confirmation over requests for clarification. When a student's utterance is unclear and made known to be unclear, it is a threat to their positive face, (the need to be appreciated by others) (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Specifically, when a NS has to request clarification of a student's unclear utterance, it is more of an overt or "on record" indication of the incomprehensibility of a student's utterance and therefore more of a threat to face than a request for confirmation, which is less overt and therefore less face threatening. As Faerch and Kasper (1982) pointed out, there is a need for the listener to make sure that they understand the speaker's communicative intention, precisely because the speaker's utterance may not have been clear in some way. In such cases, there are two ways to do this. The listener can request clarification of the speaker's utterance or they can request confirmation of what they believe is the speaker's message. However, a NS's request for clarification is more likely to draw attention to the student's inadequate use of the L2 and be face

threatening. On the other hand, requests for confirmation, in which the NS guesses the meaning of the student's utterance, reformulates it into a target-like model and requests confirmation of it is less face threatening because it tends to maintain the flow of conversation and draws less attention to the student's linguistic inadequacies.

Another reason that may explain host family members' frequent use interpretative summary and requests for confirmation as opposed to, for example, using requests for clarification, is listening behavior. First of all, Ohta (2001) points out that listeners in a conversation are not merely passively listeners, rather, they are actively analyzing what is being said and moving beyond the speaker's actual utterances to predict what may come next. Thus, listener prediction is a natural process that occurs in all conversational interaction and enables the listener to collaborate with the speaker to solve problems when they occur, as in the case of negotiation. When host family members' guess or otherwise interpret students' unclear utterances and request confirmation of them, they are essentially doing what any listener does in conversation when difficulties occur. However, normal listening behavior does not explain the extent to which the host family members use guess, interpretive summary, sentence completion and requests for confirmation in their conversations with the host students. The frequency of the use of these particular CS suggests there may be other factors involved beyond that of mere normal listener behavior. For example, features of

Japanese conversation may also play a role in host family members' preference for guessing, interpreting, and completing sentences over other types of strategies such as request for clarification. Several researchers have shown that Japanese conversation displays a relatively high degree of listener "involvement" (Maynard, 1986; Clancy, 1986; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Ono & Yoshida, 1996; Strauss & Kawanishi, 1996). Specifically, the listener in Japanese NS-NS conversation plays a very active role frequently interjecting comments, finishing sentences, and otherwise displaying their attentiveness, comprehension, and interest in what the speaker is saying (White, 1989). This characteristic is undoubtedly reflected in the NS's use of interpreting, requesting confirmation, and completing students' unclear utterances. Additionally, Clancy (1986a, 1986b), a researcher of Japanese L1 socialization, maintains that Japanese caregivers tend to accommodate (i.e., help their children to get their intentions across) in communication with their children. In the L2 context the use of "accommodation" in the host family context refers to the host family members' attempts to help the student get his/her intentions across by deciphering the student's unclear utterances. This is easily observable in the host family negotiations when the host family members attempt to guess or otherwise interpret what the student is trying to say, sometimes based upon minimal input from the student, then reformulate the unclear utterances, saying it in the form of a request for confirmation so the student may accept or reject it. If the NS's guess is correct,

the student needs only to confirm what the host family member has said or they may repeat it and incorporate it into their utterance. If the host family member's guess does not match what the student wants to say, then the student may use communication strategies to modify their utterance in a host of different ways to convey the intended meaning. This type of implicit feedback in the form of reformulations of unclear utterances has also been noted in the L1 literature on corrective feedback. Specifically, in Moerk's (1992) study that reanalyzed data from a previous study, he found that caregivers were able to smoothly integrate feedback on linguistic errors children made so as not to disrupt the conversational flow. This appears to be exactly what the host family members are doing in this study, providing implicit corrective feedback to students with their requests for confirmations, taking care to not disrupt the flow of the conversation. Thus, while listener guess, prediction, and implicit feedback may be considered to be a normal part of any conversation, it is perhaps those features of Japanese conversational behavior, namely accommodation and listener behavior that may offer insight into the host family members' frequent use of requests for confirmation, interpretive summary, and sentence completion.

All things considered, perhaps the most likely explanation of the NSs' use of requests for confirmation in the host family setting is that it is influenced to some extent by all of the above mentioned factors. First, the Principles of Clarity and Economy suggest that it is perhaps quicker and easier

to guess the student's message and request confirmation of it than it is to request clarification and go into what may turn into a lengthy, difficult negotiation (Poulisse, 1997). Second, concerns for face may compel NSs use more requests for confirmation and to avoid a lot of requests for clarification so as to not to draw attention to students' linguistic deficiencies. At the same time, listener behavior may play a role in the many requests for confirmations NSs use. The tendency for Japanese NSs to guess, predict and otherwise display a high "attentiveness" while listening may influence the use of their strategies. At the same time, L1 studies (Clancy, 1986a, 1986b; Moerk, 1992) suggest that caretakers often reformulate novices' unclear utterances into a target-like version to help novices get their messages across. Such accommodation in the host family setting allows host family members to provide implicit correction or feedback of the student's unclear utterance by providing a model of the utterance in target-like Japanese and at the same time confirm their understanding of the meaning of the utterance while maintaining the flow of the conversation.

**Student use of other repetition as request for clarification and NS use of clarification and rephrasal.**

Student use of "other repetition" is the second most used strategy in the host family (13.28%). Other repetition occurs when all or a portion of an interlocutor's utterance is repeated, often with a question intonation. It tends to be used most often as an indirect request for clarification (8.29%).

Essentially, when students experience reception problems, they attempt to elicit clarification from the NS by repeating what was said. Other repetition is perhaps one of the easiest ways for the student to let the NS know that they have not understood something. Rather than saying, "what does X mean?", the student often opts to use the least energy consuming strategy, which consists of repeating a word or phrase with a rising intonation. In the host family setting in particular, when the student does not understand something, they often repeat the word or portion of the utterance that is causing the difficulty with a rising intonation in order to elicit clarification from the host family member. When the host family members clarify their utterances in order to make it more comprehensible for the student, they may do so using a variety of CSs. They may clarify their utterance by using codeswitch, circumlocution, self repetition and the like. However, the data suggests that host family members tend to clarify their utterances mainly by rephrasing their original utterance. In fact, rephrase (9.97%) is the NS's third most commonly used strategy in the host family setting. Rephrase occurs when the speaker, in response to a signal of incomplete understanding from the listener, rephrases their own utterance, keeping the semantic content of the utterance the same but adding or changing a few lexical items, word order, or grammar to make the utterance more comprehensible to the student.

What is interesting about the host family data is that there were several instances where the rephrase involved replacing the informal verb ending in

the original utterance with a formal verb ending. An example of this is illustrated in Excerpt 6.3 below. Here, Amy (A) and her host mother (M), are talking about the legal age that children can smoke cigarettes in the United States. Amy is trying to tell her host mother that in bars in America, eighteen-year-olds can smoke cigarettes. However, she fails to use the potential form to say, "they can smoke" (*suu koto ga dekiru*). Instead she says, "they smoke" (*suu*). Therefore, in the next line, the host mother uses the potential form to say, "*suu koto ga dekiru no?* " (they can smoke?) and requests confirmation. Here, we see that the host mother has used the informal form of the verb, "*dekiru*" (can do-informal form), and Amy responds in line 3 by asking for repetition, "hm?". Therefore, the host mother repeats what she has said in line 4, still using the informal form of the verb. In the next line, it becomes clear that Amy doesn't understand "*dekiru*" (can do - informal form). We know this precisely because she repeats the word "*dekiru?*" (can do? - informal form) with a question intonation, indirectly requesting clarification of the word.

**Excerpt 6.3 [Student use of other repeat & request for clarification and NS use of clarification and rephrase - host family]**

(trigger -grammar)	1	A:	<i>Ibaa de um jyuuhassai Ium tabako I'o su- suu</i> [at a bar um eighteen year olds smoke cigarettes=
(backchannel)	2	M:	<i>Iun u::n Iun unun Iun =ah suu hai hai</i> req. confirm.) <i>e::h suu koto ga dekiru no?</i> [yes h::m [yes yes yes [yes =ah smoke yes yes e::h they can smoke?
(req. repetition)	3	A:	<i>hm?</i> what?

(self repeat)	4	M:	<i>suu koto ga dekiru</i> they can smoke
(other repeat/ req. clarification)	5	A:	<i>dekiru?</i> can?
(clarify/rephrase)	6	M:	<i>suu koto ga dekimasu</i> they can smoke
(indicates understanding)	7	A:	<i>ah hai hai hai</i> ah yes yes yes

In response, Amy's host mother clarifies her original utterance by rephrasing it, this time using the formal form of the verb, "*dekimasu*" (can do ~ - formal form) (line 6). Amy seems to understand the formal form of the verb and signals her understanding in line 7 several times, thereby ending the negotiation. This excerpt illustrates the way students in the host family setting prompt the NS to provide clarification of an utterance by repeating part of the NS's utterance with a question intonation. It also shows how host family members respond to this prompt by clarifying their original utterance, often rephrasing it slightly to make it more understandable to the student. In this negotiation, it is interesting to note that after the host mother provided the correct utterance in line 2 requesting confirmation of it, Amy's responds by saying, "*um?*" (what?), which is perceived by the host mother as a request for repetition (and therefore is labeled as such). Thus, it is subsequent turn that determines whether the Amy's initial global request is labeled a request for repetition or clarification. However, Amy's utterance could very well have been meant as a global request for clarification because, as we see later in the negotiation, she didn't understand part of the utterance. Such vague

utterances like, "what?", "huh?", and "um?" may be used by students as global requests for clarification because they are unable to pinpoint the exact nature of their nonunderstanding. As such, they are often misinterpreted by the interlocutor due to their ambiguous nature. For example, such global requests can be construed as requests for repetition. It is only later in the conversation that the interlocutor may become aware that what they perceived was a request for repetition was actually a request for clarification. Likewise, the NS may recognize a global request as a request for clarification but respond by clarifying their utterance in a way that does not solve the student's comprehension problem. In both of these situations, students often eventually end up repeating the portion of the NS's utterance with a rising intonation in order to pinpoint the actual word, phrase, or structure that is causing the problem. This helps the NS immensely in terms of being able to understand what is causing the difficulty and being able to rephrase the utterance in such a way that the student will be able to understand it.

This negotiation also suggests that at times, some students may not be familiar enough with the informal form to recognize it when it is used, but also that host family members are familiar enough with this phenomena among host students that they know to sometimes rephrase their utterances into the formal form so the student can understand it. The fact that the host mother responds in line 7 by rephrasing her utterance into the formal/polite form rather than giving some explanation of the meaning of "*dekiru*" (can),

indicates that the host mother is well aware of the limits of Amy's interlanguage, and that one thing that causes difficulties for Amy is the use of plain form. Therefore, it is not surprising that she adjusts her speech from informal to formal in response to Amy's comprehension problems (refer to Chapter Four, grammatical negotiations for more details on formal/informal modification).

There are several issues that are important to address when considering students' use of other repeat as requests for clarification and host family members' subsequent clarification by rephrase. First of all, students' use of other repeat as a request for clarification probably has a lot to do with the Principles of Clarity and Economy more than anything else (Poullisse, 1997). Literally, the use of other repeat to request clarification is one of the easiest, least demanding strategies to let the NS know something has not been understood. Eliciting a clarification in this way requires little else than the ability to be able to repeat something one has heard. Also, it is the easiest way to pinpoint for the NS what it is in the utterance that the student has not understood. In this way, the NS can immediately set about modifying their utterance to make it more comprehensible. Another observation is that students use of other repetition as requests for clarification of host family members' utterances suggests that students' concerns for face-saving are relatively low. This may be due to the role students have chosen for themselves as second language learners and novices who are willing to admit

indicates that the host mother is well aware of the limits of Amy's interlanguage, and that one thing that causes difficulties for Amy is the use of plain form. Therefore, it is not surprising that she adjusts her speech from informal to formal in response to Amy's comprehension problems (refer to Chapter Four, grammatical negotiations for more details on formal/informal modification).

There are several issues that are important to address when considering students' use of other repeat as requests for clarification and host family members' subsequent clarification by rephrase. First of all, students' use of other repeat as a request for clarification probably has a lot to do with the Principles of Clarity and Economy more than anything else (Poullisse, 1997). Literally, the use of other repeat to request clarification is one of the easiest, least demanding strategies to let the NS know something has not been understood. Eliciting a clarification in this way requires little else than the ability to be able to repeat something one has heard. Also, it is the easiest way to pinpoint for the NS what it is in the utterance that the student has not understood. In this way, the NS can immediately set about modifying their utterance to make it more comprehensible. Another observation is that students use of other repetition as requests for clarification of host family members' utterances suggests that students' concerns for face-saving are relatively low. This may be due to the role students have chosen for themselves as second language learners and novices who are willing to admit

when they don't understand something and seek help from their host family members. In turn, NSs responded by clarifying and rephrasing their utterances. In fact, NS clarification and rephrase were the third and fourth most frequently used strategies for host family members. This indicates that along with constantly interpreting students' unclear utterances, host family members also worked hard to provide students with comprehensible input by clarifying their own utterances and took on the majority of responsibility for maintaining comprehension.

#### **Student use of appeals for help.**

Student appeals for help are the third most used strategy in the host family setting after confirmation and other repetition. Out of total strategy use, student appeals for help represented 10.64% in the host family data. In this study, "appeal for help" refers specifically to a strategy that students use only when they are experiencing production difficulties and they need the NS to help provide a word, structure etc.. Although not a distinction used in coding the data in this study, appeals for help can be either direct or indirect. Indirect appeals for help involve saying a word or a portion of an utterance usually with a question intonation to illicit help from the NS. Direct appeals for help are often phrased as, "how do you say x in Japanese?" (*x wa nihongo de nan to iimasu ka*) or "what is x in Japanese?" (*x wa nihongo de nan desu ka*). The fact that appeals for help were the third most used strategy in the

host family setting tells us that students encountered many production problems when speaking, and that they relied on an interactive strategy to help solve these production difficulties. Thus, appeals often served as a way of eliciting vocabulary from the NS. In response, the NS often provided the word or phrase the students needed, casting it as a request for confirmation. Although, sometimes students have to make several attempts and use different strategies in order to give the NS enough information to be able to provide the needed word. In turn, NSs often have to make several attempts to ascertain the word the student is trying to convey.

An example of student appeal for help in the host family setting is given below. Mandy (Ma) is trying to tell her host parents that she painted her nails, but she does not know how to express this in Japanese, so she appeals to her host father (D) and mother (M) for help. Specifically, the two words that Mandy is having difficulty with are "nails" and "to paint". In the beginning of the negotiation, Mandy points to her own fingernail and appeals to her host parents for help by asking, "*kore nan to iimasu ka*" (what is this called?). Such an action, called "ostentation", is often used for concrete objects such as this. Her host mother and father are able to understand what she wants to say and they provide the word in line 2 and 3 respectively. However, in the next line, Mandy indicates that she is not completely finished conveying her message. She does this by saying the Japanese direct object marker '*o*' and elongating

the vowel sound along with miming the action of painting her fingernails to elicit the verb, "to paint". This is an indirect appeal for help.

**Excerpt 6.4**

**[Student appeal for help - host family]**

(appeal for help/ gesture)	1	Ma	<i>ah onnanohito no kore nan to iimasu ka</i> ((pointing to fingernail)) <i>ah woman's what do you call this</i> ((pointing to fingernail))
(provides word)	2	M	<i>tsume</i> nail
(provides word)	3	D	<i>tsume</i> nail
(appeal for help/ trailing off)	4	Ma	<i>o:::</i> ((pretending to paint own nails)) <i>o:::</i> ((pretending to paint own nails))
(complete sent. /req. confirm.)	5	M	<i>ah kitta?</i> ah cut
(other rep/ req confirm/codeswitch appeal for help/ gesture)	6	Ma	<i>o kitta? to paint?</i> ((pretending to paint own nails)) <i>cut? to paint?</i> ((pretending to paint own nails))
(starting to understand)	7	M	<i>ah oh ah e::h</i> ah oh ah e::h
(circumlocution/ appeal for help)	8	Ma	<i>iro- iro ni suru [nan to iimasu ka=</i> to make color- color what do you call it?
(provides word)	9	M	<i>[un un</i> = <i>manikyua manikyua un</i> <i>manikyua o shite</i> [yes yes = manicure manicure un to do a manicure
(other rep./ req. confirm.)	10	D	<i>[iroiro?</i> [various?
(other repeat/ req. confirm.)	11	Ma	<i>manikyua o shite?</i> to do a manicure?
(confirm)	12	M	<i>ee</i> yes

The host mother misunderstands Mandy's action to indicate "cutting one's fingernails", therefore in line 5, the host mother finishes Mandy's sentence by providing the word "kitta" (cut). In response, Mandy repeats the word with a question intonation, requesting confirmation of this word, then appeals for help again by codeswitching into English saying, "to paint?" again

miming the action of painting her nails. With this, the host mother seems as if she is perhaps beginning to understand what Mandy is trying to say, but is not able to provide the word right then. Thus, Mandy continues in her attempt to convey what she wants to say, this time using circumlocution describing "painting one's nails" as, "*iro iro ni suru*" (to make colored colored), directly appealing to her host parents for help. It is at this point that the host mother finally understands what Mandy is trying to say and provides Mandy with the word, which is "*manikyua*" (manicure); a loan word from English that is used in Japanese. However, the host father is still confused as to what Mandy is trying to say because in line 8, Mandy repeated the word for color, "*iro iro*", twice, which can also be confused with the word, "various" (*iroiro*) in Japanese. Perhaps confused by this, the host father repeats what Mandy said, "*iroiro*" (various), and requests confirmation as to whether she meant "various" or not. However, the lexical difficulty has been resolved already by the host mother, and in line 11, Mandy repeats the phrase for "painting one's nails" (*manikyua o shite?*"), requesting confirmation that she has heard it correctly. The host mother confirms this in the last line, thus ending the negotiation.

The appeals for help in this negotiation and in many negotiations in the host family data seem to mainly function as vocabulary elicitations. In this excerpt, each time Mandy comes across a word that she does not know or has difficulty with, she appeals for help, essentially asking her host family

members to “fill in the blank” with the appropriate word, which they are not able to do right away. However, eventually, given Mandy’s use of a variety of strategies such as gesture and circumlocution, they are able to understand what she is trying to say and provide the word for her. Thus, students’ use of appeals for help is valuable as an interactive resource for overcoming difficulties in production and maintaining a level of comprehension for all participants.

Like students’ requests for clarification, their frequent use of appeals for help also indicate that their concerns for face are minimal in conversations with their host family members. This view coincides with comments that students made in their journals indicating that not only did they appreciate when host parents helped them with difficult utterances, but that they often wished they would help more often than they did.

I did not have the vocabulary needed to express my point. She (host mother) was very helpful in assisting me with words I wasn’t quite sure of or if I couldn’t spit it out. (*Amy, journal entry*)

I didn’t know the word for “ground”. I was pointing to the floor but neither of them (host mother and father) said anything. Usually when they realize what I am saying, they will say the word. (*Amy, journal entry*)

I also think it is very useful that my host mom can speak some English... For example, if I’m unsure of a word, I can say it in Japanese then in English. If I’m right she’ll tell me or she tells me the correct way to say it. I’ve also learned new vocabulary by having her translate from the English word. (*Amy, Journal entry, 7/13/99*)

When I don't know a word, she (host mother) tells it to me - I can't remember it the next time I want to use it. (*Jamie, journal entry*)

I need a lot of help with my vocabulary. I run into words I don't know all the time and I'm constantly saying stuff like, "you know that big, yellow round thing in the sky" and my host mom will eventually figure it out and give me the word. (*Susan, journal entry*)

The students' comments above indicate that for them, the host family setting is a place where concerns for face are relatively low and that the "help" they receive from their host family parents is not only welcomed, but expected. Therefore, students had few reservations about appealing to their host parents for help when they were having production problems, even to the point of using their host parents as "dictionaries". Similarly, as noted above, students were not afraid to request clarification when they didn't understand something in the NS's utterance, which was the fourth most used strategy in their repertoire. All of this indicates that for the students, conversational interaction in the host family setting is characterized by a fairly low degree of concern for face in terms of admitting their linguistic weaknesses and asking for help.

On the other hand, the host family members' behavior indicated that concerns for face were attended to. Namely, host parents' guesses and interpretive summaries cast as requests for confirmation indicated that the host parents were concerned with saving students' face. Thus, while students' concern for face may be relatively low in terms of seeking help from the

NS when production or reception difficulties arose, it appears that NS's took great care to not overtly correct students or draw attention to students' linguistic inadequacies, but rather give implicit corrective feedback so as to minimize threats to face.

**NS use of request for clarification and student use of clarification.**

Host family members made three times more requests for confirmation (24.70%) of students' utterances than requests for clarification (7.42%). Thus, although host family members were more likely to try and understand a student's utterance and offer their understanding of it as a request for confirmation, there were certain circumstances in which a request for clarification was clearly preferable. Namely, as Varonis & Gass (1985b) note, when the speaker's utterance is uninterpretable or marginally interpretable and the listener has little or no confidence in their interpretation, they are more likely to give an overt indication of incomplete understanding such as "what?" or "huh?". On the other hand, when the listener is able to interpret the remark and has relative confidence that the interpretation is correct but want to make sure, they request confirmation. Therefore, when the host members in this study did not understand enough of what the student was trying to say in order to make an educated guess, they resorted to requesting clarification. Accordingly, host family members' requests for clarification played a role in negotiations by prompting students

to clarify their unclear utterances. In response to 67 host members' requests for clarification, students clarified their utterances 45 times. This suggests that students provided clarifications in response to NS requests for clarification approximately 67% of the time.

The following excerpt shows Mandy's host mother (M) using requests for clarification to elicit clarification of Mandy's (Ma) unclear utterances. Mandy is trying to explain about taking a "placement test", but does not know the phrase in Japanese. The preceding talk is included here in lines 1 through 9 because it shows the absence of any information that the host family mother (M) could use to formulate a guess about what type of test Mandy is talking about. In the preceding talk, Mandy is telling her host mother (M) and father (D) about some students in her class who read very slow, and that she's done a lot of reading in previous classes, so the reading they do in her class is quite easy for her.

**Excerpt 6.5 [NS request for clarification and student clarification - host family]**

(preceding talk)	1	Ma	<i>watashi ni totte mo sukoshi yasui to omoimasu yasashii</i> [to omoimasu for me it's a little cheap I think, easy I think	
	↓	2	M	[un yasashii [yes easy
		3	Ma <i>yasashii</i> easy	
	↓	4	M <i>un un naruhodo ne</i> yes yes I get it	
		5	Ma <i>nankai mo kyokasho no iroiro na mono yomimashita kara</i> Because I've read various things many times in textbooks	
	↓	6	M	[un un [yes yes

	7	D	<i>dakara minna wa bikkuri shite ru deshoo</i> ['ah Mandy wa hayai' so everyone is surprised right 'ah Mandy is fast'	
↓	8	Ma		[u:m [u:m
	9	D	<i>nihongo yomu no ga hayai</i> you read Japanese fast	
(lexical trigger/ foreignize)	10	Ma	<i>demo watashi puresument tesuto o torima-</i> u- <i>ukemashita</i> but I took t- took the placement test	
(req. clarif)	11	M	<i>un? nani testo?</i> what? what test?	
(clarif./ self rep./foreignize/ comp. check)	12	Ma	<i>pureesumento tesuto lanoo wakarimashita? wakarimasu ka=</i> placement test um did you understand? do you understand?	
(req. clarif./ rephrase)	13	M	<i>[un</i> <i>chotto wakarimasen donna tesuto?</i> <i>[yes</i>	=un =u:m I
(clarif./ foreignize/ circumlocution)	14	Ma	<i>anoo do- samaa shiken wa donna reberu no kurasu ni ireru no shiken</i> <i>desu</i> um do- the summer test is a test for which class level to put you in	
(guess/ req. confirm.)	15	M	<i>ah kurasu wakashiken?</i> ah a placement test?	
(confirm)	16	Ma	<i>hai</i> yes	
(confirm)	17	M	<i>unun</i> yes yes	
(confirm)	18	Ma	<i>h a i</i> yes	
	19	M	<i>u::n</i> <i>h::m</i>	
(other repeat/ req. confirm.)	20	Ma	<i>kurasu ni wakeru? [ no shiken? =</i> a test to divide you into classes? =	
(confirm)	21	M	<i>[un</i> <i>[yes</i>	=un =yes

The negotiation starts in line 10, when Mandy tries to say that she took a placement test to get into the class she is currently in, however, she does not know the word in Japanese for placement, so she tries to foreignize it into "puresument" (placement). Unfortunately, the word is not a loan word in Japanese, so neither the host mother or father recognizes it. Therefore, the

host mother asks Mandy to clarify the type of test she is talking about, "*un? nani tesuto?*" (what? what test?). In response, Mandy tries once again to foreignize the word, this time lengthening one of the vowels and putting an 'o' at the end for "*pureesumento*" (placement) and then she does a comprehension check "*wakarimasu ka*" (do you understand?). The host mother responds that she does not understand and then she rephrases her original request for clarification to "*donna tesuto?*" (what kind of test?) in line 13. At this point Mandy realizes her strategy for foreignizing "placement test" is not working", therefore, in line 14, she attempts a circumlocution. She describes a placement test as, "*samaa tesuto wa donna reberu no kurasu ni ireru shiken desu*" (the summer test is a test about which class level to put you in). Mandy uses foreignization here for "summer" which she pronounces "*samaa*". The host mother understands Mandy's explanation and offers the phrase, "*kurasu wakashiken*" for "placement test" in Japanese and requests confirmation from Mandy. In the next turn then, Mandy confirms that this is what she is trying to say. After a series of confirmations from line 16 to line 19 , and in line 20, Mandy attempts to repeat the phrase that the host mother used for "placement test" and then asks for confirmation that she has the right phrase. The host mother confirms that Mandy's use is correct in the last line of the negotiation.

This negotiation illustrates when and how the host family member requests clarification. Although the topic preceding the negotiation was about

reading in the classroom, nevertheless, Mandy's host mother is unable to understand the type of test Mandy is talking about perhaps because the surrounding talk does not give her any information that might help her decipher what type of test Mandy is talking about. Therefore, rather than provide the word and then seek confirmation of it, which seems to be the preferred choice for NS in the host family setting, the host mother asks for clarification and Mandy is prompted to make her meaning understood by clarifying her utterance. Mandy does so through a variety of strategies, namely foreignization and circumlocution. Mandy's circumlocution gives the host mother enough information for her to figure out what type of test Mandy is talking about. When the host mother finally understands, she provides the word/phrase, then requests confirmation of it so that she knows she has understood correctly (line 15).

This negotiation seems to suggest a sequence of strategies students use when they are not sure how to say a word in the L2. The sequence itself seems to reflect the Principles of Clarity and Economy because it starts out with the strategy that requires the least amount of effort to a strategy that requires more effort (Poulisse, 1997). The strategy sequence that is demonstrated here is one in which Mandy starts out with a foreignizing strategy that is perhaps the least cognitively taxing besides mime or gesture. Then, even though the host mother signals that she doesn't understand, Mandy repeats the foreignizing strategy, only this time attempts to make it sound more

"Japanese" than the first attempt. However, the host mother still does not understand, and in response, Mandy abandons her attempt at foreignizing the word and resorts to circumlocution. In essence, the series of strategies suggests that students try to use their interlanguage resources efficiently by using the least cognitively taxing strategies first, and then, when they prove insufficient, resort to more difficult strategies.

Although in the above negotiation Mandy tries several strategies to clarify her utterance, the data indicates that students did not clarify or rephrase their utterances very much in response to requests for clarification. This is probably because NSs often took on the responsibility of discerning students' unclear utterances and would provide them with a model of the utterance to confirm or deny. Thus it was simply not necessary for a student to clarify their utterances in the host family setting very often.

#### **NS and student use of codeswitching.**

In the host family situation, host family members used codeswitching (5.54%) more frequently (percentage wise) than the students did (4.80% - see Table 6.2). This was rather surprising considering that only one of the host family members spoke English well enough to use it as a strategy in negotiation. However there seemed to be a few exceptions to the rule where codeswitching in the host family was concerned. For instance, students used codeswitching even if their host parents did not speak English. Besides Amy,

whose host mother spoke English, one would think that the other host students would have little reason to codeswitch because it would prove to be a wholly unsuccessful strategy for them. Nevertheless, students codeswitched often enough, especially when they needed help with a lexical item in the L2. However, their attempts at codeswitching usually met with unsuccessful results and students often had to follow up with the use of other more L2-based strategies such as circumlocution in order to give their host parents enough information so they could figure out the word the student needed. The following excerpt illustrates student use of codeswitch. Here, Mandy (Ma) is trying to explain to her host mother (M) and father (D) that she painted her nails, only she does not know the word for “nails” or for “to paint” in Japanese. In the beginning of the negotiation (lines 1-5) we see Mandy appealing to her host mother and father for help with the words “nail” and “to paint”. The host mother has mistakenly taken Mandy’s gesture of ‘painting her nails’ to mean “cut (nails)” (*kitta*) in line 5. In response, Mandy repeats the word with a question intonation, requesting confirmation, then appeals for help again by code switching into English saying, “to paint?” again miming the action of painting one’s nails.

**Excerpt 6.6 [Student use of codeswitch - host family]**

(appeal for help/ gesture)	1	Ma <i>ah onnanohito no kore nan to iimasu ka</i> ((pointing to fingernail)) ah woman’s what do you call this ((pointing to fingernail))
(provides word)	2	M <i>tsume</i> nail

(provides word)	3	D	<i>tsume</i> nail	
(appeal for help/ trailing off)	4	Ma	<i>o:::</i> ((pretending to paint own nails)) <i>o:::</i> ((pretending to paint own nails))	
(guess/ complete sent./ req. conf.)	5	M	<i>ah kitta?</i> ah cut	
(other rep/req conf./ app. help/ codeswitch /gesture)	6	Ma	<i>o kitta? to paint?</i> ((pretending to paint own nails)) <i>cut? to paint?</i> ((pretending to paint own nails))	
(starting to understand)	7	M	<i>ah oh ah e::h</i> ah oh ah e::h	
(circumlocution/ appeal for help)	8	Ma	<i>iro- iro ni suru</i> [ <i>nan to iimasu ka=</i> to make color- color what do you call it?	
(provides word)	9	M	<i>[un un</i> = <i>manikyua manikyua un</i> <i>manikyua o shite</i> [yes yes = <i>manicure manicure un to do a</i> manicure	
(other rep./ req. confirm.)	10	D	<i>[iroiro?</i> [various?	
(other repeat/ req. confirm.)	11	Ma	<i>manikyua o shite?</i> to do a manicure?	
(confirm)	12	M	<i>ee</i> yes	

The codeswitching here is ineffective since Mandy's host parents know little English, but perhaps because it accompanies Mandy's gesture of "painting nails", the host mother seems to be beginning to understand in line 7. However, because Mandy's gesture and codeswitching strategies are not working, she resorts to using circumlocution in line 8, "*iro iro ni suru*" (to make colored colored). It is because of Mandy's use of circumlocution the host mother is finally able to understand what Mandy is trying to say and is able to provide Mandy with the word in line 9, which turns out to be a loan word from English "*manikyua*" (manicure).

What is noteworthy about this excerpt is that even though Mandy is well aware of the fact that her host parents speak very little English, she still

uses codeswitching as a strategy. Her attempt at codeswitching is obviously not successful and she eventually ends up using circumlocution, which is successful.

Another exception to the use of codeswitch in the host family setting was that even though only Amy's host mother spoke English well enough to use it as a strategy on a regular basis, there were instances in the data where the other students' host parents used an English word (not a loan word from English pronounced with a Japanese pronunciation) here and there in an attempt to help the student understand more easily. However, this was not an especially fruitful way to aid comprehension because the NS was often unable to pronounce the word correctly enough for the student to understand what they were saying. In particular, Mandy's host father had a habit of trying to use English that he picked up from high school English classes. Mandy's journal comment below indicates that this was not often successful:

Otoosan (father) knows a lot of various English words, and it's generally helpful, but sometimes (a lot of times really) it takes him saying it 3 or 4 times for me to understand because our cultural *hatsuons* (pronunciations) are different. (*Mandy, journal entry*)

In such cases, codeswitching often complicated the situation more than it helped. Thus, the use of codeswitching into English in the host family setting proved helpful only if the NS could approximate the pronunciation well enough for the student to recognize it as English, as is the case in Excerpt

6.7 below. Here Amy (A) and her host mother (M) are talking about vending machines in Japan. In the beginning of the host mother uses the word “*hanbaiki*” (vending machine) and “*jidoohanbaiki*” (vending machine), which Amy does not understand. Amy indicates her non-understanding by repeating the trigger, “*hanbaiki?*” (vending machine) with a question intonation, indirectly asking for clarification. In response, rather than explain the word in Japanese and perhaps trigger more negotiation work, the host mother opts to clarify the word by codeswitching into English saying, “*bending machine*” (vending machine). Although the host mother’s pronunciation is not correct, Amy immediately indicates her understanding of the word in line 4, and in the next turn, the host mother continues her explanation by again codeswitching into English using “*bending machine*” rather than using “*jidoohanbaiki*” (vending machine) in Japanese.

**Excerpt 6.7 [NS use of codeswitch - host family]**

- |                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| (trigger-lexical)          | 1 | M: <i>dakara ima yappari soo iu koto ga mondai ni natte kara wa un biiru biiru tabako no kana juusu no hanbaiki koka koora toka no hanbaiki jidoohanbaiki</i><br>so now of course the fact that these beer beer cigarette juice vending machines coca cola and such vending machines are open all the time |
| (other rep./ req. clarif.) | 2 | A: <i>hanbaiki?</i><br>vending machine?  |
| (clarify / codeswitch)     | 3 | M: <i>bending machine</i><br>vending machine   |
| (expresses understanding)  | 4 | A: <i>ah!</i><br><i>ah!</i>  |
| (codeswitch)               | 5 | M: <i>un wa koka koora toka nanka no juusu no bending machine wa aru de ichinichijuu</i><br>yeah the coca cola and the juice vending machines are there and all day  |

The use of English in this negotiation serves the same purpose as in the classroom, it is a fast, efficient way of overcoming difficulties. Amy's host mother seems to use codeswitching in order to clear up lexical problems so they can continue their conversation about vending machines. However, what is most interesting in this particular negotiation, is that even after telling Amy what "*jidoohanbaiki*" (vending machine) meant in English, the host mother chose to keep using the English word in the next utterance even though Amy, in all likelihood, could have probably been able to recognize the word in subsequent utterances. Why the host mother chose to do this is not clear, although she may have thought that the continued use of English in this case was easier for Amy than using the Japanese word again. Thus, this excerpt is one example of a situation in which both participants knew English and used it as a resource. If Amy's host mother had not known English and had had to respond to Amy's look of confusion with an L2 explanation of "*jidoohanbaiki*", this would have entailed using more difficult strategies such as circumlocution. Similarly, if Amy resorted to English every time she had production problems, then she would never be forced to make use of her interlanguage resources by engaging in other strategy use. Hence, it is clear that codeswitching affects the use of different strategies on both sides of the conversation and may reduce the need for students to use other interlanguage strategies such as circumlocution or rephrase and the like.

In some cases, the use of English no doubt reduces the amount of time and energy students would have to spend on negotiating lexical items, thus adhering to the Principles of Clarity and Economy (Poulisse, 1997). However, whether the use of English is clear and efficient obviously depends on the interlocutor's knowledge of English. In Mandy's case (Excerpt 6.6) the use of English did not assist her in conveying her message. She ultimately had to resort to circumlocution again suggesting that students may try to use easier, more accessible communication strategies first and when they fail, they move on to more difficult strategies that take more linguistic effort to produce. In Amy's case however, the use of English is no doubt helpful and effortless because her host mother speaks English very well. For NSs who try to use English, the results are mixed. Far from being a clear and effective means of solving comprehension problems, they may actually cause problems as Mandy's journal entry suggests. Thus, NSs' use of English may depend on the extent to which they can approximate the correct English pronunciation, as when Amy's host mother pronounced "vending machine" as "bending machine", which was close enough for Amy to be able to recognize it.

#### **Student use of foreignizing.**

A close cousin to codeswitching is foreignizing, where the student attempts to say an English word, but pronounces it using Japanese pronunciation. As indicated in Table 6.2 the use of this strategy represents

5.08% of students' total strategy use in the host family. Although not always the case, foreignizing was often used by the students as a relatively easy alternative to more difficult strategies such as circumlocution or word coinage. Students commented that when talking to their host family they often tried to "say words in a Japanese way" in hopes that the word was a loan word in Japanese and that the host family members would recognize it. In fact, in his study of negotiation and communication strategies between native speakers of Japanese and nonnative speakers of Japanese, Shortreed (1993) surmised that the use of foreignizing as a strategy was perhaps more prevalent in Japanese because of the large number of loan words found in Japanese. This may indeed be the case. In this study, students foreignized such words as freedom, treadmill, oak, public, skit, ice, fluoride, acrobat, deck, patio, and placement test. In group discussions, Jamie and Mandy had this comment to make about trying to say words with a Japanese pronunciation that they were not sure were actual loan words in Japanese.

I say it in an English accent first and if that doesn't work I say it in a Japanesey way. Um like treadmill, toreddo miiru. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

The first time I try to say it in English then I say it in a Japanese way. I don't know if it's gairaigo (loan word) but I figure, what the heck, I might as well try and maybe she'll know it. Like the other day I said hot chocolate and she didn't get it so I said *hotto chokoretto* (hot chocolate) and she said *kokoa?* (cocoa?) and she got it so sometimes it works. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

Thus, however popular this strategy was it did not always succeed because the words students tried to foreignize often did not exist as English loan words in Japanese or the student did not foreignize the word close enough to a Japanese pronunciation and the NS was unable to recognize it. Equally as likely was the chance that the word students used to describe something in English was not the loan word chosen to describe the same item, concept, or idea in Japanese (e.g. pancake is *"hottokeeki"* (hotcake) in Japanese). Thus, this strategy was only useful to students when and if the word was known in Japanese as a loan word and when and if the student could pronounce the word close enough to the Japanese pronunciation for the NS to recognize it. Below is a portion of a negotiation in which Susan (S) is trying to tell her host mother (M) and grandmother (O) that in America, the water is fluoridated. However, Susan does not know the word for "fluoride", and has previously described it as something in the water that makes your teeth white. It is at this point that this portion of the negotiation starts. In line 1, Susan appeals for help by asking her host mother what the name of the stuff in the water is that makes your teeth white. The host mother responds by providing different words for "toothpaste", something that fits Susan's description, and requests confirmation. However, Susan knows that "toothpaste" is not what she wants to say, so she again tries again to clarify what she means. This time she foreignizes the word into *"floraido"* (fluoride), and then she mentions *"haisha"* (dentist) and mimes gargling as

in, rinsing her mouth out with fluoride. Essentially, all of this functions as an indirect appeal for help.

**Excerpt 6.8 [Student use of foreignizing - host family]**

(app. for help)	1	S	<i>nihongo de ano koto wa namae wa nan desu ka wakaru?</i> what is that thing called in Japanese do you know?
(guess/ req. confirm.)	2	M	<i>hamigaki? hamigakiko? sa- hamigaki no sekken?</i> tooth paste? tooth powder? sa- tooth paste soap?
(foreignize/ cicumloc./ fluoride))	3	S	<i>za- floraido? to u:n tatoeba haisha</i> ((mimes rinsing mouth with fluoride)) <i>za- fluoride? u:n for example dentist</i> ((mimes rinsing mouth with fluoride))
app. help/mime)			
(guess/ req. confirm.)	4	M	<i>u- ugai?</i> to ga- gargle?
(other repeat/ confirm/mime)	5	S	<i>ugai hai hai uh tatoeba [ah ugai</i> ((mimes gargling again)) <i>gargle yes yes uh for example ah gargle</i> ((mimes gargling again))
(confirm/self repeat)	6	M	<i>[un ugai</i> <i>[un gargle</i>
(other repeat/ confirm)	7	S	<i>ugai hai</i> gargle yes
(clarify)	8	O	<i>ah koo yaru no wa mina to yaru no wa ugai ugai o suru to iimasu</i> ((clears throat & then does a gesture indicating spitting something out)) <i>ah everyone does this doing this is called gargling gargling</i>
	9	S	<i>ah chotto :</i> <i>ah wa:it</i>
	10	M	<i>ah ahha haha</i> ((laugh)) <i>furorido !</i> <i>ah ah ha ha ha</i> ((laugh)) <i>fluoride!</i>
(confirm/other repeat/ req. confirm)	11	S	<i>hai ano floraido?</i> yes um fluoride?
(confirm)	12	M	<i>un aru</i> yes it's there (in the water)

The host mother thinks that Susan is trying to say the word "gargle", so she gives the word for "gargle" in Japanese and then asks for confirmation of it. In response, Susan repeats what the host mother has said and even though this is not the word she is looking for, she confirms that it is. Next, the host mother and Susan go back and forth in line 6 and 7, repeating and confirming

the word "gargle". However, the grandmother explains more clearly to Susan in line 8 that "*ugai*" means "gargle", and Susan realizes in line 9 that this is not the word she is looking for. The host mother has, by this time, realized that Susan wanted to say "fluoride", which is "*fusso*" (flouride) in Japanese. It is not a loan word in Japanese but somehow the host mother knew it in English and pronounced it, "*furorido*" rather than, "*furoraido*" in line 3. Susan confirms that this is what she was trying to say, then repeats the word pronouncing it "*florido*", and requests confirmation that she is saying it right. The host mother then confirms Susan's use of the word and the negotiation comes to an end.

This is an excellent example of how students use foreignizing in the host family setting. Susan's attempt at foreignizing fluoride into "floraido", was close to, but not quite the way it is said in Japanese. When this strategy does not seem to work she resorts to mime and circumlocution. Again, there seems to be a pattern of first using strategies that require minimal linguistic resources and then when that does not solve the problem, students often move on to other more difficult strategies. In this case, Susan used foreignizing as a strategy first, and when that didn't work, she used more difficult strategies that were more successful. Thus, it appears that students use foreignization because it does not make strong demands on limited L2 resources such as circumlocution might require, which would suggest adhering to the Principle of Economy (Poulisse, 1997). However, the use of

foreignization does not necessarily successfully adhere to the Principle of Clarity. Namely, although students found this strategy easy to use, it was not always a successful strategy. This was especially the case when students did not apply the correct Japanese phonological rules to the word they foreignized or the word did not actually exist as a foreign loan word (e.g., the use of *"pankeeki"* for "pancake", which is *"hottokeeki"* (hotcake) in Japanese) and therefore is not recognized by the NS. In such cases, foreignization may have proved to be an easy strategy to use but not a very successful one.

#### **NS use of sentence completion.**

The sentence completion strategy, used primarily by host mothers, represented 5.54% of the total use of strategies in the host family setting. One caveat in calling this a communication strategy is that completing someone's sentence in Japanese may not be strategic behavior so to say, rather, it may reflect a common practice in Japanese conversation for the listener to predict the ends of their interlocutor's sentences and fill them in (Maynard, 1989). However, sentence completions were only labeled communication strategies if the student's previous utterance indicated that the student was either having difficulty finishing their sentence, or if they directly appealed for help. These instances suggested that NS completion of sentences was done so strategically in order to facilitate mutual comprehension or smooth communication. For example, Excerpt 6.9 below shows how Susan (S) directly

appeals to her host mother (M) for help with a verb that will finish her sentence. In line 1, Susan has trouble saying 'thirsty' in Japanese. She remembers the first part, "*nodo ga*" (throat + subject marker), but cannot produce the second half "*kawaku*" (to be dry), so she appeals to her host mother for help by first asking "*nodo ga nan to iu*" (throat is what do you say?) However, she does not stop with this, she continues to clarify what she wants to say by using circumlocution, "*watashi wa nomitai nan to iu nodo ga*" (I want to drink. what do you say? your throat is?), saying the sentence up until the point where she needs help, effectively prompting the host mother to finish her sentence. The host mother then completes the sentence by providing the word that Susan is trying to solicit (line 2):

**Excerpt 6.9 [NS use of sentence completion - host family]**

- |                                      |   |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| (appeal for help/<br>circumlocution) | 1 | S: <i>nodo ga nan to iu watashi wa nomitai nan to iu nodo ga</i><br>your throat is what do you say? I want to drink. what do you<br>say? your throat is? |
| (complete sent.)                     | 2 | M: <i>kawaku</i><br>dry  |
| (other repeat/<br>req. for confirm.) | 3 | S: <i>kawaku kawaku nodo ga kawaku?</i><br>dry dry thirsty?  |
| (confirm)                            | 4 | M: <i>unun</i><br>yes yes  |

Then, Susan repeats the word a couple of times and requests confirmation that she has said it correctly. The host mother confirms her usage in line 4, and the negotiation ends.

In this negotiation, the sentence completion has taken place because Susan has overtly appealed for help. This prompts the host mother to finish

the portion of the sentence that Susan is having trouble with. This is one situation in which a sentence completion can be used strategically by the NS to assist the student with trying to say something. However, there are also indirect ways that students signal that they need help from the NS. For example, hesitations, partial completion of words, vowel elongations, and pauses may signal that a student is having trouble saying something. In such cases, NSs may be indirectly prompted to provide a lexical item, complete the student's sentence, or offer other means of assisting the student with getting their meaning across. The data revealed that one way students signaled to the NS that they were having trouble finishing the end of their sentence was to "trail off" at the end of their sentence, usually by elongating a vowel sound and just not finishing their sentence. By trailing off at the end of their sentences, students indirectly prompted the NS to finish what they were saying. Excerpt 6.10 below illustrates a student "trailing off" at the end of her sentences and the NSs subsequent completion of the sentence. Here, Jamie (J) is talking to her host mother (M) about how she gave money to a homeless person once when she was visiting a big city. Jamie is trying to tell her host mother that she gave money to a homeless person, but before she says the verb, she elongates the direct object particle, "o::" indicating that she is having difficulty finishing the sentence. This effectively prompts the host mother to complete the sentence, which she says with a rising intonation indicating a request for confirmation of her interpretation. Jamie subsequently confirms

the host mother's interpretation and in line 5, continues to explain what happened after she gave the homeless person money. However, she again indicates through a hesitation marker and vowel elongation that she is having difficulty finishing her sentence. Therefore, in line 6, the host mother finishes Jamie's sentence and requests confirmation of it. Jamie again confirms the host mother's interpretation in line 7.

**Excerpt 6.10 [NS Completion of Sentence - host family]**

(trailing off)	1	J	<i>watashi wa okane o::</i> I mone::y
(guess/comp.sent./ request confirm.)	2	M	<i>ageta no?</i> you gave?
(confirm)	3	J	<i>hai</i> yes
(exclamation)	4	M	<i>araa!</i> oh no!
(trailing off)	5	J	<i>demo watshi no haha wa a:h...</i> but my mother a:h...
(comp.sent./ req. confirm.)	6	M	<i>dame to itta deshoo</i> she said you shouldn't right?
(confirm)	7	J	<i>hai</i> yes
(backchannel)	8	M	<i>un</i> yes

This negotiation, like the one above (Excerpt 6.9) is a good example of what prompts NS to finish their host students' sentences. In this example Jamie uses a trailing off strategy to prompt the host mother to finish her sentence rather than an overt appeal for help as in Excerpt 6.9. In both cases, the host mothers are somehow prompted, either directly or indirectly, to provide assistance to their host student in the form of sentence completion, so the student can produce an utterance that they are unable to produce on

their own. The presence of a direct or indirect prompt by the student is what indicates that the host mothers' sentence completion is a strategic move to help maintain comprehension. However, without the presence of a prompt, sentence completion may be considered a normal characteristic of Japanese NS listener behavior rather than a communication strategy, simply because there is no indication that the student is having trouble and that help is needed in the form of a sentence completion.

As mentioned above in the section on NS requests for confirmation, Japanese listener behavior might play a part in NSs' use of sentence completion. For example, features of Japanese conversation indicate a high degree of listener "involvement" and this includes a preference for guessing, interpreting, and completing sentences (Clancy, 1986; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Maynard, 1986; Ono & Yoshida, 1996; Strauss & Kawanishi, 1996). Although this type of behavior is considered a normal part of Japanese NS-NS conversation, it also can be "strategic" behavior in NS-NNS conversations as indicated by the above two excerpts. What makes these instances of sentence completion strategic as opposed to just a normal part of listener behavior is the way in which students indicate that they are having production difficulties. They may directly or indirectly appeal for help in finishing their sentence. Indirect appeals for help often involve "trailing off" at the end of one's sentence (Excerpt 6.10 above). This has been recognized as a common characteristic of Japanese NS-NS discourse (Clancy, 1986; Lebra, 1976). Clancy

(1986) notes that ellipsis of verbs often occurs if there is enough information available without it to permit comprehension. Ellipsis in Japanese NS-NS discourse also finds its origin in the culturally based notion of "*omoiyari*" (empathy), in which speakers do not complete their sentences, but leave them open-ended so that the listener will pick up the meaning without the end of the sentence having been specifically expressed (Lebra, 1976). In Japanese NS-NS conversation, the practice of trailing off one's sentences may find its roots in "*omoiyari*" (empathy), but for students using it when talking to NS of Japanese, it is a fairly effective communication strategy rather than an expression of "*omoiyari*" (empathy). In fact, statements made by a couple of students support this idea of using trailing off as a strategy.

I have such a hard time figuring out how to conjugate the verbs. I mean, do I use *tai* (I want) or *te* (continuing form) or *te iru* (present progressive form) or what? So I just leave off the end of my sentences when I'm not sure, and my host mother will fill it in. Then I can hear what she said and know how I should have said it. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

When I don't know what word I should use, I start the sentence, but I can't finish it and *myokaasan* (mother) just says it like she knows what I'm trying to say. Sometimes when I don't what to say then, I stop at that point and she'll give me the word or the verb or whatever. She's really good at finishing my sentences when I need help. (*Susan, group discussion*)

Essentially, the trailing off strategy involves not finishing the end of one's sentence, instead, trailing off at the end of the sentence and having the NS finish the sentence for you. This strategy may be used in Japanese because

as an SOV (subject-object-verb) language the end of the sentence is often the most difficult portion. Thus, trailing off and leaving the NS to finish the sentence is often less taxing for students than to try to figure out how to conjugate the verb at the end of the sentence to convey what one wants to say. This strategy requires work on the part of the NS though, who has to predict what the student is trying to say in order to finish their sentences. One caveat in calling this a communication strategy is that completing someone's sentence in Japanese may not be strategic behavior so to say, rather, it may reflect a common practice in Japanese conversation for the listener to predict the ends of their interlocutor's sentences and fill them in (Maynard, 1989; Hayashi & Mori, 1998). However, as was discussed above, the student use of 'trailing off' was identified as a strategy by the students themselves, and in this case, there are certain characteristics revealed in the context of the negotiation that suggest completing sentences is done so strategically. This effectively prompts the NS to finish the student's sentence as a way of helping the students get their message across.

#### **Student use of circumlocution.**

One way students may handle problems, especially if the difficulty is caused by gaps in lexical knowledge, is to use circumlocution. In fact, student use of circumlocution in the host family setting represented 4.99% of total strategy use. When students use circumlocution, they essentially "go around"

the lexical item, describing it with words that they do know until the NS understands what they are trying to say. Once the NS understands what the student is trying to say, they often provide the word or phrase for the student to confirm or disconfirm. Below is an example of Lisa's use of circumlocution. Here, she is trying to explain her favorite movie to her host mother (M), but is experiencing lexical difficulty. Note that in her explanation, she uses circumlocution (with other strategies) no less than three times in order to overcome her lexical gaps. In the first line, Lisa makes a mistake by using a similar sounding word, "riyuu" (reason) when she means to say, "jiyuu" (freedom). However, to complicate matters further, she mispronounces "riyuu" (reason) and instead, ends up saying "ryuu" (dragon). Because the word "ryuu" (dragon) does not make sense within the context of her explanation, the host mother is confused and responds by repeating the word twice "ryuu? ryuu?" (dragon? dragon?) with a question intonation in order to indicate her lack of understanding and to indirectly request clarification from Lisa. In line 3, then, Lisa attempts to request confirmation of the host mother's utterance. She uses circumlocution and essentially asks her host mother, "do you mean "why" did they do it?". The host mother does not confirm Lisa's interpretation and still seems confused about what Lisa is trying to say. In line 5 then, Lisa tries to explain, but makes the same mistake, using "ryuu" (dragon) for "jiyuu" (freedom). The host mother then asks Lisa if she's trying to say "riyuu" (reason) and asks for confirmation. However,

Lisa does not confirm this in line 7, but instead expresses her frustration. The host mother again asks if Lisa means “*riyuu*” (reason), and this time, Lisa repeats what her host mother has said “*riyuu*” (reason) as a whisper as if she is thinking about it. At this point, in line 9, Lisa finally realizes what word is causing the trouble and that her previous attempts using “*ryuu*” (dragon) for “*jiyuu*” (freedom) are possibly wrong.

**Excerpt 6.11 [Student use of circumlocution - host family]**

(similar sounding word)	1	L	<i>sono koto o suru riyuu wa maa jibun no ryuu ah chigai ryuu to ano nedan ano ryuu mo=</i> the reason they do that is uuh because one's own dragon ah different dragon and that price that dragon is also=
(Other repeat/ req. clarif.)	2	M	= <i>ryuu? ryuu?</i> =dragon? dragon?
(circumlocution / req. for confirm.)	3	L	<i>wa anoo dooshite shita no?</i> um why did they do it?
	4	M	<i>dooshite u:n</i> why u:n
(similar sounding word)	5	L	<i>ano ryuu ko-</i> well, that dragon
(req. for confirm.)	6	M	<i>riyuu?</i> reason?
(frustration)	7	L	<i>a::h</i> (indicates frustration) a::h
(req. for confirm.)	8	N	<i>riyuu deshoo?</i> reason right?
(Other repeat/ codeswitch/ foreignize/ comp. check)	9	L	<i>ah riyuu</i> ((whisper)) <i>freedom furiidomu tte wakaru?</i> <i>ah reason</i> ((whisper)) <i>freedom do you know freedom?</i>
(hesitation)	10	N	<i>u:n</i> ((hesitant)) <i>u:n</i> ((hesitant))
(circumlocution)	11	L	<i>jibun no koto o kimeru</i> you make decisions about yourself
(req. for confirm.)	12	N	<i>kimerareru?</i> to be able to make decisions?
(Other repeat/ circumlocution)	13	L	<i>ji- ji- kimerareru jibun no=</i> <i>ji- ji-</i> to be able to make decisions, your own=
(circumlocution/ req. for confirm.)	14	N	= <i>un dooree no yoo na kanji jibun no koto o tanin ga kimeru tte iu koto?</i> =un like a slave when someone else makes decisions for them?

(confirm)	15	L	<i>un soo</i> yes
(guess/ req. for confirm.)	16	N	<i>jiyuu de nai koto?</i> not being free?
(confirm)	17	L	<i>ah jiyuu! jiyuu!</i> ah freedom! freedom!
	18	N	<i>jiyuu! ah ahaha haha ((laugh))</i> freedom! ah ah hahaha ((laugh))
(explains mistake)	19	L	<i>jiyuu to riyuu wa itsumo riyuu ah naruhodo ah wakatta</i> freedom and reason it's always reason ah I get it ah I understand
	20	N	<i>ah soo ah ahha ahah ((laugh))</i> ah okay ah ah ha ahah ((laugh))
(incorporates word)	21	L	<i>ah sono hito no jiyuu o totte motto chikara ga takusan naru</i> ah if you take that person's freedom you get a lot of power
(confirm)	22	N	<i>soo soo</i> yes yes

Therefore, she first code switches into English, saying “freedom”, then foreignizes the same word into “*furiidomu*”, making it sound more in line with Japanese pronunciation, and asks her host mother if she understands. The host mother’s response indicates that she doesn’t understand. This prompts Lisa to find another way to explain the word in line 11. She tries using circumlocution explaining “freedom” as “*jibun no koto o kimeru*” (to make decisions about yourself), but makes another mistake when she fails to use the potential form of the verb “*kimeraru*” (to be able to make decisions). Thus, the host mother asks her if she means “*kimerareru*” (to be able to decide or make decisions) phrasing it as a request for confirmation (line 12). Lisa repeats the word in the new form that the mother has modeled for her, and with the new form, attempts the circumlocution again. With this, the host mother begins to understand what Lisa is trying to explain and offers her own circumlocution in line 14, “*un doree no yoo na kanji jibun no koto o*

*tanin ga kimeru tte iu koto?* (un like a slave when someone else makes decisions for them?), and requests confirmation from Lisa that her interpretation is correct. Lisa confirms this in line 15, and then the host mother guesses at this point that Lisa is trying to say something about “*jiyuu*” (freedom), and asks Lisa “*jiyuu de nai koto?*” (when someone is not free?), phrasing it as a request for confirmation (line 16). Lisa recognizes the word immediately and both she and the host mother repeat it a couple of times in lines 17 and 18. In line 19, Lisa tries to explain that she sometimes mixes up “*riyuu*” (reason) and “*jiyuu*” (freedom). Finally, in line 21, Lisa is able to use the word she’d just negotiated to convey what she wanted to explain from the very beginning, that the Protestants and Catholics were fighting to take each other’s freedom in order to gain more power. The host mother confirms Lisa’s use of the word in the next line, thereby ending the negotiation.

This excerpt illustrates the difficulty that Lisa experienced in trying to convey a topic that is unfamiliar to her in the L2. Because the explanation contained a lot of difficult concepts, and since it was Lisa’s favorite movie, it was completely up to her to describe it, thus requiring her to produce a lot of speech. Consequently, when Lisa came across a lexical difficulty, she had to compensate for it by using different communication strategies such as codeswitching, foreignizing, and circumlocution, in that order. Again, as mentioned previously, this hierarchy of strategy use seems to manifest itself quite frequently in negotiations in the host family setting. In this case, Lisa

opts for the least cognitively demanding strategy, codeswitching, and when that fails, she tries something a little more difficult, foreignizing, and finally resorts to circumlocution. Thus, it was the L2-based strategy that was the most effective here as was shown to be in Excerpts 6.6 and 6.8 (above). Thus, the use of circumlocution by both the student and the host mother seemed to be the main reason they were able to overcome the lexical difficulty.

Other factors may also have played a role in the use of strategies in this negotiation and others like it. First, an important point to be made about his negotiation is that it is an excellent example of the student as “knower” in the conversation. Specifically, even though Lisa is not familiar with this topic in terms of knowing the vocabulary in the L2 necessary to convey her message, Lisa may be more familiar with this topic than her host mother is, which makes her the “knower” in the conversation. This means that there is little shared reference with her host mother and therefore Lisa becomes responsible for the explanation. As such, Lisa may appeal to her host mother for help, but if her host mother is not familiar with the topic, she can only try to interpret what Lisa is saying and she is unlikely to be confident about her interpretations. As a result, Lisa has to make several attempts to compensate for the word “freedom” (*jiyuu*), using a variety of strategies; codeswitch, foreignizing, comprehension check, and circumlocution before her host mother is able to guess what she is trying to say.

Another factor that may have encouraged the variety of CS use is that

Lisa's motivation to talk about the topic. Not only was it her favorite movie, but being a very religious person, religious freedom was a topic that she was interested in. Studies suggest that students who talked about a topic they knew well and were interested in produced more speech but were less grammatically accurate. Although validating such claims about more speech production and accuracy would require an entirely different analysis, I believe that what can be said here is that Lisa does not abandon her explanation when difficulties arise precisely because she is motivated to talk about it and to try to overcome problems so she can eventually communicate the story.

Another quite plausible explanation for the use of some strategies may have been the level of difficulty of the story and word being conveyed. Namely, because the topic of religion and battles between Catholics and Protestants requires the explanation of difficult terms such as freedom, an abstract concept, strategies such as gesture would not have been not successful here. In fact, Lisa went from using less challenging strategies such as codeswitching and foreignizing to using a strategy that required a more challenging use of her interlanguage resources, circumlocution. Her host mother also went from using other repeat and request for clarification to guessing and request for confirmation and finally, the use of circumlocution. It is not surprising that difficulties in conveying an abstract concept like "freedom" might require several attempts and the use of a variety of strategies by both parties before a solution is reached.

To review, it has been suggested in this section that there are factors related to topic and content type that may influence negotiation and the use of communication strategies. In particular, if a student is the “knower” in a conversation, their role is to speak and explain and this puts heavy demands on their linguistic resources. The NS’s primary role then, becomes one in which they try to decipher what the student is trying to say, but even guessing may be difficult because they may not know the topic well enough to make an educated guess. Additionally, if a student is interested in and motivated to talk about the topic, they are perhaps more likely to attempt to overcome *difficulties* using communication strategies rather than abandon the topic when things get difficult. Lastly, when the content type includes abstract or culturally based concepts or entities, students are challenged to use more difficult L2-based strategies such as circumlocution that require them to use their interlanguage resources creatively.

#### **Summary of CS use in host family.**

To summarize, the host family data shows that the strategy used most frequently by host family members was request for confirmation. When a student experienced production difficulties and a host member provided help (e.g., a lexical item), requests for confirmation were used to confirm whether their contribution matched the student’s intended meaning. Consequently, host members’ frequent use of request for confirmation explains why

students used confirmation more than any other strategy, mainly as a response to NSs' frequent requests for confirmation. The negotiation excerpts indicated that host family members' use of request for confirmation and subsequent confirmation by the student was a delicate process of maintaining comprehension and avoiding difficulties so that communication could continue. This was especially notable in the data when NSs provided interpretive summaries (NSs' second most used strategy) of students' utterances and then requested confirmation of their interpretation. The most likely explanation of NSs' frequent use of requests for confirmation and interpretive summaries in the host family setting is that they were influenced to some extent by the Principles of Clarity and Economy (Poullisse, 1997). Essentially, it was quicker and easier to guess a student's intended message and request confirmation of it than it was to request clarification, which would have required students to modify their utterance. Concerns for face may also have compelled NSs to use more requests for confirmation because in general they do not draw so much attention to students' linguistic deficiencies as requests for clarification do. At the same time, listener behavior may also have played a role in the many requests for confirmations NSs used. Studies have shown that it is a normal part of listener behavior for Japanese NSs to guess, predict and otherwise display a high level of "attentiveness" while listening, and this may have influenced NSs' strategy use in negotiations with the host students. There is also some L1

evidence to suggest (Clancy, 1986a, 1986b; Moerk, 1992) that when NSs take on the role of caretaker as they do in mother-child interactions, they often recast novices' unclear utterances into a target-like versions. For this study, this type of "accommodation" between NSs and their host students allowed NSs to help the student convey their intended message as well as provide implicit correction or feedback of the student's unclear utterance by providing a target-like model of the utterance without interrupting the flow of communication too much.

The students second most frequently used strategy was "other repeat", which was often used by the students to indicate to the NS that they were experiencing reception difficulties. Students often repeated the part of the NS's utterance with a rising intonation, indicating a request for clarification and effectively pinpointing the portion of the utterance that had caused the comprehension difficulty. Such frequent student initiated indirect requests for clarification explains NSs frequent use of clarification and rephrasing. One way NSs rephrased their utterances to make them more comprehensible to students was to replace the *informal form* with the *formal form*, which lower proficiency students tended to be more familiar with. The fact that students used other repeat as requests for clarification so frequently probably had a lot to do with the Principles of Clarity and Economy because in combination, they were the easiest and most effective strategies for indicating comprehension problems (Poulisse, 1997). The frequent use of requests for

clarification also indicates that students' concerns for face-saving in the host family setting were relatively low. This may have been because students chose the role of "novice" in host family interactions and were willing to admit their difficulties. At the same time, NSs, especially host mothers, took on the role of caregiver not only through clarifying and rephrasing their utterances to make sure students could understand, but also by attempting to discern students' unclear utterances and helping them with production problems.

The roles of novice and caregiver also influenced students use of appeals for help. Appeals for help were used when students wanted to convey a message but did not have the linguistic means to do so. Like students' frequent use of requests for clarification, their use of appeals for help suggest that because students took on the role of novice and therefore asking for help was not so much of a threat to face and they indicated that the "help" they receive from their host family parents was not only welcomed, but expected, even to the point of using their host parents as "dictionaries". All of this indicates that for the students who consider themselves novices, conversational interaction in the host family setting is characterized by a fairly low degree of concern for face in terms of admitting their linguistic weaknesses and asking for help. At the same time, host family members took on most of the "work" of maintaining a satisfactory level of comprehension in conversations with their host students as a part of their role as caregivers.

Although the data shows that NSs preferred to decipher students' unclear utterances and then request confirmation of them, some negotiations suggested that in instances where NSs were unable to formulate an educated guess of what the student was saying, NSs resorted to requesting clarification. This did not always mean, however, that students obliged the NS with a clarification of their utterance. In fact, students only clarified 67% of their utterances (45 out of 67). This is probably because for the most part, NSs often took on the responsibility of discerning students' unclear utterances and would provide them with a model of the utterance to confirm or deny. Thus it was simply not necessary for a student to clarify their utterances in the host family setting very often.

On the low end of the frequency continuum was NSs' use of codeswitch, sentence completion, and students' use of foreignization and circumlocution. For codeswitch, the data showed that NSs used codeswitching more than students. However, NS were often unable to approximate the English pronunciation close enough for the students to recognize it as English, making this strategy a fairly inefficient one. Students' use of codeswitch was not as frequent, but they did use foreignization a lot. For example, when students experienced production difficulties they sometimes attempted to foreignize English words in the hope that the word might be recognized and understood by the NS. Thus students used foreignization because it does not make strong demands on limited L2

resources thus indicating that the Principle of Economy may have played a part in the use of this strategy. However, although students found foreignization easy to use, it was not always a successful strategy. As when NSs tried to use English words, students' attempts at foreignization were only successful if the word was an actual loan word in Japanese and if the student was able to successfully approximate the Japanese pronunciation of the word. Another important point to make about foreignization is that it seems to have been the first strategy of choice in a sequence of strategies students used when they were not sure how to say a word in the L2. The sequence itself seems to reflect the Principles of Clarity and Economy because it starts out with the strategy that requires the least amount of effort to a strategy that requires more effort. For example, students typically started out with a foreignizing strategy or a miming strategy, essentially strategies that did not require a lot of effort. Then, if that particular strategy did not work, the student would graduate to more L2-based strategies such as circumlocution. In essence, the series of strategies suggests that students tried to use their interlanguage resources efficiently by using the least cognitively taxing strategies first, and then, when that proved insufficient, they resorted to more difficult L-2 based strategies.

NSs also used sentence completion as a strategy when students directly or indirectly indicated that they needed assistance finishing their sentences. One way students indirectly prompted NSs to finish their sentences was trail

off at the end of their sentence to prompt the NS to finish the sentence for them. This meant that NSs had to predict what the student was trying to say in order to finish their sentences. Some may argue that NSs sentence in Japanese may not be strategic behavior, rather, it may reflect a common practice in Japanese conversation for the listener to predict the ends of their interlocutor's sentences and fill them in (Maynard, 1989). However, the student use of 'trailing off' was identified as a strategy by the students themselves, and in this case, there are certain characteristics revealed in the context of the negotiation that suggest completing sentences was done so strategically.

Lastly, although students use of circumlocution barely reached 5% of total strategy use, nonetheless it was shown to be an important part of strategy use, especially perhaps in instances where difficult concepts such as "freedom" were concerned. Certain factors related to topic and content type may have influenced negotiation and the use of circumlocution. For example, when the student is the "knower" in a conversation and is motivated and interesting in talking about a topic, their output is likely to increase because they are made responsible for conveying the information. Moreover, they may be more likely to attempt to overcome difficulties using a variety of strategies rather than abandon the topic when things get difficult. Also, when the topic involves talking about abstract or culturally based concepts or entities, students may be pushed to attempt more difficult L2-

based strategies like circumlocution, that require them to use their interlanguage resources creatively.

### **CS use in the Classroom**

Table 6.3 (below) shows the frequency of different types of communication strategies used by students and instructors in the classroom. As can be seen in the second column, students used "other repetition" more than any other strategy, while "self repetition" was at the lower end of the most frequency used strategies continuum. In the last column we can see that instructors used "request for clarification" more frequently than any other strategy and that comprehension checks were used the least frequently. Of note in the same column are strategies such as display questions and prompts, which were found only in the classroom as a part of "teacher talk". Nonetheless they were used as strategies in negotiation to solve comprehension problems. As with the host family data, certain strategies used by one participant can elicit or prompt the subsequent use of another strategies by the other participant. Moreover, certain strategies tend to be used in conjunction with each other by the same participant. For example, the frequency data indicates that instructors' use of clarification most likely prompts students to clarify and rephrase their utterances. Thus, among the strategies listed below, if certain strategies tended to elicit the use of other strategies or if certain strategies were found to often be used in conjunction

with other strategies, they will be presented together as such in the next section along with excerpts that illustrate their usage.

1. NS use of request for clarification and student use of clarification and rephrasal
2. Student use of other repetition as requests for confirmation and clarification
3. NS use of other repetition as requests for confirmation/clarification and student use of confirmation
4. Student and NS use of codeswitch
5. Student appeals for help
6. NS use of prompt and display questions

**Table 6.3. Percentage & types of CS used by students and NSs - classroom**

Student use of CS	% of total CS use	Instructor use of CS	% of total CS use
1. Other repetition	18.53%	1. Request clarification	13.70%
2. Codeswitch	16.73%	2. Other repetition	13.44%
3. Rephrase	10.96%	3. Confirmation	13.18%
4. Clarification	8.57%	4. Request confirmation	12.14%
5. Request confirmation	8.57%	5. Prompt	8.27%
6. Request clarification	8.57%	6. Display question	8.01%
7. Confirm	6.97%	7. Codeswitch	7.75%
8. Appeal for help	5.98%	8. Others (below 5%)	23.50%
9. Others (below 5%)	15.15%		
Total	100%	Total	100%

**NS use of request for clarification and student use of clarification and rephrasal.**

Instructors used requests for clarification more than any other strategy in the classroom (13.70%). The transcript data suggests that the instructors used requests for clarification to either let students know that their utterances

were not comprehensible or that they were not correct. However, because the intent behind the request for clarification is not immediately evident in the data, it is not considered for analysis. While clarifications by students do not match instructors' use of request for clarifications as the most frequently used strategy, nevertheless, students' frequent use of clarification (8.57%) and rephrase (10.96%) suggests that students responded to these requests for clarification by clarifying their utterances 81% of the time (43 out of 53). Moreover, they often did so by rephrasing their original utterance to make it more understandable or acceptable. This process of instructor request for clarification and subsequent clarification by the student often seemed to be repeated sometimes several times within a single negotiation. For example, in this excerpt about general debate tactics, Instructor Endo starts out with a typical display question, asking the class what an "opposing opinion" means. Jamie tries to answer his question by saying, "*hokano hito no iken*" (someone else's opinion). In response, Instructor Endo says, "*un?*" (what?). Jamie responds to this as if Instructor Endo were asking her to repeat her answer, so she repeats her original utterance, only this time with a question intonation requesting confirmation. However, it appears that Instructor Endo either does not understand Jamie's utterance or it is not the answer he is looking for, so he repeats Jamie's utterance with a rising intonation, indirectly requesting clarification in line 5. This prompts Jamie to clarify her utterance in line 6, rephrasing it as "*chigau chigau no iken*" (a different different opinion).

**Excerpt 6.12 [NS request for clarification & student clarification and rephrasal-classroom]**

- |                                |    |   |  |
|--------------------------------|----|---|--|
| (display quest.)               | 1  | E | <i>hantai no iken o iu hantai no iken donna imi desu ka</i><br>to say an opposing opinion what does an 'opposing opinion' mean?  |
| (trigger-unknown)              | 2  | J | <i>hokano hito no iken</i><br>another person's opinion   |
| (req. repetition)              | 3  | E | <i>un?</i><br>what?  |
| (self repeat/req. confirm.)    | 4  | J | <i>hokano hito no iken?</i><br>another person's opinion?   |
| (other repeat/req. clarif.)    | 5  | E | <i>hokano hito no iken?</i><br>another person's opinion?   |
| (clarify/rephrase)             | 6  | J | <i>chigau chigau no iken</i><br>a different different opinion  |
| (other repeat/req. clarif.)    | 7  | E | <i>chigau?</i><br>different?   |
| (clarify/rephrase)             | 8  | J | <i>chigau ga aru hito no iken</i><br>an opinion of a person who has a 'difference'   |
| (other repeat/req. clarif.)    | 9  | E | <i>chigau hito?</i><br>a different person?   |
| (clarify/rephrase)             | 10 | J | <i>chigau no iken</i><br>a different opinion   |
| (codeswitch/ explains mistake) | 11 | E | <i>un chigau no ne chigau wa verb desu dakara modifier no toki wa chigau iken ne ja</i><br>yes 'different' different is a verb so when you use it as a modifier it's a 'different opinion' right? well |

However, it appears that this is also not clear to Instructor Endo and he repeats the word "*chigau?*" (different?) again indirectly requesting clarification in line 7. Therefore, once again Jamie tries to clarify her utterance by rephrasing it into "*chigau ga aru hito no iken*" (an opinion of a person who has a difference), which actually makes little sense in Japanese grammatically. Instructor Endo responds to Jamie's rephrased utterance by request clarification yet again saying, "*chigau hito?*" (a different person?) in line 9. The next line, 10, is Jamie's fourth attempt at trying to rephrase and clarify her utterance. She says "*chigau no iken*" (a different opinion),

however she says it wrong, incorrectly placing the particle “*n o*” between the verb and the noun where there should be none. This appears in content, to be the answer Instructor Endo wants, but because Jamie has said it grammatically incorrectly, he corrects her, explaining that when she uses a verb (*chigau* - different) to modify a noun (*iken* - opinion), the resulting phrase should be “*chigau iken*” (a different opinion), without the particle “*n o*”.

This excerpt clearly illustrates the repeated cycle of request for clarification and subsequent clarification by rephrase that seems to dominate a lot of classroom negotiations. We can see that Instructor Endo requested clarification of Jamie’s utterances three times and that she clarified and rephrased her utterances three times in response. This negotiation in particular seems to suggest that Instructor Endo expects Jamie to clarify her utterances to make them more comprehensible or acceptable. However, it is often unclear as to why an instructor requests clarification, whether is because an utterance is incomprehensible, unacceptable in terms of what the instructor wants to elicit, or grammatically incorrect. For example, at the beginning of the negotiation it is not clear whether Instructor Endo’s requests clarification because he really doesn’t understand the meaning of Jamie’s utterance, or because the answer Jamie gave is not the answer he wants. Either way, Instructor Endo is giving Jamie feedback on the comprehensibility or acceptability (in terms of the answer he is looking for and the grammaticality of it) of her utterance and Jamie is prompted to clarify her

utterance in response to his feedback. As this process continues, we see that Jamie's clarifications and rephrases get closer and closer to the answer that Instructor Endo feels is acceptable. Although, given his "correction" at the end of the negotiation, we are led to the conclusion that for at least this portion of the negotiation (lines 6 - 11) Instructor Endo asked for clarification because he wanted Jamie to see that her utterance was not correct and prompt her to modify it. One thing that is clear, however, is that by requesting clarification the instructor is prompting the student to clarify their utterance and that oftentimes students comply by rephrasing.

The factors that influence CS use in the classroom tend to be quite different than those that affect CS use in the *host family setting*. In the classroom for example, universal principles of communication and concerns for face seem to be less important and CS use seems to be more closely tied to participant roles and goals and expectations in the classroom. For example, in contrast to what was found in the *host family setting*, instructors made more requests for clarification than confirmation. This means that rather than trying to interpret students' utterances and request confirmation of their interpretation, instructors instead pushed students to clarify their utterances. In response, students often modified their utterances to make them clearer or more acceptable. Depending on the ability of the student to modify their utterance, negotiations often became more lengthy and difficult (Poullisse, 1997). Thus, instructor's use of requests for clarification seems to contradict

the Principles of Clarity and Economy by making things more drawn out and difficult. This is perhaps where the Principles of Clarity and Economy are surpassed in importance by adherence to classroom goals. Essentially, the classroom goal of learning is manifested in the requests for clarifications that instructors use to push students to clarify their unclear or inaccurate utterances. Therefore, rather than adhering to Principles of Clarity and Economy, instructors and students alike may follow classroom goals of learning more closely when choosing which CSs to use in negotiations. Adhering more closely to goals of learning may occur especially in certain types of formal tasks like structure drills or the learning of new patterns and less so in more communicative tasks.

Also in contrast to the host family setting, concerns for face do not seem to be as important in the classroom setting. In fact, concerns for face may often be "suspended", so to say, in a classroom context. This may be because a teacher's institutional role, by nature, is one of continuously threatening students' face, impeding on their rights (negative face) by correcting their mistakes, drawing attention to their linguistic deficiencies, interrupting them, and evaluating them (Cazden, 1988). Thus, the students' roles as learners carry a responsibility to deal with threats to their face, as when teachers correct their mistakes. Although this study did not look at other-repair, lack of concerns for face may explain why the instructors made frequent use of requests for clarification of students' unclear utterances, essentially prompting

students to modify their own output to make it more comprehensible, accurate, or acceptable. Such requests for clarification draw attention to students' deficiencies and are ultimately face threatening. However, Kramsch (1985) notes that the need for face-work in classrooms is minimized because of the role of the teacher and learner. Teachers are expected to correct students' linguistic errors and students are less concerned about losing face because they expect to be corrected. Thus, in some cases institutional roles or goals and expectations in the classroom may override concerns for concerns for face and adherence to principles of communication.

**Student use of other repetition as requests for confirmation and clarification and instructor use of confirmation.**

The strategy most used by students in the classroom is other repetition (18.53%). In the host family setting students often used other repetition to request clarification of something they did not understand in the NS's utterance. This is also the case in the classroom data. Consider the following excerpt, where Instructor Hoshino asks a student (S6) if they've ever seen an interesting "*jidoohanbaiki*" (vending machines) in Japan. S6 responds by repeating a portion of the word with a rising intonation, indirectly requesting clarification. Instructor Hoshino clarifies by providing the English equivalent of the word and S6 indicates in the last line that he has understood.

**Excerpt 6.13 [Student use of other repeat as request for clarification - classroom]**

(display quest.)	1	H:	<i>ah soo anoo S6 san nanika omoshiroi jidoohanbaiki miru koto arimasu ka</i> oh is that right well S6 have you ever seen an interesting vending machine?
(other repeat/ req. clarif.)	2	S6:	<i>jidoohan?</i> vending?
(clarify/ codeswitch)	3	H:	<i>vending machine</i> vending machine
(expresses understanding)	4	S6:	<i>a::h</i> a::h

The above excerpts exemplifies a typical exchange that occurs when a student doesn't understand something in their instructor's utterance. By pinpointing the specific part of the utterance that is not understood, other repeat serves as a particularly effective strategy in helping the NS decipher where the student's comprehension difficulties lie.

Besides using other repetition and requests for clarification, students also used other repetitions as requests for confirmation (8.57%), in order to confirm their understanding of something the instructor said or to show the instructor that feedback on a word or a corrected form has been noticed, understood, and incorporated. An example that illustrates student use of other repetition and request for confirmation as well as to display understanding and noticing is given in Excerpt 6.14 below, where a student (S5) has problems with a lexical item and appeals to Instructor Hoshino (H) for help. The student (S5) begins to explain in line 1, that he got caught in the rain yesterday. The lexical trigger comes in line 3, when the student code

switches into English and says “wet?”, as an indirect appeal for help from Instructor Hoshino. At the same time he also rubs his shirt to illustrate ‘wet’. Instructor Hoshino provides the word in line 4, “*nuremashita*”. Then, upon receiving feedback in the form of Instructor Hoshino providing the word, Student 5 seeks to confirm his understanding of the word by repeating it with a rising intonation. Instructor Hoshino responds by confirming and then writes the word on the board and explains it further by using it in the context that the student wants to use it, “*ame ga furu to sore mo nuremashita*” (when it rains that is also ‘was wet’). Thus, the student repeats it again in line 7 as if to reconfirm and Instructor Hoshino confirms again in the last line.

**Excerpt 6.14 [Student use of other repetition as request for confirmation - classroom]**

	1	S5:	<i>uuh uh kaeru uh</i> [ <i>kaeru toki wa [ano um ooame furimashita=</i> when I was going home there was heavy rain=
(backchannel)	2	H:	<i>hoo</i> [ <i>un</i> [uh huh [uh huh
(trigger- lexical/ gesture/ codeswitch/ appeal for help)	3	S5:	= <i>watashi wa konna um wet?</i> ((rubs shirt to indicate wet)) =I um this wet?
(provides word)	4	H:	<i>nuremashita</i> got wet
(other rep./ req confirm.)	5	S5:	<i>nuremashita?</i> got wet?
(confirm/ expand)	6	H:	<i>h a i</i> ((writes on board)) <i>ame ga furu to sore mo nuremashita</i> yes ((writes on board)) when it rains that is also ‘got wet’
(other rep./ req. confirm.)	7	S5:	<i>nuremashita</i> wet
(confirm)	8	H:	<i>hai, ja S6 san</i> yes, then Student 6

This particular excerpt reveals some interesting aspects about students’ use of other repetition in the classroom. Specifically, when students appeal to

their instructors for help with a lexical item and the instructor obliges by providing the word, the student, in an attempt to make sure that they have heard the word correctly, repeats the word with a rising intonation, thereby requesting confirmation of it. The use of "other repeat" and request for confirmation can be repeated, as seen in this excerpt, until the student and instructor are satisfied that everything has been understood. The last confirmation given by Instructor Hoshino is no doubt essential to the continuation of the classroom activity. Without confirmation, students may feel a sense of incompleteness or confusion as to whether something was deemed accurate or acceptable. Generally, the use of other repetition and request for confirmation seems to be very common in the classroom setting, where students are constantly repeating and attempting to incorporate their instructor's feedback into their utterances and while requesting confirmation of its accuracy.

Factors that influence student use of other repetition as requests for clarification and confirmation are in some ways similar to those in the host family setting and in some ways different. On one hand, as in the host family setting, the Principles of Clarity and Economy can no doubt be applied to student use of other repetition in the classroom (Poulisse, 1997). Other repetition is perhaps the easiest way for a student to ask for clarification or confirmation. Rather than saying something like, "what does X mean?", the student essentially opts to use the least energy consuming strategy, "other

repetition" with a question intonation to indicate an indirect request for clarification or confirmation. There is obvious motivation for students in the classroom to request clarification and confirmation because students may be held responsible for the knowing information later. However, although other repetition was an easy and efficient way to make indirect requests for clarification or confirmation of unclear portions of the instructor's utterance, it also seemed to serve another function in the classroom perhaps unrelated to the Principles of Clarity and Economy. In the host family situation students often used other repeat with a request for clarification in order to elicit an explanation of a word or unclear utterance from their host parents. Although there are instances of students using other repetition as requests for clarification in the classroom, closer analysis of the data suggests that other repetition is used by students in the classroom to show the instructor that feedback on a word or a corrected form has been noticed, understood, and incorporated. Students also tend to use other repetition with a rising intonation (i.e. as a request for confirmation) in order to confirm their understanding of something the instructor said. Both of these uses of other repetition are common in the classroom and perhaps even expected as a part of classroom discourse. In fact, in their study, Pica and Doughty (1985, 1988) found that self and other repetitions were used so frequently in the classroom, that perhaps their high occurrence was more indicative of "classroom conventions" than for negotiation purposes. This may explain

why the classroom data shows so much student use of other repetition with requests for confirmation. This use of other repetition and request for confirmation is very common in the classroom setting and is indicative of the focus on learning. Students are made to be responsible for the information they learn in the classroom and are also expected to show that they understand, notice, and can incorporate feedback from the teacher. It would be rare indeed to see a teacher give feedback to a student where the student did not repeat the feedback or give any indication that s/he had noticed and made an attempt to incorporate that feedback. Moreover, studies have shown exactly what we see here, that in classroom lessons with the primary focus on language as object, students respond to their teacher's feedback by repeating and attempting to incorporate it into their utterances and requesting confirmation of its accuracy (Chaudron, 1988; Salica, 1981, Wren, 1982). It is undoubtedly the instructor's role as expert that entitles him/her to give confirmation on the accuracy or acceptability of the student's utterance. This confirmation by the instructor is no doubt essential to the continuation of the activity. Without confirmation, students may feel a sense of incompleteness or confusion as to whether something was deemed accurate or acceptable. The fact that at the end of a negotiation the instructor must be the one to confirm the eventual outcome is dictated by the teachers' roles in classrooms in general and in multi-party negotiations in particular. Namely, who may say what to whom and when depends on the participant

roles and participant structure (teacher fronted versus group work etc.) and these often limit the way student participate in classroom negotiation. To illustrate, comments from the students' journals and in the group discussions indicated that they felt it was the instructor's job to have the initial and final say in dealing with a problem or a question in the classroom.

When the teacher corrects me I feel like that's his job, but when other students correct me I get so mad. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

But when you make a mistake and the teacher asks someone else what the answer is, that's no big deal. It's not like they're correcting you, but like they're answering the teacher's question. (*Mandy, group discussion*)

Yeah, but the other day when someone told me my answer was wrong without the teacher even asking her to butt in, that really made me mad. (*Jamie, group discussion*)

Most people won't do that unless they're asked by the teacher though. But when someone has a question, most of us are already answering it under our breath, we just don't say it out loud. (*Amy, group discussion*)

Essentially, the students believed that the teacher had the right to open the floor to other students when a question or a problem arose, and then those students could provide explanation, but unless s/he did so, the other students were not supposed to initiate corrections, clarifications, or even confirmations themselves, lest they offend their classmates. The underlying theory here is an intersection of face and participant roles. Essentially, what an interlocutor can say, to whom, and under what circumstances is

determined by the role they fill in a particular situation. In this case, the teacher is considered the "expert" and therefore controls the floor. S/he may relinquish, share, or gain the floor at any time. However, other students are the "non-experts", status-equal to each other, so unless given the floor through prompts to answer questions or participate in problem solving they are not supposed to engage in such activity. Thus, if a student were to correct another student, answer another student's question, or confirm the correctness of another student's utterance, this would result in a threat to face since it is a violation of the student's role as novice in the classroom.

To summarize, student use of other repetition as requests for clarification or confirmation may reflect to some extent the Principles of Clarity and Economy namely because classroom time constraints may push students to use fast and easy means of clearing up comprehension difficulties (Poullisse, 1997). On the other hand, the frequent use of other repetition with requests for confirmation may be a reflection of goals and expectations in the classroom. Repeating feedback provided to them by the instructor and requesting confirmation of it to check their accuracy is commonplace in classroom interaction. Moreover, the instructor's subsequent confirmation of any and all requests for confirmation seems to be part of the instructor's role in the classroom and violations of this role are thought to be face threatening.

**NS use of request for confirmation, other repetition, and student use of confirmation.**

In the classroom data NS requests for confirmation only represented 12.14% of total communication strategy use and student confirmation only 6.97%. This is quite a big difference from the 24.70% and 20.06% respectively of the host family setting (see Table 6.2). It is interesting to note that instructors did very little guessing or interpretive summaries of what students said, which would explain the lower frequency of these strategies as compared to the host family setting (refer to Table 6.3). That these types of strategies are not used to any large extent in the classroom perhaps reflects the focus on accuracy and the goal of teaching in the classroom and that the teacher's role in the classroom is not to guess what the student is saying rather it is to prompt the student to make their utterances clear. This was made evident in the data when instructors, rather than "giving the student the answer" by modeling the corrected target-like version of a student's unclear utterance and requesting confirmation of it, tended to make the students responsible for making their own utterances comprehensible. It is because of the expectation that students should reformulate their utterances set up by the learning situation in the classroom that the use of request for confirmation with guesses and interpretations and subsequent confirmation is considerably lower than in the host family situation. To illustrate, the following excerpt represents a typical classroom negotiation where requests

for confirmation by the instructor are noticeably absent.

**Excerpt 6.15 [Absence of instructor's use of request for confirmation - classroom]**

- (req. clarif.) 1 L *so like shitsuren suru toki no sayoonara itte ato de au tsumori desu ka*  
so like when you are broken hearted and say goodbye, do you plan to  
meet them again later?
- (req. clarif) 2 Y *dooshite?*  
why?
- (clarify/example) 3 L *tatoeba watashi wa nihon ni itte [shitsuren shite [anoo ato ichinen*  
*mo kaette kimasu=*  
for example I go to Japan and am broken hearted and well then after a  
year passes
- (backchannel) 4 Y *[hai* *[hai*  
*[yes* *[yes*
- 5 L *=kara sono toki mo booifurendo=*  
*=because I come back, at that time my boyfriend=*
- (req. clarif.) 6 Y *=chotto wakaranai*  
*=I don't understand*
- (clarify/rephrase/  
req. for clarif.) 7 L *u:n booifurendo ni [ai ni ikimasu ka=*  
*u:m do you go and meet your boyfriend?=-*
- (clarify/circum.) 8 Y *[hai* *=ah soo desu ne shitsuren suru to*  
*iu no wa booifurendo to sayoonara shitakunai desu shitakunai keredo*  
*shitsuren shimasu*  
*[yes* *=ah okay 'shitsuren' is when*  
*you don't want to say goodbye to your boyfriend you don't want to but*  
*you do*
- (hesitation) 9 L *un*  
*hm:*
- (example/prompt) 10 Y *jya booifurendo to sayoonara shitai toki sayoonara to iu no wa furu to*  
*iimasu booifurendo o gaarufurendo o furu kore wa sayoonara shitai*  
*desu hai furu jya kono hantai wa nan desu ka watashi wa S4 san o*  
*furimasu S4 san wa watashi::*  
well when you want to say goodbye to a boyfriend it's called 'dump'.  
a boyfriend dumps with a girlfriend well what is the opposite of 'to  
dump'? I will dump S4 but by me S4 i::s
- (answers prompt) 11 S4 *o shitsuren*  
*is broken hearted*
- (confirm/prompt) 13 Y *shitsuren shimasu soo ii shi watashi::*  
*is broken hearted is good but I::*
- (answers prompt) 14 S7 *furare-*  
*was dump=*
- (completes tense) 15 Y *furareta furareru*  
*was dumped dumped*
- (req. confirm.) 16 L *ja shitsuren suru no ga furareta?*  
*so to be broken hearted is to be dumped?*

(confirm) 17 Y *onaji desu. hokani shitsumon wa arimasu ka ii desu ka hai ja ima niban ikimashoo te ori etto 'a' L san yonde kudasai*  
it's the same. are there any other questions? alright? then well now  
let's go to number two, 'te ori' um L please read 'a'

The word that triggered the negotiation, "*shitsuren suru*" (to be broken hearted/ disappointed in love), was actually introduced several lines before Lisa asked about its meaning in line 1. Confused about its meaning and how it is used, Lisa requests clarification of the word, asking if "*shitsuren suru*" (to be broken hearted/ disappointed in love) means that you say goodbye to someone and then plan on seeing them again. Instructor Yoshimura responds in line 2 by requesting clarification herself, asking "*dooshite?*" (why?). Lisa then tries to clarify her question by giving an example of a situation she thinks applies to "*shitsuren suru*" (to be broken hearted/ disappointed in love) in lines 3 and 5. However, Instructor Yoshimura does not understand Lisa's example situation and expresses this in line 6, asking indirectly for clarification, "*chotto wakaranai*" (I don't understand). Lisa tries once again to clarify what she means in line 7, and in line 8, Instructor Yoshimura responds by giving a more detailed example of when *shitsuren suru*" (to be broken hearted/ disappointed in love) could be used, saying that when you are broken hearted, you say goodbye to your boyfriend but you don't want to. It is not clear in line 9 whether Lisa understands this explanation or not, but Instructor Yoshimura continues her explanation in line 10 by giving an opposite example of when someone wants

to say goodbye to their boyfriend (e.g., "*furu*" to dump a girlfriend or boyfriend), and then prompts the class to finish the sentence she started. In response, S4 attempts to finish the prompt, but it is apparently not the answer that Instructor Yoshimura is looking for, so she repeats the prompt in line 13. This time another student (S7) answers the prompt with the passive form of "*furu*" (to dump), "*furare(ru)*" (to be dumped), but does not complete the ending of the verb, so in line 15, Instructor Yoshimura supplies the passive form of the verb (*furareta* = was dumped/ *furareru*= to be dumped) in the completed form, indicating that the passive form of the verb is what she was asking the class to provide. Based on the exchange between Instructor Yoshimura and the class, Lisa then asks for confirmation of her interpretation of "*shitruren suru*" (to be broken hearted/ disappointed in love), asking, "*jya shitsuren suru no ga furareta?*" (so to be broken hearted is to be dumped?). Instructor Yoshimura confirms that the two meanings are the same "*onaji*" (same) in line 17, thereby ending the negotiation.

What is different in this negotiation, as compared to the host family negotiation, is that Instructor Yoshimura does not attempt to guess, interpret, or request confirmation of what Lisa is trying to say as a host mother might try to do in a host family situation. Thus the request for confirmation and subsequent confirmation sequences that are common in the host family negotiations are not very common here. Rather, Instructor Yoshimura requests clarification (line 2), then indicates her lack of understanding (line 6 -

an indirect request for clarification) and when she finally understands what Lisa is saying, she uses circumlocution to explain the meaning of the word in question and then goes on to introduce a similar word and turns this portion of the negotiation into practice for the passive tense. In effect, instead of trying to guess what Lisa was asking or solving the problem by providing the class with a one to one translation of the word in English, Yoshimura has made Lisa and the other students work actively to solve Lisa's comprehension problem. Lisa is made to clarify her original utterance through examples and rephrases, and she herself is the one requesting confirmation to make sure that she understands the meaning of the word. This perhaps explains the reason rephrasing, clarification, request for clarification, and request for confirmation are among the most used strategies for students in the classroom. This style of negotiation seems to be in direct contrast to what was found in the host family setting, where in response to host mothers frequent attempts to guess, interpret, request confirmation of student's meaning, students were often not required to clarify their utterances but only needed to confirm the guess that the host mother provided. The question becomes then, if instructors do not tend to use requests for confirmation with guesses and interpretive summary, then how do they use them? A closer look at the data revealed that instructors often use requests for confirmation with other repetition in the classroom. In fact, in the classroom data, other repetition was found to be the instructors' second most frequently used strategy. Given

students' frequent use of other repetition with requests for confirmation, it is perhaps not surprising that instructors also used other repetition with requests for confirmation, often repeating the student's utterance with an upward intonation and requesting confirmation that the utterance has been understood correctly. However, Instructors' other repetitions can be just as likely used as requests for clarification, as when a student says something that the instructor does not understand and needs the student to clarify their utterance. The following negotiation illustrates the instructor's use of other repetition to both request confirmation and clarification. The class is engaged in a pattern drill that is focused on talking about probability and expressing uncertainty in Japanese. The excerpt starts with Instructor Yoshimura (Y) asking the class what they think Einstein was like and how he lived. Lisa (L) responds by saying that she thinks Einstein's friends were probably intellectuals. The word she uses "*shikisha*" (intellectual) seems to cause some confusion for Instructor Yoshimura. This is because it is not a word that is commonly used for "intellectual". The most common words used for intellectual are "*interi*" (intellectual) or "*chishikijin*". Thus, Instructor Yoshimura repeats "*shikisha*" (intellectual) in the next turn with a rising intonation, requesting confirmation of it. Lisa confirms and then repeats the word again. However, this has apparently not solved the problem and Instructor Yoshimura again repeats the word along with gesturing like a conductor, this time requesting clarification of it. At this point it becomes

obvious that it is not clear to Instructor Yoshimura whether Lisa intends “*shikisha*” to mean “intellectual” or “conductor”. Lisa responds by clarifying her meaning by pointing to her head. This seems to solve the problem, because Instructor Yoshimura immediately indicates her understanding. Then Lisa follows up in the next turn, essentially clarifying her gesture and her meaning by saying, “*shikisha wa atama ga ii to omoimasu*” (I think intellectuals are smart). Instructor Yoshimura confirms this in the last line and the negotiation comes to an end.

**Excerpt 6.16 [NS use of other repeat as request for confirmation/ clarification - classroom]**

(display quest.)	1	Y	<i>ja ainshutain wa?</i> what about Einstein?
(lexical trigger)	2	L	<i>um tabun tomodachi wa shikisha da to omoimasu ah da to omoimasu</i> um I think his friends were probably intellectuals ah I think
(other rep/ req. confirm.)	3	Y	<i>shikisha?</i> shikisha?
(confirm/ self-repeat)	4	L	<i>hai shikisha</i> yes intellectuals
(other repeat/ req. clarif)	5	Y	<i>shikisha tte</i> ((gestures like a conductor)) as for “ <i>shikisha</i> ” ((gestures like a conductor))
(clarify/gesture)	6	L	<i>sono anoo=</i> ((points to her head)) that um=
(expresses understanding)	7	Y	<i>=ah shikisha shikisha wakarimashita</i> =ah intellectuals intellectuals I understand
(clarify)	8	L	<i>shikisha wa atama ga ii to omoimasu</i> I think intellectuals are smart
(confirm)	9	Y	<i>hai</i> yes

Instructor Yoshimura’s use of other repetition in the above negotiation seems to serve several functions here. Her first repeat and request for confirmation in line 3 obviously serves to confirm her understanding of the

word Lisa used. The next one in line 5, where Instructor Yoshimura repeats and requests clarification, lets Lisa know that the word she used is not clear. Such other repetitions by instructors may also serve as an overt acknowledgment of the student's contribution, and at the same time may serve to call the other students' attention to a difficult word or make it clear for the other students who may not have heard it.

Thus, as the fourth most commonly used strategy (12%) in the classroom, requests for confirmation in the classroom may not have been completely about interpreting or guessing students' unclear utterances as they were in the host family setting. Rather, they may have served a couple of different functions in the classroom. For example, requests for confirmation served as an overt acknowledgment of the student's contribution, as a check to make sure that the utterance had been heard correctly, and as a way to repeat what the student said either to call other students' attention to it or make it clear for other students who may not have heard it.

#### **Student and NS use of codeswitch.**

Student codeswitch was the second most frequently used strategy in the classroom (16.73%). However, instructors' use of codeswitch was only 7.75%, suggesting that although instructors often allowed students to use English during negotiations, they themselves did not use English quite as frequently. To illustrate, in the next excerpt, Jamie and her partner are discussing topics

for a debate that they will do in class and Jamie (J) asks Instructor Endo (E) for the Japanese equivalent to a word that she wants to use in the debate. In line 1, Jamie codeswitches into English to appeal to Instructor Endo for help with the word “to depend on”. However, Instructor Endo responds to her question by asking for clarification saying, “*eh?*” (what?). It is not clear here whether Instructor Endo does not understand what Jamie is asking, or he is essentially prompting Jamie to frame her question using Japanese. Jamie perceives it as both request, which is why she not only clarifies her original utterance by rephrasing it, but this time also uses Japanese to frame her question, although she still codeswitches into English for the actual word “to depend on”. However, it appears that Instructor Endo still needs more information in order to assist her with finding the appropriate word. Therefore, codeswitching into English, he seeks confirmation from Jamie as to whether or not she wants to say “depend on someone”. Jamie confirms that it is what she wants to say. Instructor Endo responds by seeking further clarification, asking Jamie, “*tatoeba donna sentence?*” (for example, what kind of sentence?). In response, Jamie clarifies by codeswitching into English in line 7, saying, “*like, depend on your wife*”. However, Instructor Endo again requests clarification as to whether Jamie wants to say that you depend on someone financially (*keezaiteki na koto*) or psychologically (*shinriteki na koto*). Jamie answers that she wants to say all of that. Finally, in line 10, Instructor Endo is able to provide Jamie with two words that fit the description of the word she

is seeking to say, “*izon suru*” (to be dependent on) and “*tayoru*” (to rely on). Here again, for the second and last time, Instructor Endo codeswitches into English to say “*rely on someone*”.

**Excerpt 6.17 [NS and student use of codeswitch - classroom]**

(trigger- lexical/ codeswitch/app. help)	1	J	<i>oh um to depend on?</i> <i>oh um to depend on</i>
(req. clarif.)	2	E	<i>eh?</i> <i>huh?</i>
(clarify/rephrase/ codeswitch)	3	J	<i>doo yatte to depend on to iimasu ka you can depend on</i> <i>how do you say to depend on you can depend on</i>
(other rep./ req. confirm.)	4	E	<i>depend on someone?</i> <i>depend on someone?</i>
(confirm)	5	J	<i>hai</i> <i>yes</i>
(req. clarif.)	6	E	<i>tatoeba donna sentence?</i> <i>for example what kind of sentence?</i>
(clarify/codeswitch)	7	J	<i>like depend on your wife</i> <i>like depend on your wife</i>
(req. clarif./exmpl.)	8	E	<i>donna koto? tatoeba keezaiteki na koto? toka shinriteki na koto?</i> <i>what kind of thing? for example economically? or</i> <i>psychologically?</i>
(clarify)	9	J	<i>zenbu</i> <i>all of that</i>
(codeswitch/ provides word)	10	E	<i>zenbu zenbu wa ne soo ne izon suru sore ka rely on someone tayoru</i> <i>all that all that is 'izon suru' (to be dependent on) or to rely on</i> <i>someone is 'tayoru' (to rely on someone)</i> <i>((Endo moves on to the next pair group))</i>

Both Jamie’s and Instructor Endo’s use of English is an important part of this negotiation. Jamie uses more English than Instructor Endo, but what is perhaps more important is that they both use English as a way to maintain a level of comprehension, switching back and forth from Japanese to English in such a way as to avoid complicating the negotiation. The use of English seems especially useful here in terms of maintaining comprehension perhaps because “to depend on” is an abstract concept that may be difficult to describe

in Japanese even through the use of communication strategies. Thus, Jamie uses Instructor Endo as an “English-Japanese dictionary” because she knows that he knows English well. Essentially then, she is eliciting his help for words she doesn’t know how to say. However, this type of simple English to Japanese equivalent does not appear to be very effective in this negotiation. Far from being as simple as a one to one equivalent, Instructor Endo did not have all the needed information to understand exactly what Jamie wanted to say and how she wanted to say it, so he resorted to requesting clarification several times before he was able to provide Jamie with the Japanese word(s) she wanted. In general, the data indicates that it is not unusual for students to engage instructors in this type of exchange, where the student use English to ask for a word in the L2, and, in order to help, the instructor must ask questions about how the student wants to use the word and what sort of sentence s/he wants to use it in, all the while, codeswitching into English for those portions of the negotiation that are likely to cause more problems in comprehension.

This negotiation and others like it indicate that students in the classroom have more L1 resources available to use when they experience production problems and that teachers may allow students who do not know a word to simply insert the English equivalent (codeswitch) into their utterance without any sort of appeal for help to elicit the word in the L2. The use of codeswitching in the classroom is undoubtedly influenced by time

constraints as well as by the Principles of Clarity and Economy (i.e., use of English is fast and easy). Thus, teachers and students use codeswitching because it is easy and to shorten the amount of time spent on negotiating and to reduce the effort it takes for both parties to solve difficulties. In the classroom, then the use of codeswitching is undoubtedly beneficial in terms of time and effort, but it can also discourage students from attempting to use other strategies that may utilize more of their interlanguage resources. In their study, Rosing-Schow and Haastrup (1982) found that a common strategy for students in the classroom was to appeal to the teacher as a "walking dictionary", asking the teacher to supply words in the L2 that they did not know, which is what is shown in the negotiation above. Thus, the availability of English as a resource affects negotiation and the use of CS in obvious ways. When a student codeswitches into English in order to compensate for the lack of a lexical item in the L2, and the NS is able to provide that word, then negotiation is either preempted and not necessary or the amount of negotiation that is necessary is often shortened. Meanwhile, the use of codeswitching can also replace the use of other L2-based communication strategies that might have been used if codeswitching were not an option. Consequently, the accepted use of English by students in the classroom may prevent students from learning L2-based strategies to solve production difficulties in non-classroom situations with NSs who do not know English.

### Student appeals for help.

Student appeals for help in the classroom represent 5.98% of total strategy use, indicating that students used appeals for help considerably less in the classroom than they did in the host family setting. Thus, while not as frequent in use as some other strategies in the classroom, nevertheless, it is important to see how students in the classroom setting dealt with production difficulties. The following excerpt illustrates how a student uses appeal for help as a strategy in the classroom. The students are talking about the vocabulary for the lesson they are studying. One of the words is “*gokiburi*” (cockroach). In response, Student 2 (S2) asks Instructor Hoshino (H) how to say the word “gross” in Japanese.

#### Excerpt 6.18

#### [Student use of appeal for help - classroom]

- |                                |   |    |   |
|--------------------------------|---|----|---|
| (codeswitch/<br>app. for help) | 1 | S2 | <i>gross wa nihongo de nan desu ka</i><br>what is 'gross' in Japanese?  |
| (other rep/<br>open up floor)  | 2 | H  | <i>gross wa gross wa dareka shirimasen ka</i><br>gross is gross is does someone know?   |
| (provides answer)              | 3 | S5 | <i>iya?</i><br>bad?   |
| (req. confirm)                 | 4 | H  | <i>iya toka ne iya to ne kimochi warui kimochi warui</i> ((writes on board))<br>bad and bad and disgusting disgusting ((writes on board)) |
| (other rep./<br>req. confirm)  | 5 | S2 | <i>kimochi warui?</i><br>disgusting?  |
| (confirm)                      | 6 | H  | <i>un ah S4 san nani ka aru?</i><br>yes ah S4 do you have something?  |

In line 1, Student 2 codeswitches into English to appeal to Instructor Hoshino for help with the word “gross”. Instructor Hoshino responds by opening up the negotiation to the class, asking if someone knows the word in

Japanese. In response, Student 4 offers the word "*iya*" (bad) and requests confirmation of it. Instructor Hoshino does not necessarily indicate that "*iya*" (bad) is the wrong word, however, she provides another word "*kimochi warui*" (gross/disgusting) that is perhaps closer to meaning "gross". Student 2 then repeats the word and requests confirmation that she has heard it correctly. Instructor Hoshino confirms the word and moves on to another student and the negotiation ends.

As in Excerpt 6.17 (above), this negotiation also suggests that students may resort to the use of English in appeals for help when they are experiencing production problems. However, instructors may not necessarily just provide the student with the lexical item right away, but as in this case, they may encourage other students to help solve the problem by opening up the negotiation to the whole class. Although these two excerpts (6.17 & 6.18) suggest that students are not reluctant to appeal to their instructors for help with production difficulties, the frequency data indicates that students do not appeal for help that often in the classroom. In fact, students made half as many appeals for help in the classroom as they did in the host family setting. Undoubtedly there are characteristics of the classroom situation that affect the use of appeals for help that are not present in the host family situation. First, classroom discourse is often controlled enough to eliminate the possibility of a lot of unknown words and grammar so as not to frustrate students. In contrast, in the host family setting the nature of free conversation is likely to

facilitate an environment in which students are confronted with words and grammar that they do not know and they are pushed to resort to appealing to the NS for help in order to get their message across. Although not the norm, the classroom may also be a place where students are challenged to use words and grammar that they haven't studied depending on the activity or topic at hand and the extent to which student and teacher allow the use of English to compensate for lexical difficulties. For example, unknown or unfamiliar topics and activities such as the debate discussion or the tangential talk in Instructor Endo's class required students to seek help for unknown words and grammatical patterns. However, such activities were not abundant in the three classrooms observed in this study and instructors often controlled topics so that students did not become frustrated and classroom interaction remained as free of comprehension problems as possible. Consequently, students may not have needed to appeal for help as much as they did in the host family setting. Other explanations for the low number of appeals for help in the classroom may have been students' concerns for face and the availability of different resources. For example, students may have avoided appealing to their teacher for help simply because it may have signalled incompetence or a lack of attention. Students in the classroom also have more resources available in the classroom when they experience production problems. For instance, the teacher may allow students who do not know a word to simply insert the English equivalent (codeswitch) into their utterance

without any sort of appeal for help to elicit the word in the L2. This may be more prevalent in the classroom because of time constraints that prevent teachers from addressing every word or structure that students do not know. Moreover, if a student has difficulty producing a word or a structure, they can, and often do, turn to their classmates sitting next to them and ask them for help or use a dictionary or textbook instead of appealing to the instructor for help. In sum, teachers' control over the content of classroom talk, perhaps with the exception of Instructor Endo's debate discussion and tangential talk, meant that students had little opportunity to engage in talk about unfamiliar topics and were therefore not challenged to compensate for unknown lexical items or other production difficulties. Moreover, concerns for face in the classroom in terms of appealing for help may have been stronger in the classroom than they were in the host family setting simply because of the focus on learning and students' unwillingness to appear incompetent. On the other hand, the low number of appeals for help may have been influenced by the fact that students in the classroom could use their classmates as a resource and did not have to appeal to their teacher for help.

#### **NS use of prompt and display questions.**

The last two strategies that will be discussed in this section are "prompt" and "display question". These two strategies were used only by instructors in the classroom and each represent approximately 8% of total

communication strategies used. Prompts and display questions were used when instructors tried to get the student to work a problem out on their own rather than “give the answer” to the student. These types of moves are a part of teacher talk, where teachers present questions to students where the answer is already known, but they can be a part of a negotiation when there is a real or perceived comprehension difficulty. An example of this is in the excerpt below, where a student (S4) is trying to respond to Instructor Yoshimura’s (Y) invitation by using a particular pattern, “*X nara mada ii*” (X is preferable (to ‘Y’ but only a little better) as part of a grammar drill.

**Excerpt 6.19 [NS use of prompt & display questions - classroom]**

- |                              |    |     |   |
|------------------------------|----|-----|---|
| (Invitation)                 | 1  | Y:  | <i>soo ja gogo ni ikoo ne ja kyoo no gogo dekaikenai S4 san</i><br>well, let’s go in the afternoon. Won’t you come out with me this afternoon S4? |
| (hesitation)                 | 2  | S4: | <i>um kai- anoo</i><br>um kai, we:ll  |
| (self rep.)                  | 3  | Y:  | <i>kyoo no gogo</i><br>this afternoon   |
| (req. clarif.)               | 4  | S4: | <i>da kara saishoo no paato wa onaji ‘kyoo no gogo nara?’</i><br>so, the first part is the same ‘if it’s this afternoon’ ?                        |
|                              | 5  | Y:  | <i>sore wa mada benkyoo shite imasen</i><br>we haven’t studied that yet   |
|                              | 6  | S4: | <i>ah! soo</i><br>ah! right   |
| (clarify)                    | 7  | Y:  | <i>ima X nara mada ii</i><br>now (we’re doing) “ <i>X nara mada ii</i> ” (X is preferable to Y but only a bit better)                             |
| (req. clarif.)               | 8  | S4: | <i>oh um X nara mada ii (0.1) no hoo ga ii?</i><br>um, then is “ <i>X nara mada ii</i> ” (0.1) like “no hoo ga ii” ?                              |
| (clarif./<br>display quest.) | 9  | Y:  | <i>uun kyoo no gogo ja dekaikenai? nani to nani o kurabemasu ka</i><br>hum, won’t you go out this afternoon? what and what are we comparing here? |
| (req. confirm.)              | 10 | S4: | <i>dekakeru?</i><br>going out?  |

- (clarify/prompt) 11 Y: *dekakeru ka dekaenai ka mo ii shi sore kara(0.3) ja kyoo no gogo dekaenai? kyoo no gogo ka hokano hi o kurabemasu kyoo no gogo wa yokunai hokano hi mo yokunai kedo::*  
to go out or not to go out that's okay too. Then, (0.3) won't you go out this afternoon?" This afternoon or another day is what we're comparing. Today is not good, and another day is not good, but:
- (req. confirm.) 12 S4: *ashita nara mada ii?*  
tomorrow is a little better?
- (confirm) 13 Y: *mada ii*  
a little better
- (other repetition)14 S4: *mada ii*  
a little better

Instructor Yoshimura guides the structure drill by posing invitations as she does in the beginning of the negotiation. In his response, Student 4 is supposed to use the new structure, “*X nara mada ii*” (X is preferable (to ‘Y’ but only a little better). However, he is not sure how to start out his sentence and after Instructor Yoshimura repeats part of her invitation in line 3 to elicit his response, Student 4 directly requests clarification about the beginning portion of the sentence. She responds in line 5 that the pattern he is describing they haven’t studied yet, and tells him in line 7 that the pattern they are practicing now is “*X nara mada ii*” (X is preferable to ‘Y’ but only a little better). Still unclear, he asks (in line 8) if the pattern is similar to another one that he knows, “*~ no hoo ga ii*” (better than~). Thus, Instructor Yoshimura responds by breaking the problem down and getting to the core of what Student 4 doesn’t understand by using a display question and asking him what two things are supposed to be compared in this particular use of the pattern. He replies that what is being compared is “going out” or “not going out”. However, Instructor Yoshimura explains that while what he wants to use for

comparison might work, what she is looking for is a comparison between “going out today” versus “going out another day”, citing that the pattern is used when comparing two fairly equally bad options, but one is a little better than the other. With that, Instructor Yoshimura begins the first part of the sentence again, and prompts him to finish it. In response, Student 4 attempts to use the pattern, *X nara mada ii* (X is preferable to ‘Y’ but only a little better) and requests confirmation that his usage is correct. Instructor Yoshimura confirms that his usage of the structure is correct by repeating what he has said, and Student 4 repeats it again in the line 14 again as a sort of reconfirmation.

The negotiation itself is metalinguistic in nature, with both Student 4 and Instructor Yoshimura talking about how to use a particular grammatical pattern. Although she could have, Instructor Yoshimura did not provide Student 4 with a model of the answer she was seeking during the negotiation, even though it was obvious that Student 4 was having trouble and did not understand the meaning of the pattern and how to use it. Rather, she took the time to negotiate the use and meaning of the structure without resorting to English and broke down the non-understanding by posing a display question to get S4 to think actively about what two things were supposed to be compared in the sentence. Then later she prompted him to complete a sentence that she had begun and he was able to provide the correct pattern.

Similar to instructors’ use of requests for clarification, display questions

and prompts are a reflection of the goal of learning. They are one way of facilitating students' participation in negotiations by requiring them to actively pursue the solution to their lack of understanding. When instructors use these two strategies to point out to students that their utterances are unclear or inaccurate, they draw students' attention to the deficiencies in their interlanguage and push them to try to correct those deficiencies even though it takes more time and effort to do so. This suggests that pedagogical goals of learning in the classroom often outweigh concerns for face and that clarity and economy may not be as important as getting the students to think actively about how to solve their own interlanguage problems.

#### **Summary of CS use in the classroom.**

To summarize, it is important to note that the bulk of student and instructor CS use in the classroom included a combination of requests for clarification, confirmation, and other repetition. Specifically, instructors' requests for clarification of students utterances were used more often than any other strategy. In response to instructors' requests for clarification, students responded by clarifying their utterances 81% of the time, often doing so by rephrasing their original utterance to make it more comprehensible or acceptable. The use of requests for clarification over confirmation in the classroom seemed to contradict the Principles of Clarity and Economy and concerns for face. This is because the goal of the classroom is learning and this

means that instructors try to draw students' attention to mistakes in their utterances and push them to try to modify them to make them more target-like. Pedagogical goals and teacher-student roles may also outweigh concerns for face. It is the teachers' role to draw attention to students' linguistic deficiencies and push them to reformulate their utterances, which in non-classroom conversation may be considered face threatening. However, Kramsch (1985) notes that the need for face-work in classrooms is minimized because of the role of the teacher and learner. Teachers are expected to correct students' linguistic errors and students are less concerned about losing face because they expect to be corrected. Thus, in some cases institutional roles and pedagogical goals and expectations in the classroom may outweigh concerns for concerns for face and adherence to principles of communication.

As for students' use of CS, they used more other repetitions than any other strategy. They often used other repetition to request clarification of something they didn't understand in the instructor's utterance or to request confirmation of instructor provided feedback. The use of other repetition as requests for clarification or confirmation may have reflected to some extent the Principles of Clarity and Economy namely because classroom time constraints pushed students to use fast and effective means of clearing up comprehension difficulties. On the other hand, the frequent use of other repetition with requests for confirmation may have been a reflection of goals and expectations in the classroom in which students often repeat feedback

provided to them by the instructor and requesting confirmation of it to check their accuracy. Moreover, instructors' subsequent confirmation of any and all requests for confirmation seemed to be part of the instructor's role in the classroom. Specifically, students often elicited confirmation from instructors on the acceptability and comprehensibility of their utterances. Instructors' subsequent confirmation or "approval" seemed to serve as a "green light" to go on with the activity.

Similarly, instructors often repeated portions of students' utterances in order to request clarification or confirmation of them. However, unlike requests for confirmation in the host family setting, requests for confirmation in the classroom seemed to be motivated by classroom goals and expectations. For example, requests for confirmation served as an overt acknowledgment of the student's contribution especially in multi-party negotiations, as a check to make sure that the utterance had been heard correctly, and as a way to repeat what the student said either to call other students' attention to it or make it clear for other students who may not have heard it.

Students' second most frequently used strategy was codeswitching. They often used codeswitching to compensate for lexical items they did not know in the L2. Instructors also used codeswitching, but only half as much as students did, suggesting that instructors allowed students to use more English than they themselves used. English was often used as a way to reduce the amount of time and effort students and instructors put into solving

production and reception problems, but it also discouraged students from attempting to use other strategies that may have utilized more of their interlanguage resources. Thus, the availability of English as a resource affected negotiation and the use of CS by reducing the amount of negotiation that was necessary and by taking the place of other L2-based communication strategies that might have been used if codeswitching were not an option.

On the lower end of the scale for student strategy use was appeals for help. Students used appeals for help when they experienced difficulties in production. This often involved using the instructor as a "dictionary" to help fill in the gaps in the student's lexical knowledge. The negotiation data suggested that students often resorted to the use of English in appeals for help. However, there is some indication that concerns for face may make students reluctant to appeal to their instructors for help with production difficulties because *doing so draws attention to their inadequate command of the target language*. However, the low number of appeals for help may also be explained by the limited opportunities in the classroom for students to compensate for unknown lexical items or other production difficulties because teachers kept strict control over the content of classroom talk. Moreover the low number of appeals for help may have been influenced by the fact that students in the classroom could use their classmates as a resource and did not have to appeal to their teacher for help.

Finally, also on the lower end of the frequency continuum, instructors made use of two typical classroom strategies, prompts and display questions, as tools in negotiations to get students to participate more actively in solving their own comprehension problems. Similar to instructors' use of requests for clarification, display questions and prompts reflected the goal of learning in the classroom. They were one way of facilitating students' participation in negotiations by requiring them to actively pursue the solution to their lack of understanding. Thus, as with requests for clarification, the use of display questions and prompts suggests that pedagogical goals of learning and teacher-student roles in the classroom often outweigh concerns for face and universal principles of clarity and economy.

### **Summary of CS Use in the Host Family and Classroom**

The purpose of this section is to compare CS use in the host family and classroom setting. This is done by first noting some basic findings, then giving an overall comparison of the types of strategies used by NSs and by students and finally by discussing how different factors influenced CS use in both settings.

The analysis of CS use in both settings reveals some basic findings. First, both students and NSs used more CSs in the host family than they did in the classroom setting. This is not surprising, however, because the difference in CS frequency between the two settings probably reflects, to a large

extent, the difference in the number of negotiations that occurred in each setting. Thus, because there were 17.9 negotiations per fifty-minutes in the host family setting as compared to only 14.8 negotiations in the classroom setting, it stands to reason that NSs and students in the host family setting employed a greater number of CS to deal with all the negotiations. Second, the majority of communication strategies used in the host family versus the classroom were interactive communication strategies, which means that they were the type of strategies that required the help of an interlocutor (e.g., requests for confirmation, requests for clarification, appeals for help etc..). Third, of the strategies that were not interactive, codeswitching, foreignizing, and circumlocution, students were more likely to use L1-based strategies like codeswitching and foreignizing over L2-based strategies such as circumlocution. This suggests that those strategies that put the least strain on interlanguage resources were often chosen above those that required more difficult use of the L2. Fourth, although the types of communication strategies used in the both host family and classroom were similar, the factors that affected their use and their frequency varied greatly.

As for specific use of communication strategies, when students produced unclear utterances NSs could generally respond one of two different ways, they could request confirmation or request clarification. NSs in the host family setting used more requests for confirmation than any other strategy and they tended to try to "summarize" (interpretive summary) students

unclear utterances and request confirmation of them. Although they did request clarification, it was only the fifth most frequently used strategy for them. In contrast, NSs in the classroom used more requests for clarification than any other strategy and although they did use requests for confirmation, it was only the fourth most frequently used strategy. The findings suggested that the difference in use between these two strategies in the host family and the classroom setting had to do with a variety of factors. First, NSs in the host family setting may have preferred request for confirmation over request for clarification because it is a fast and easy way to clear up difficulties, minimizes threats to face, and reflects the general practice of attentive listening behavior in Japanese, allows NSs to give indirect feedback on the students' interlanguage and check their comprehension at the same times, as well as reflects the role of Japanese caretaker as when mothers help their children to get their message across. On the other hand, NSs in the classroom may have preferred the use of requests for clarification over requests for confirmation because of the focus on learning in the classroom. This meant that rather than giving the answer to the student in the form of a model for them to confirm, instructors were more inclined to push the students to modify their own utterances using requests for clarification. Thus, pedagogical concerns outweighed concerns for face and the need for fast, easy solutions to clear up students' unclear utterances.

In response to NSs' requests for clarification students could clarify and

rephrase their utterance, or they could respond to NSs requests for confirmation by confirming as well as clarifying their original utterance. In the host family setting students regularly responded to NSs' requests for confirmation with "confirmation", the most frequently used strategy in the host family setting. They rarely clarified or rephrased their original utterances. The reason posited for this was because it was easier and faster as well as less disruptive to the flow of conversation just to confirm a request for confirmation. In the classroom, however, NSs' requests for clarification prompted students to rephrase and clarification in the classroom, which were the third and fourth most frequently used strategies. Therefore, students clarified their utterances more than twice as much in the classroom as they did in the host family setting

When students experienced reception problems, as when did not understand something in the NS's speech, they could request confirmation or request clarification. In the classroom setting, students used requests for clarification and confirmation equally. However, in the host family setting students tended to request clarification of NSs' utterances more than they requested confirmation. This indicated that in both settings, students' concerns for face were minimal with regard to letting NSs know that they didn't understand something. In both settings, "other repetition" played a major role in requesting clarification and confirmation. Students and instructors used "other repetition" in the classroom all the time. In fact, it was

students' most frequently used strategy and instructors' second most frequently used strategy in the classroom. Students and instructors alike used "other repetition" with requests for confirmation and clarification not only because it was a fast, efficient way to pinpoint a word or phrase that was unclear or needed confirmation (reception problem), but also to perform classroom "functions" such as repeating something so that it may also be heard by other students or to show that feedback provided to them by the instructor had been noticed and incorporated (Pica and Doughty, 1985, 1988). Other repetition was students' second most frequently used strategy in the host family setting but was not used to a great extent by NSs in the host family setting. Other repetition was used by students mostly who experienced reception problems as when they didn't understand a word or a phrase in the NS's speech. Thus, it was a fast and easy way to request confirmation or clarification of something they didn't understand. However, "other repetition" was also sometimes used as part of production problems as when a student appealed for help with a lexical item and the NS provided it and the student then repeated the word to incorporate it into their utterance.

NSs in the classroom and host family setting responded differently to students' requests for clarification. In the host family setting, NSs worked hard to clarify and rephrase their utterances to make them more comprehensible to students. That NSs in the host family were willing to work hard to make things comprehensible for students was perhaps a reflection of

the host family members' role of caregiver in which they felt responsible for making the conversation smooth and maintaining a level of comprehension for the student. On the other hand, instructors in the classroom did not clarify their utterances as often. Instead they used prompts and display questions to push the student(s) to solve their own comprehension problems or opened up the floor for other students to clarify or solve the problem, meaning that instructors were not just willing to "give students the answer", but to make them work together to overcome difficulties. This reflected the pedagogical focus of learning in the classroom, where students were expected to be active problem solvers. In both cases however, NSs sometimes used English to clarify their utterances. However, in the host family setting, only Amy's host mother was able to use English well enough to make it a successful strategy. Other host parents who tried to codeswitch into English often could not pronounce it well enough for it to be a successful strategy. Instructors in the classroom used more English than host family members did, mainly because it was a fast and easy way to clear up comprehension difficulties.

NS use of confirmation also seemed to serve an important function in both settings. Confirmation was used most often to confirm that students' use of a lexical item, a phrase etc.. Instructors used confirmation in the classroom more than NSs did in the host family setting. This was probably because the main focus in the classroom was on accuracy, instructors often used

confirmation to confirm the accuracy of a student's utterance. In fact, it seemed that this was part of the instructor's role, to confirm or disconfirm a student's utterance. Without it, interactions seemed incomplete.

Students handled production difficulties very differently in the classroom and the host family setting. For example, when students in the classroom experienced difficulty trying to say something, they used codeswitching more than any other strategy. This was because English was usually readily available as a resource in the classroom and it was easiest to use. They also sometimes appealed to their instructor for help in providing the needed word, but this was not a popular strategy in the classroom because students were reluctant to show their inadequate command of the L2 for face reasons. On the other hand, codeswitching was not readily available in the host family setting (except in Amy's case), so students who experienced production difficulties resorted to a variety of strategies. Most often students in the host family appealed for help from their host family members, indicating that concerns for face in this regard were not very important. They also resorted to foreignizing and circumlocution to compensate for lexical items that they did not know how to say in the L2. The findings revealed that students often started out with the easiest and least cognitively taxing strategies usually L1 based strategies such as codeswitching or foreignizing and where possible, mime or gesture. However, if that did not solve the problem, students moved on to more L2 based strategies such as

circumlocution.

These findings reveal not only that CS use differed greatly in the host family and classroom setting, but that the factors that influenced how CSs were used were inherently different in the host family and classroom setting. In the host family setting, the main factors affecting CS use tended to reflect basic principles for smooth communication. Both students and NSs in the host family showed a preference for using CSs that were fast, efficient (reflecting the Principles of Clarity and Economy - Poulisse, 1997) and did not interrupt the flow of communication and at the same time minimized threats to face. CS use also reflected the roles that they assumed, with the NS as caregiver taking on most of the “work” in negotiations by helping students with production and reception difficulties, and with the student as “novice”, willing to ask the NS for help and admit their L2 deficiencies. On the other hand, instructors’ and students’ use of communication strategies reflected to a large degree the pedagogical concerns of the classroom, which often overweighed concerns for face and general principles of communication. Institutional roles of expert and novice also played a role in the CS strategies they used. As “experts” the instructors’ responsibility was to push students to modify their utterances, confirm the accuracy of students’ utterances, and create an atmosphere of learning where answers weren’t just provided for the students but they were made to actively participate in finding answers to problems.

**CHAPTER SEVEN**  
**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION PART IV:**  
**NEGOTIATION AND SLA IN THE HOST FAMILY AND CLASSROOM**  
**SETTING**

The main objective of this chapter is to examine the role that negotiation plays in facilitating the conditions that lead to SLA in the Japanese study abroad classroom and host family setting. The discussion in this section specifically addresses the following research questions:

II. What are the similarities and differences in negotiation in the classroom and in the host family setting and how does this affect learners' chances for SLA in terms of the three conditions thought to facilitate SLA?

- a. Comprehensible input (positive evidence)
- b. Modified output (negative)
- c. Focus on form

Specifically, this chapter discusses how the findings of this study provide evidence that negotiation either promotes or fails to promote the three conditions thought to be essential for SLA; comprehensible input, production of modified output, and focus on form. To clarify, comprehensible input occurs in negotiation when NSs modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible to students (Long, 1996). Production of modified output occurs when students modify their output in response to signals of *noncomprehension* from the NS. Focus on form is evident in negotiation when NSs' utterances provide students with positive or negative input about

target language forms, meaning, and structural relationships (Long, 1996). For example, NS often provide students with positive evidence in negotiation when they modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible to students. Similarly, negative evidence is often provided to students in negotiation when NSs signal to students that their message is unclear by requesting confirmation. Thus, focus on form in the form of positive evidence is discussed in conjunction with NS provision of comprehensible input through clarification. Likewise, negative evidence is discussed in conjunction with the section on student production of modified output and requests for confirmation. For each of these three conditions then, comprehensible input, production of modified output, and focus on form, the findings from this study are reviewed and a comparison is made of the differences and similarities in negotiation between the host family and classroom setting and the effect these have on successful SLA.

### **Comprehensible Input**

Of the three conditions that negotiation must promote if it is to facilitate SLA, the first is comprehensible input. Essentially, if students are not able to understand something, it is unlikely that they will have access to L2 form and structure and be able to incorporate them into their interlanguage (Pica, 1994). Evidence of comprehensible input in negotiation is revealed when NSs take the time to modify their speech in response to signals of

noncomprehension from the student. In this study, the communications strategies the NSs used reveals how often NSs modified their speech to make it more comprehensible for the student. This is illustrated in Table xx below, which shows the number of times a student requested clarification and the number of times NSs clarified or rephrased their utterances to make them more comprehensible.

**Table 7.1. Host family versus classroom clarifications and rephrasals**

Setting	# of student requests for clarification	# of NS clarifications	% of times NSs clarified	# of NS rephrasals
Host family	88	72	81.8%	90
Classroom	43	16	37.2%	13

The table indicates that in response to students' requests for clarification, host family members clarified their utterances 81.8% of the time, while instructors in the classroom only modified their speech 37.2% of the time. Furthermore, it shows that host family members, whether in response to a request for clarification or unsolicited by the student, frequently rephrased their utterances to make them more comprehensible. In fact, rephrasing was the third most used strategy in the host family members' repertoire, while in the classroom setting, both NS clarification and rephrase were not used often enough to total even 5% of total strategy use. Accordingly, the data suggests that negotiated comprehensible input is more available in the host family setting than in the classroom setting as indicated

by how often NSs adjust their messages to facilitate student comprehension. It is also important to note that it is when NSs modify their input to make it more comprehensible that positive evidence about L2 form is provided to students. Thus, the discussion on comprehensible input and focus on form will be combined to provide a more detailed look at what is taking place in negotiation when NSs modify their utterances for students.

### **Comprehensible Input and Positive Evidence in the Host Family and Classroom**

Starting with the host family setting, as indicated in the table above, host family members frequently attempted to make their utterances more comprehensible to students through clarification. Clarification often occurred in conjunction with another strategy. For example, if a NS clarified their utterance, they may have done so by rephrasing their utterance, by using circumlocution, or perhaps they even attempted to code switch into English to help the student understand what they were saying. In any case, the recorded data indicates that host family members contributions within negotiation played an important role in helping their students understand their utterances. Consider the following excerpt that illustrates the host family members' use of clarification and rephrasal in an attempt to help clarify an utterance that has caused the student comprehension difficulties. Here, Mandy (Ma) does not understand the word "*utsutte iru*" (filming) and

requests clarification. In response the host father (D) and host mother (M) try to explain it to her so she understands it.

**Excerpt 7.1 [Comprehensible input - host family]**

- 1 D *mandy utsutte ru kana*  
I wonder if Mandy is being filmed
- 2 Ma *nani?*  
what?
- 3 D *utsutte ru kana?*  
I wonder are you being filmed?
- 3 Ma *utsu-?* (other repetition, request clarification)  
film-?
- 5 D *kore [kore ((points to video camera)) [bideo kamera ni utsutte imasu ka*  
(clarification/gesture/rephrase)  
this [this ((points to video camera)) are you being filmed by the camera
- 6 M *[utsutte ru wa [kochigawa kara yoku utsutte iru*  
[it's filming [it's filming well from this side
- 7 Ma *utsutsu wakarimasen donna imi desu ka* (request clarification)  
I don't understand 'utsutsu' what does it mean?
- 8 D *utsuru* (clarification/rephrase)  
it's 'utsuru'
- 9 M *bideo ni utsuru utsuru* (clarification/rephrase)  
to be filmed filmed by a camera
- 10 Ma *oh to like like toru? [utsuru?=  
oh to like like take? filmed?=  
11 M *[un =un bideo de=  
[yes =yes by video**
- 12 D *=denki ga tsuite ru kara*  
=because the light is on
- 13 M *totte iru deshoo ((points to camera))*  
it's filming right? ((points to camera))
- 14 Ma *hai*  
yes
- 15 M *sore ga un anoo utsuru tte*  
that is um well called 'utsuru'
- 16 Ma *ah hai*  
ah yes

In line 1, the host father asks whether or not the video camera is actually filming Mandy. Mandy asks for repetition in line 2, so the host father repeats himself in line 3. However, Mandy doesn't understand the word

*"utsuru"* (to film/take - intransitive) in Japanese, so she attempts to repeat what the host father has said, *"utsu-?"* (film-?), essentially asking for clarification. The host father clarifies in line 5 first by gesturing toward the camera, making it more clear what they are referring to. Then, he makes the sentence more complete. First, he adds in "video camera" and then rephrases his original utterance previously in the informal form (*utsutte ru*) to the formal form (*utsutte imasu*) and adds the question marker *"ka"* to the end of the sentence. Essentially, the host father clarified everything possible that may have contributed to Mandy's comprehension difficulty. However, because the problem is simply that Mandy does not know the meaning of the verb, the host father's attempt to clarify does not help. So, Mandy again attempts to repeat the word, this time saying the transitive form of the verb *"utsusu"* (to film) and asks for clarification by asking, *"donna imi desu ka?"* (what does it mean?). In response, the host father clarifies by rephrasing the word into the informal/plain form *"utsuru"* (to film/take - intransitive) in line 8, and then mother clarifies by rephrasing the host father's utterance to include *"bideo ni"* (by video) in line 9. Mandy finally seems to understand in line 10, but in order to confirm her understanding, she asks if *"toru"* (to take- transitive) is like *"utsuru"* (film/take - intransitive). Here, *"toru"* (to take - transitive) is like an approximation of *"utsuru"* (film/take - intransitive). The words are used in similar contexts but they are not quite the same. However, the host mother confirms Mandy's understanding of *"toru"* (to take-transitive) as

similar in meaning to *"utsuru"* (to film/take - intransitive). Then, in line 12, the host father points out that the light is on. The host mother then points to the camera and says to Mandy in line 13, *"totte iru deshoo"* (it's filming right?) almost like checking for comprehension. Mandy confirms that it is filming in line 14, so the host mother goes on to explain in line 15 that *"toru"* (to take - transitive) is the equivalent to saying *"utsuru"* (to film/take - intransitive). Thus, in the last line, Mary indicates that she understands and this ends the negotiation.

The excerpt above is a good example of the lengths that NSs in the host family setting will go to make an utterance comprehensible for a student. In this particular negotiation, Mandy requested clarification twice, and the host father first clarified by pointing and rephrasing his utterance, then by rephrasing again. What is important to note here is that what is revealed to Mandy in this negotiation is not only the meaning of the word, but also positive evidence of its structural properties including how it is used in a sentence. Thus, in terms of positive evidence, Mandy is exposed to a variety of different forms of the verb such as the informal forms, *"utsutte ru"* (is filming - intransitive) and *"utsuru"* (film - intransitive), and the formal form, *"utsutte imasu"* (filming - intransitive). In addition, she is given information about sentence structure and how "video camera" fits into the sentence and what particle it takes, *"ni"*. As Pica (1994) points out, these types of modifications are important sources of comprehensible input in terms of

positive evidence because they make the meaning of lexical items accessible to the student, but they also provide opportunities for students to focus on message form, which heightens their awareness of the discrepancies between their own interlanguage system and the target language.

Another excerpt below from Susan's host family recording shows the extreme lengths to which family members will go to explain something to a student when the student indicates that they don't understand something. In this excerpt (below), Susan's host mother (M) and host grandmother (G) trigger a negotiation by using the word "*tanoshimi*" (look forward to something), which Susan (S) doesn't know. In the first line, the host mother mentions that she's looking forward to two months from now. Susan requests clarification in the next line so the host mother clarifies by rephrasing her original utterance. This time she includes the object of the sentence, indicating that it is Susan's Japanese (progress) that she is looking forward to. Susan repeats the word "*tanoshimi*" to herself, possibly in an attempt to jog her memory of the word. The host mother responds to this as if Susan understands and is agreeing with her, so she says, "*ne?*" (right?), but Susan repeats the word again, this time with a question intonation, indicating that she doesn't understand the word and is requesting clarification. However, her request is ignored and at this point (line 7) the grandmother jumps in and says that what she is looking forward to is Susan gaining some weight, presumably because she considers Susan to be too thin. With this,

Susan indicates that she thinks she understands what "*tanoshimi*" means. However, when Susan offers her version of what she thinks it means for confirmation, the grandmother does not understand what she is talking about. Essentially, instead of the actual meaning, Susan has come to believe that "*tanoshimi*" means something to the effect of, "if I do something bad, that is my *tanoshimi*", which doesn't make a lot of sense in this case. For the next few turns, the grandmother and Susan go back and forth. Susan tries to explain what she thinks "*tanoshimi*" means and the grandmother does not understand what Susan is trying to say. This continues until line 14, when Susan finally gives up and says she doesn't understand the word "*tanoshimi*". However, the grandmother does not offer any help but responds with "*un*" (yes). The grandmother is hard of hearing so it is possible that she did not hear Susan clearly. In any case, because she knows the grandmother speaks a little bit of English, Susan requests clarification of the word in English (line 16). The grandmother provides her with an English word, pleasure, that unfortunately does not have the same meaning as "*tanoshimi*". Even with a little help in English, Susan still does not understand, so she requests repetition of the word "*tanoshimi*" and the host mother repeats the word for her. However, the grandmother is confused and requests confirmation that Susan is still referring to the word "*tanoshimi*" again (line 21). In the next line then, Susan confirms that she is indeed referring to "*tanoshimi*" but asks the host grandmother not to use English. It

is at this point that it becomes apparent to the host mother that Susan has been attempting to ask for an explanation of the word, rather than repetition of it. So the host mother asks her if she wants an explanation of *"tanoshimi"* and Susan responds that she does. Hereafter, the host mother gives examples to clarify the meaning of *"tanoshimi"* for Susan. This continues until line 33, after which Susan indicates that she understands. However, then the grandmother continues with the clarification by offering another example of how Susan is going to a dance party on Friday, only this time, instead of using *"tanoshimi"*, the grandmother uses the word *"tanoshii"* (fun), telling Susan that in this case, she can use either *"tanoshimi"* or *"tanoshii"* (line 42). Susan then tries to use *"tanoshimi"* in a sentence but structurally the way she uses *"tanoshimi"* is wrong and the host mother tells her so in the next line. In response, Susan tries to erroneously conjugate *"tanoshimi"* like an adjective, *"tanoshimikatta"* and *"tanoshimikunatta"*, essentially requesting clarification. In response, the host mother basically clarifies the word by telling Susan that the word is just *"tanoshimi"*, and then she gives Susan another set of examples that focus on the fact that *"tanoshimi"* is only used for something that has not happened yet.

#### Excerpt 7.2 [Comprehensible input - host family]

- 1 M *demo nikagetsu ato tanoshimi desu yo ne*  
but I'm looking forward to two months from now aren't you?
- 2 S *nani?* (request for clarification)  
what?

- 3 M *anata no nihongo o tanoshimi* (clarification, rephrase)  
I'm looking forward to your Japanese
- 4 S *tanoshimi ((to self))*  
looking forward to ((to self))
- 5 M *ne*  
right?
- 6 S *tanoshimi?* (request for clarification)  
looking forward to?
- 7 G *obaachan futoru no mo tanoshimi*  
I'm also looking forward to your gaining weight
- 8 S *ah (0.2) wakatta but tatoeba moshi uh uh watashi wa warui koto o shimasu sore*  
*watashi no tano- tanoshimi?* (request for clarification)  
ah (0.2) I get it but for example if uh uh I do something bad is that my look- looking  
forward?
- 9 G *nani?*  
what?
- 10 S *moshi watashi wa warui koto shimasu sore wa watashi no tanoshimi?* (request for clarification)  
If I do something bad is that my looking forward?
- 11 G *wakaranai*  
I don't understand
- 12 S *tanoshimi*  
look forward to
- 13 G *janai*  
I'm not (looking forward)
- 14 S *ah tanoshimi wa wakaranai*  
ah I don't understand 'look forward to'
- 15 G *un*  
**un**
- 16 S *nan to iu eego* (request for clarification)  
what is it in English?
- 17 M *tano=*  
look=
- 18 G *=ah tonoshimi to iu to pleas- pleasure pleasure to iu ka ne* (clarification, codeswitch)  
=ah look forward to is called pleas- pleasure pleasure I wonder
- 19 S *sumimasen nan to iu?* (request for clarification)  
excuse me what's is called?
- 20 M *tanoshimi*  
look forward to
- 21 G *tanoshimi?*  
look forward to?
- 22 S *hai demo eego eego de tsukawanaide*  
yes but please don't use English English
- 23 M *tanoshimi o setsumee surun desu ka*  
you want me to explain 'look forward to'?
- 24 S *hai*  
yes
- 25 M *ja anata ni setsumee shimasu tanoshimi tte ashita wa tatoeba [tatoeba ashita=*  
(clarification)  
then I'll explain it to you look forward to for example tomorrow for example tomorrow =

- 26 S {un  
[yes
- 27 M =wa onsen ni ikimasu [totemo kimochi ga ureshiku narimasu [ah ashita hayaku=  
=you are going to a hot springs and you become very happy ah you think I want to get=
- 28 S {un {un  
[yes [yes
- 29 M =ikitai hayaku ikitai to omoimasu [soo iu joutai o tanoshii tanoshimi da tanoshimi=  
=there fast tomorrow that condition is fun looking forward looking forward
- 30 S {un  
=ah wakatta wakatta wakatta=  
[yes  
=ah I understand I understand I understand=
- 31 M =tatoeba ashita mo deeto ga arimasu [sore wa sugoi ne hayaku deeto ga shitai  
=for example you also have a date tomorrow and you really want the date to come soon
- 32 S {un  
[yes
- 33 M =[kare ni aitai sugoi tanoshimi toka ni tsukaimasu  
=[you want to meet your boyfriend you're really looking forward to it that's when you use it
- 34 S [ah wakatta wakatta  
[ah I understand I understand
- 35 G kinyoobi no=  
Friday=
- 36 S =tanoshii to tanoshimi ah wakatta wakatta  
=fun and looking forward to ah I understand I understand
- 37 G ne kinyoobi no yoru wa dansu ni iku deshoo (clarification)  
you're going to a dance Friday night right?
- 38 S watashi wa to-  
me to-
- 39 G tanoshii ne  
that's fun right?
- 40 S hai  
yes
- 41 G u:n sore wa dochi [dochidemo  
well that's either either one
- 42 M {tanoshii tanoshimi  
{fun looking forward to
- 43 S hai tanoshimi watashi wa tanoshimi ni narimashita  
yes I'm looking forward to it I become looking forward to it
- 44 M chigau  
wrong
- 45 S okay watashi wa tanoshimikatta? tanoshimikunatta? ((tries to conjugate))  
(request for clarification)  
okay I looked forward to it? I didn't look forward to it? ((tries to conjugate))
- 46 M anata no iu toki ni tanoshimi desu = (clarification)  
when you say it it's looking forward=
- 47 S =hai demo kinyoobi no tatoeba kinyoobi  
=yes but Friday for example Friday
- 48 M kinyoobi doyoobi no koto o kangaeru to tatoeba doyoobi ni deeto ga arimasu  
when you think of Friday or Saturday for example Saturday you have a date

- 49 S *un*  
yes
- 50 M *kare ni au no wa tanoshimi desu*  
you look forward to meeting your boyfriend
- 51 S *hai demo senshuu [kinoo ga totemo tanoshii?* (request for clarification)  
yes but last week yesterday is fun?
- 52 M [un *sore wa tanoshikatta* (clarification)  
[yes that's 'it was fun'
- 53 S *tanoshikatta ah!*  
it was fun ah!
- 54 M *sore wa tanoshikatta*  
that's 'it was fun'
- 55 S *tanoshikatta*  
it was fun
- 56 M *ashita no koto asate no koto ne [next ashita no koto shichigatsu no koto*  
*hachigatsu no koto kugatsu no koto kangaeru toki wa tanoshimi desu*  
when you think of tomorrow's things the day after tomorrow's things right next  
tomorrow's things July August September's things that is looking forward to
- 57 S [hai *ah wakatta wakatta*  
[hai ah I understand I  
understand
- 58 M *un*  
yes
- 59 S *arigatoo*  
thank you
- 60 M *kono mae reiko to itta no ne reiko to ano kurabu e ikimashita*  
before you went with Reiko to well you went with Reiko to the club
- 61 S *hai*  
yes
- 62 M *are wa tanoshikatta desu*  
that was fun
- 63 S *hai*  
yes
- 64 M *tanoshimi to iimasen*  
you don't say looking forward to
- 65 S *a h*  
a h
- 66 M *shichigatsu hachigatsu kugatsu mae no koto*  
previous July August September occurrences
- 67 S *tanoshii tanoshimi okay*  
fun looking forward to okay
- 68 M *tanoshimi desu*  
looking forward to
- 69 S *okay wakatta*  
okay I understand
- 70 M *un*  
yes
- 71 G *wakatta? sunda koto to saki no koto*  
Do you understand? things that have passed and things that are yet to come
- 72 S *un*  
yes

- 73 G *ne*  
right
- 74 M *dansu ni iku no wa tanoshimi desu*  
you're looking forward to going to the dance
- 75 S *hai*  
yes
- 76 M *Aomori ni iku no wa tanoshimi desu*  
you're looking forward to going to Aomori
- 77 S *hai*  
yes
- 78 G *takusan aru ne tanoshimi ne*  
there is a lot to look forward to isn't there?
- 79 S *un demo*  
yes but
- 80 M *obaachan saki obaachan wa saki wa [anata ga [futoru no wa tanoshimi desu*  
grandma before grandma before 'I'm looking forward to you gaining weight'
- 81 G *[un [un ah haha ha ((laugh))*  
*[yes [yes ah haha ha ((laugh))*
- 82 M *obaachan wa anata ga futoru no ga mitai desu*  
grandma wants to see you gain weight **(rephrase)**
- 83 S *ah ah hah hahah ha ((laugh))*  
*ah ah hah hahah ha ((laugh))*
- 84 G *un ne*  
yes right
- 85 S *demo watashi wa futoru tanoshimi janai yo*  
but I'm not looking forward to getting fat
- 86 M *u:n susan ga kurushii desu*  
yes: to you it's bad
- 87 S *hai*  
yes

The host mother's clarification goes on until line 51 when Susan again attempts to ask for clarification of her understanding of the difference between "*tanoshimi*" and "*tanoshii*". She asks for clarification of whether or not "*tanoshii*" can be used to describe something from "last week" or "yesterday". The host mother clarifies this by giving Susan the past tense of "*tanoshii*", which is "*tanoshikatta*". The host mother then goes on to reclarify the fact that "*tanoshimi*" is used for things that are yet to come, giving examples and explanations from line 56 to 78 (!). Then, in line 80, the

host mother refers back to the very beginning of the negotiation when she reminds Susan that the grandmother said that she was "looking forward to Susan gaining weight". The host mother rephrases the sentence to help Susan understand it better, saying, "Grandma wants to see you gain weight" instead of, "Grandma is looking forward to you gaining weight". Susan laughs when she hears this and then, using the word "*tanoshimi*", tells her host mother that she (Susan) is not looking forward to gaining weight.

Admittedly, this negotiation represents an extreme level of clarification in that Susan's host mother and host grandmother have gone to great lengths to explain the word in question to Susan. As such, their explanation provides Susan with positive L2 input on several different levels. First, it provides Susan rich input about the meaning of the word, including the contexts in which the word can (for future events) or cannot (for past events) be used. Second, the explanation makes clear to Susan the difference between "*tanoshimi*" and a similar word "*tanoshii*", which Susan seemed to be confused about. Third, structural information about how the word is used in a sentence and how it is or is not conjugated is imparted through the various examples. Thus Susan is exposed to a variety of detailed positive L2 input that negotiation researchers believe is a necessary condition for SLA to occur. Whether Susan makes use of all of this input at the level is another question altogether. What is perhaps important to note on this point is that toward the very end of the negotiation Susan attempts to use the word

*"tanoshimi"* in a sentence. She says, *"watashi wa futoru tanoshimi jyanai"* (I'm not looking forward to gaining weight), and while her sentence is not entirely grammatically correct, it is evident that for the most part, Susan has understood the meaning of *"tanoshimi"* and how it might be used in a sentence.

In contrast to the host family setting, instructors in the classroom clarified their utterances less than half of the time in response to requests for clarification from students. Moreover, whether prompted by a request for clarification or not, during negotiation, instructors rarely rephrased their utterances to make them more comprehensible to students. However, the fact that instructors made fewer attempts to clarify or rephrase their utterances does not mean that students' requests for clarification went unheeded. Most of the time, if a student requested clarification of an instructor's utterance, if the instructor didn't clarify it themselves, they usually opened up the floor for other students to clarify the utterance. This twist on negotiation seems to be connected to the teacher's role in the classroom and to the focus on learning. Essentially, by opening up the floor for all students to participate in negotiation, instructors allow the students to actively participate in solving a problem by expressing their knowledge and at the same time are able to assess how many people understand what is being said. Similarly, by pushing students to solve difficulties themselves, instructors teach students how to be self-sufficient learners. Consider the following excerpt that shows an

instructor who responds to a student's request for clarification by opening up the floor to another student who clarifies the meaning of the words in question. Here, Instructor Hoshino (H) is having the class repeat pairs of words that sound similar, but in fact differ in terms of the presence or absence of a long vowel. After giving an example of two such words, "biru" (building) and "biiru" (beer), Susan (S) asks for clarification of the difference between them.

**Excerpt 6.3 [Comprehensible input and multiparty negotiation- classroom]**

- 1 H *biru biiru*  
building, beer
- 2 S *chigau wa nan desu ka biru to* (request for clarification)  
what is the difference with building?
- 3 H *doo desu ka S2 san*  
how about it S2?
- 4 S2 *biiru* ((mimes picking up a can and drinking)) *biru* (clarification/mime)  
((makes shape of building w/hands))  
beer ((mimes picking up a can and drinking)) building ((makes shape of building w/hands))
- 5 H *hai ja issho isshoo*  
right then together, lifetime

The negotiation is triggered in line 1 when Instructor Hoshino gives an example of two pairs of words that differ with respect to vowel length. Susan then asks for clarification of the difference between the two words, but rather than clarifying the difference herself, Instructor Hoshino responds by opening up the clarification to the class, specifically calling on another student, Student 2. Student 2 attempts to clarify by saying each word then miming the difference between the two words, pretending to pick up a can of beer and

drink it and then outlining the shape of a 'building' with his hands. Although Susan does not respond by saying anything audible, a head nod seen on the video indicates that she understood. In the last line of the negotiation, Instructor Hoshino confirms Student 2's explanation and continues to give other examples of similar word pairs.

As shown, rather than answering the question herself, Instructor Hoshino opened the floor for the other students to answer or clarify Susan's question. This is something that instructors do often especially when the instructor is relatively sure that someone knows the answer to the question. In other words, Instructor Hoshino temporarily forfeited her right to the floor and delegated it to Student 2. However, when Student 2 finished his clarification, the last turn of the negotiation went back to Instructor Hoshino who was expected to either confirm the accuracy of his explanation, or if it was not accurate, either clarify it herself or delegate it to someone else to reclarify. This shows that instructors who open the floor in these types of negotiations are still very much a central part of the negotiation because they demonstrate the 'right' to delegate turns to others and have the final say in what is accepted as an accurate explanation. However, one questions the richness of the positive input in the clarification that Student 2 has provided as compared to what Instructor Hoshino herself might have provided. Namely, Student 2's clarification did not provide Susan or her classmates with any other information besides the bare minimum, in this case, the

meaning of the word. There is no other information, structural or otherwise, that draws students' attention to how the words may be used in a sentence for example or perhaps even how definitions of words are composed in Japanese. In a sense, the clarification meets the minimal requirements of negotiation by providing the meaning of the words, but fails to provide the type of information that is thought to facilitate SLA by heightening awareness of features of the L2 related to the words in question. Although one cannot say for certain that every negotiation opened up to other students will result in minimal positive L2 input, the reality is that most students do not have a full command of the L2 and this undoubtedly affects their ability to provide the types of clarifications etc. that maximize input most conducive to SLA.

Accordingly, if we compare the above negotiation with the one below in which the instructor clarifies the meaning of the utterance herself, we see that her clarification may provide students with more than just minimal information about the word in question. Here, during a "definition formulating activity", Student 5 (S5) asks for clarification of the word "juutai" (traffic jam), which has just been brought up as a new vocabulary word. In response, rather than opening the floor for other students to clarify the word, Instructor Hoshino (H) provides clarification herself.

#### **Excerpt 7.4 [Comprehensible input - classroom]**

- 1 S5 *uh um uh eigo de is it just to wait in a crowd?* (request for clarification)  
uh um uh in English is it just to wait in a crowd?

- 2 H *ah juutai no koto desu ne*  
are you talking about traffic jam right?
- 3 S5 *uh huh*  
uh huh
- 4 H *jyuutai wa kuruma dake desu ne* (clarification)  
traffic jams are only cars right?
- 5 S5 *a h*  
a h
- 6 H *kuruma ga komu to wa juutai desu hai S2 san* (clarification, circumlocution)  
((calling on another student))  
when cars are crowded that's a traffic jam, yes S2 ((calling on another student))

At the beginning of the negotiation, Student 5 asks for clarification of the word “*juutai*” (traffic jam), which has previously been introduced by another student several lines before. He codeswitches into English to ask his question. In response, Instructor Hoshino requests confirmation that he is asking about the word “*juutai*” (traffic jam), and he confirms that this is the word he is asking about. Therefore, Instructor Hoshino tries to clarify the meaning of the word in line 4, saying that traffic jams only involve cars. Then, after Student 5’s response, Instructor Hoshino continues to clarify the word by offering a circumlocution of “*juutai*” (traffic jam) as “when cars are crowded”. After this clarification through circumlocution, she quickly moves on to another student who has raised his hand.

What is illustrated here is similar to what is found in the host family setting, where the clarification is provided by the NS and the clarification itself provides positive L2 input in terms of the meaning of the word in question as well as describing the features of “*juutai*” (traffic jam), specifically that it only involves cars and that it occurs when cars are “crowded”.

Moreover, by offering a circumlocution the student is exposed to input about how to formulate a simple definition of a word in Japanese, "*kuruma ga komu to wa juutai desu*" (when cars are crowded it's a traffic jam). Consequently, it is this type of L2 positive input that negotiation provides that is thought to facilitate opportunities for SLA (Long, 1996).

### **Summary of Comprehensible Input and Positive Evidence in the Host Family and Classroom**

To review, the data suggests that comprehensible input through clarification and rephrase is alive and well in the host family setting but perhaps less so in the classroom. Not only do host members often go to great lengths to explain things to students when they don't understand, but their explanations also provide students with rich positive input in the L2 that is likely to facilitate SLA such as structural input about how words are used in a sentence, input on the contexts appropriate for a certain words, and input on morphology or how to conjugate words. Thus, positive input is given on a variety of different levels and it is this type of input that negotiation researchers suggests facilitates SLA (Pica, 1994; Long, 1996). In contrast, instructors often respond to students' requests for clarification by opening the floor for other students to provide clarification. One caveat of this is that while students are usually able to provide simple clarifications as to the meaning of a lexical item, oftentimes their interlanguage is not developed enough to provide the type of positive input that is most conducive to

language acquisition. However, opening up the floor and allowing other students to actively participate in negotiation may benefit students in other ways that is not immediately apparent when looking only at the aspect of comprehensible input in negotiation. On the other hand, when the instructors themselves offer clarifications, the positive input they provide is similar to what is provided in the host family setting, but perhaps not as in depth or lengthy. If one considers the negotiation between Susan and her host family members, it may be assumed that such a negotiation with all of the repetition, examples, and explanations is unlikely to occur in the classroom due to time constraints. As such, students who request clarification are more likely to be exposed to richer positive L2 input in the host family than they are in the classroom. And this in turn suggests that the host family setting may be more likely to facilitate the conditions that lead to SLA in terms of the rich input that is provided through negotiation.

### **Production of Modified Output**

Pica (1994) points out that when students modify their output in response to NS's feedback, this is evidence that they are paying attention to the gap between their interlanguage and the L2. Even more so than exposure to comprehensible input, which provides indirect attention to form, modified output directly draws learners' attention to L2 form (Swain, 1985). Attention to L2 form is accomplished when NSs give students feedback on their

interlanguage in the form of negative evidence, evidence that shows what is not accurate or acceptable in the L2. It is in response to this type of evidence that students are motivated to modify their output and make it more target-like. In negotiation student production of modified output is evident in two ways. The first is when a student responds to a NS's requests for clarification by modifying their original utterance. Students may also produce modified output in response to NS feedback, often in the form of a request for confirmation, by subsequently incorporating that feedback into their output. This often occurs during the course of a negotiation when the NS guesses what the students is trying to say and requests confirmation of it, as if to inquire, "is this what you want to say?". In response to this type of request for confirmation, students may simply confirm the NS's interpretation or incorporate the feedback into their utterance. This is sometimes as simple as repeating the feedback they've been given and incorporating it into their utterance. It is when the student incorporates the NS's feedback into their utterance that modified output is evident. Therefore, although different in terms of how they are brought about in the negotiation, the end result is that students are exposed to negative feedback that ultimately provides them with feedback on their interlanguage that they may use to modify their output accordingly. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to look at requests for clarification and requests for confirmation in the host family and classroom setting and determine how they affected students' modification of output,

how production of modified output differed in both settings and what kind of negative evidence is provided to students through NS feedback.

Table 7.2 below shows the number of times NSs requested clarification, as well as the number of times students clarified their utterances. Each column includes the number of that particular strategy that occurred in a fifty minute period and the total number that occurred out of all negotiations. Moreover, in the parentheses, the percentage of times students modified their output in response to NSs' requests for clarification or confirmation is given.

**Table 7.2. Comparison of modified output in the host family and classroom**

Strategy	Host Family Total #	Classroom Total #
NS requests for clarification	67	53
Student clarifications	45	43
% of times students modified output in response to requests for clarification	67.1%	81.1%
NS requests for confirmation	223	7
Student modification/incorporation of output	71	17
% of times students modified output in response to requests for confirmation	31.4%	36.17%

Specifically, NSs in the host family setting requested clarification of students' unclear utterances 67 times and students clarified 45 of them, indicating that students clarified their utterances to make them more comprehensible approximately 67% (45/67) of the time. In the classroom, however, students clarified their utterances more often, 81% of the time in response to NS requests for clarification. This is 14% more than in the host

family, suggesting that students in the classroom made more attempts to make their utterances comprehensible, accurate, or acceptable in the classroom than they did in the host family setting.

In contrast to requests for clarification, the data shows that students modified their output fewer times in response to NSs' requests for confirmation. For instance, in the host family setting students modified their utterances in response to requests for confirmation 35.7% less than they did for requests for clarification. This same gap is evident in the classroom as well, where in response to requests for confirmation, students modified their utterances approximately 45% less than they did when NSs requested clarification. This is consistent with the negotiation literature, where studies have shown that there is a difference in the use of these two strategies, request for clarification and request for confirmation, and its effect on students' production of modified output. For example, in her study focusing on learner production in negotiation, Pica (1992) found that the type of 'signal' NSs used to indicate that the student's utterance was unclear had a major effect on whether the students modified their utterances to make them more comprehensible. Essentially, when NSs used what Pica (1992) called "open signals" (e.g., "what?"), which are labeled "requests for clarification" in this study, students modified their utterance 60% of the time. However, when NSs used a "closed signal", called a "request for confirmation" in the present study, as when a NS repeated, modified, modeled or otherwise elaborated the

student's utterance, the students only modified their utterances 25-32% of the time. Pica (1992) suggests that this is because with a "closed signal" the NS had already done all the work for the student and oftentimes, all the student had to do was confirm the NS's interpretation with a simple "yes" rather than modify their output based on the feedback they were just given by their NS interlocutor.

Lastly, a comparison between the host family and classroom setting reveals that the difference in the percentage of times students modified their output in response to NS requests for confirmation is not as pronounced as it is in the case of requests for clarification where there was a 14% difference between the host family and classroom setting. Specifically, students in the classroom setting modified their output in response to requests for confirmation only 4.8% more than students in the host family setting did.

To summarize, in both the host family and classroom setting, students modified their output more in response to NS requests for clarification than they did in response to requests for confirmation. This is supported in the negotiation data by Pica (1992) whose study shows that requests for clarification are more likely to elicit student modification of output than requests for confirmation. This is because requests for confirmation often provide the student with a target language model of the utterance and students need only to confirm this rather than modify their original utterance. In addition, students in the classroom modified their utterances

more than students in the host family setting in responding to both requests for clarification and requests for confirmation. Specifically students modified their utterances 14% more than students in the host family setting in the case of requests for clarification, and 4.8% more in the case of requests for confirmation.

### **Modified Output and Negative evidence in the Host family and Classroom**

As indicated above, students did not modify their utterances as much in the host family setting as they did in the classroom. Decreased student production of modified output in general may be due to the fact that host family members made three times more requests for confirmation (24.70% of total strategy use) of students' unclear utterances than requests for clarification (7.42% of total strategy use). As Pica (1992) points out, students were less likely to respond to requests for confirmation by modifying their output. However, what typified most negotiations in the host family was that family members were more likely to attempt to understand a student's unclear utterance, then offer a modified version of what the student had said and request confirmation of it. Essentially, host family members' seemed to emphasize trying to determine every unclear utterance students made rather than asking for clarification. Thus, how often students modified their utterances had a lot to do with how their host family members dealt with students' unclear utterances. Sometimes, even when host family members

started out requesting clarification of a student's utterance, they often ended up eventually requesting confirmation later on after they had enough information to formulate an idea of what the student was trying to say. For example, consider the following excerpt (6.5) where Jamie (J) is trying to ask her host mother (M) where her friend Amy can buy a beach chair. In line 1, Jamie pronounces the word for "chair" in Japanese wrong, basically pronouncing "isu" (chair) as "itsu" (when), and this causes a breakdown in communication.

#### Excerpt 7.5 [Student modification of output - host family]

- 1 J: *umi ga suki desu kara* [demo amy san wa uh kono umi no itsu fo ga kaemasu ka [demo=  
because she likes the ocean but amy uh can she buy this ocean when but=  
2 M: [u:n [un [un?!  
[uh hu:m [yes [what?!  
3 J: =kono [kono umi no i- itsu?=  
=this this ocean wh- when?=  
4 M: [un =un? umi ni? (request for clarification)  
[yes =what? to the ocean?  
5 J: like kono ((gestures shape of chair)) amy san wa [umi de [hai hai hai [sooshite kono=  
(clarification, onfirmation)  
like this amy ((gestures shape of chair)) at the [ocean [yes yes yes so this  
6 M: [un [un oyogitai no? [un  
(request for confirmation)  
[yes [yes she wants to swim? [yes  
7 J: =umi no itsu ga kaemasu ka [hai hai hai demo nihon de wa [biichi no isu ga [arimasu ka  
(clarification, confirmation/incorporation of feedback)  
can buy an ocean when [ yes yes yes but in Japan are there beach chairs?  
8 M: [isu? [un biichi no isu? [aaah ha ha  
(request for confirmation)  
[chair? [un beach chair? [aaah ha ha  
9 J: demo amy san ga=  
but amy=  
10 M: =utte ru janai?  
=they sell them don't they?

The host mother responds to Jamie's original mispronunciation of the word "isu" (chair) by requesting repetition, "un?!" (what?!) in line 2.

Therefore, Jamie repeats what she's said almost verbatim, only this time she makes clear that she's not sure she is saying the word *"itsu"* (when) correctly. She indicates this by using a question intonation. However the host mother still doesn't understand what Jamie is trying to say, so she says, *"un? umi ni?"* (what? to the ocean?) and requests clarification of Jamie's unclear utterance. It is at this point that Jamie is forced to clarify her utterance for the sake of comprehension, so she starts making the shape of a chair with her hands and tries to explain that Amy goes to the beach/ocean. However, just as Jamie is about to explain what Amy does at the ocean, the host mother jumps in and asks Jamie if Amy "wants to swim?". The host mother is doing what a lot of host family members do, and that is first trying to guess what Jamie wants to say and then offering a version of it in the target language and requesting confirmation of it. In this case Jamie confirms the host mother's guess and then goes on to continue with her clarification of her previous utterance and repeats the same mistake she's been making in the pronunciation of "chair", *"umi no itsu ga kaemasu ka"* (can you buy an ocean when?). It is after she asks this question that the host mother has finally figured out that Jamie is asking about a "chair" (*isu*), so she says the word *"isu?"* (chair) and requests confirmation from Jamie that this is what Jamie has been trying to say all along. Jamie confirms that this is what she is talking about and then continues to ask her original question, which was about whether you can buy one in Japan or not. Before she can finish though, the host mother again

requests confirmation that Jamie is talking specifically about a “beach chair” (*biichi no isu*). Jamie subsequently confirms this and then repeats and incorporates the phrase, “*biichi no isu*”, that she has learned from her host mother essentially modifying her original question to “*biichi no isu ga arimasu ka*” (are there beach chairs?), thereby ending the negotiation.

What is particularly important to point out in this negotiation is that the host mother initially asks for clarification perhaps because she does not have enough information to guess what Jamie is trying to say. Thus Jamie is forced to clarify her meaning in some way. She chooses to do this through gesture, indicating the shape of a chair, and then she tries to expand the information that she gives so she can make the host mother understand what she wants to say. Even so, the host mother is already busy formulating an idea of what Jamie is trying to say and she jumps in and asks for confirmation in line 5 of whether Amy wants to swim in the ocean. This is perhaps one way that the host mother can actively set out to determine what object Jamie is talking about. Jamie confirms this and continues with her clarification, but the host mother has already figured out that Jamie is asking about an “*isu*” (chair) and more specifically, she is asking about a “*biichi no isu*” (beach chair). In both cases, the host mother requests confirmation to make sure that she has accurately deciphered what Jamie is talking about. Jamie’s subsequent confirmations and more importantly, her modification of the original

question, let the host mother know that she has accurately guessed what Jamie has been trying to say.

In Jamie's excerpt above, the host mother's requests for clarification and confirmation were fairly successful in terms of encouraging Jamie's modification of output. Other examples of this occurred throughout the host family data. For example, in the next excerpt between Mandy (Ma) and her host mother (M), Mandy is trying to say something but she cannot find the correct form of the verb to use.

**Excerpt 7.6 [Incorporation of feedback - host family]**

- 1 Ma: *un soo ano X daigaku kara tomodachi ga nai areba [nai nareba =*  
       yes, if there were no friends from University X=
- 2 M:                                [un    = na- na- inai to?  
                                       [uhhuh]    =na- na- if they weren't here?]  
       *X daigaku no tomodachi ga inai to?*                                (request for confirmation)  
       you mean if there were no friends from University X?
- 3 Ma: *hai inai to*    (confirmations & incorporation of feedback)  
       [yeah if there were none]
- 4 M: *un tomodachi ga inai to*  
       yes if there weren't friends

At the beginning of the negotiation, not knowing what the correct form of the verb is, Mandy tries a series of grammatically wrong forms known as retrieval. Seeing Mandy's difficulty, the host mother tries to guess what she is saying in line 2. First, she offers Mandy the correct form alone and then repeats the same sentence that Mandy uttered previously, but this time with the correct form, modeling it for Mandy as a request for confirmation. In

response, Mandy confirms and then repeats the form her host mother has modelled for her, essentially incorporating the feedback she has been provided with. Then in line 4, the mother repeats the modified version again and the negotiation ends.

Mandy's negotiation is evidence that in the host family setting students do modify their output in response to feedback given to them in the form of NS requests for confirmation. However, the data shows that students only do this 31.4% of the time, indicating that students are less likely to modify their output in response to NS requests for confirmation than they are in response to NS requests for clarification. What this means is that in most cases students were more likely to simply provide confirmation in response to NS requests for confirmation. Consider the following negotiation where Jamie, rather than incorporating the feedback her host mother provides, simply confirms the host mother's interpretation of what she is trying to say. In this excerpt, Jamie is talking to her host mother about how she gave money to a homeless person once when they were visiting a big city.

**Excerpt 7.7 [Lack of incorporation of feedback - host family]**

- 1 J *watashi wa okane o::*  
I mone:y
- 2 M *ageta no?* (request for confirmation)  
you gave?
- 3 J *hai* (confirmation)  
yes
- 4 M *araa!*  
oh no!
- 5 J *demo watshi no haha wa a:h...*  
but my mother a:h...

- 6 M *dame to itta?* (request for confirmation)  
 she said you shouldn't?
- 7 J *h a i* (confirmation)  
 yes
- 8 M *un*  
 yes

Jamie tries to describe in line 1 that she once “gave” money to a homeless person, but before she says the verb “gave” at the end, she elongates the vowel in the direct object particle, “o:”, indicating that she is having difficulties with finishing the sentence. This seems to prompt the host mother to finish the sentence, which she does in the form of a request for confirmation. In response, rather than repeating or somehow incorporating the feedback she’s just gotten from her host mother, Jamie simply confirms the host mother’s interpretation. However, as Jamie continues to explain what happened after she gave the homeless person money ( line 5), she again indicates through vowel elongation, that she is having difficulties finishing her sentence. Therefore, the host mother finishes Jamie’s sentence again and requests confirmation of it. Once more Jamie confirms the host mother’s interpretation without incorporating the feedback.

This negotiation is a good example of how the host mother helps Jamie get her meaning across by first guessing or anticipating what Jamie wants to say and then providing a L2 model of it for Jamie to confirm. On the other hand, Jamie does not incorporate the feedback she gets from her host mother, rather she simply confirms it, indicating that NS requests for confirmation

often do not result in immediate incorporation of input. This observation is supported by negotiation studies that looked at spontaneous or free conversation (Brock, Crookes, Day, and Long, 1986; Crookes & Rulon, 1988). They found that for spontaneous or free conversation, there was minimal evidence of NNSs repeating and thereby incorporating implicit and explicit feedback provided for them by their NS interlocutors (Brock, Crookes, Day, and Long, 1986; Crookes & Rulon, 1988). It is also confirmed by Pica (1992), whose study shows that students often do not modify their output in response to requests for confirmation.

One wonders why host family members seemed to prefer to decipher students' unclear utterances and then request confirmation rather than ask for clarification. There are a few plausible reasons for this. First, guessing or anticipating what the student is saying and checking to see if it is correct is perhaps more efficient in terms of time and energy when dealing with a breakdown compared to requesting that the student, whose command of the L2 is still inadequate, clarify their own utterance. This view is supported by Poullise (1997) who maintains that participants often choose to use certain communication strategies because they adhere to universal principles of communication, namely the Principle of Economy and Clarity. Essentially, attempting to decipher what the student is saying, then offering a model of it in the L2 and having the student confirm it is more economical than having the student try to clarify their own utterance. Moreover, in terms of the

Principle of Clarity, the model that the NS offers the student to confirm is undoubtedly the clearest and most intelligible version of what the student is trying to say. Thus, in terms of clarity and economy, when the NS does all the work, the breakdown is likely to be less disruptive. Another reason NSs may prefer requests for confirmation over requests for clarification is because it may simply be less face-threatening to the student for the NS to try to guess what the student is saying and request confirmation of it rather than request clarification. However, while requests for confirmation may be used for the sake of smooth communication, students are less likely to modify their utterances in response to requests for confirmation. This may be because in host family conversations where the main focus is on communication, students may have a tendency to use NSs' modeled feedback for immediate communicative purposes and therefore not attempt to repeat or incorporate the feedback simply because doing so may disrupt the flow of the conversation. Moreover, if the student is at a lower proficiency, they may be unable to incorporate feedback due to their inadequate linguistic resources. This may be the case especially if the student's original utterance had several errors in it and the subsequent feedback was too difficult for the student to be able to incorporate it in their next utterance (Richardson, 1993). Therefore, requests for confirmation may not provide the conditions for SLA in terms of student production of modified output, however, there may be another aspect of NS's requests for confirmation to consider in terms of how it may

contribute to SLA specifically in the form of negative L2 input.

Consider for a moment the content of NSs requests for confirmation in response students' unclear utterances. An excerpt from above is repeated here to illustrate this. Recall that Mandy (Ma) is talking to her host mother (M) about a package of pictures that she just received from home.

**Excerpt 7.8 [Negative L2 input - host family]**

- 1 Ma: *watashi wa mada tegami o moraimasen deshita*  
I didn't receive the letter yet
- 2 M: *dare kara? ah! ichido mo tegami ah mada moratte inai?* (request for clarification,  
request for confirmation)  
from who? ah! you haven't received a letter ah even once yet?
- 3 Ma: *hai mada moratte inai* (confirmation, incorporation of feedback)  
yes I haven't received it yet

In line 1, Mandy fails to use the correct form of the verb and this causes momentary confusion as to the meaning of her utterance. The host mother responds by asking for clarification and then immediately understands what Mandy is trying to say. At this point, because the host mother understands, there is no need for her to model the correct version in the L2 and ask Mandy to confirm it. However, she does exactly this, and then Mandy repeats the corrected verb form, essentially modifying her original utterance. Thus, if lack of comprehension is why negotiation is triggered in the first place, why then, does the mother insist on offering Mandy the corrected version of her original utterance and request confirmation of it even after it is clear she understands Mandy's utterance? It may be that even though the host mother thought she understood what Mandy was trying to say, she still wanted to

make sure, so she requested confirmation. While this in part may explain why the host mother first models a corrected version of Mandy's utterance and then requests confirmation of it, there is perhaps something else that seems likely. Namely, that the host mother's model of the correct L2 version seems like an indirect correction or a corrective recast of Mandy's error as when mothers recast their child's utterance to make it more accurate or comprehensible. Essentially, even though the host mother seems to already understand what Mandy is trying to say, she provides Mandy with feedback about her utterance. The host mother's feedback simultaneously provides important negative L2 input by making it salient to Mandy that there is a problem with her utterance, and at the same time, draws Mandy's attention to what the correct L2 version should be by giving Mandy a target language model. Moreover, the NS provides negative L2 input in such a way that is non-face threatening. This seems to be the case in a lot of host family negotiations, where host family members request confirmation as a means to providing the student with negative feedback about their unclear utterances by offering a correct target language version and requesting confirmation of it. The following excerpt is another example of this in Amy's host family. Here, Amy (A) is talking to her host mother (M) about a family friend who is the same age as her brother, however, she does not know how to say "same age".

### Excerpt 7.9 [Corrective feedback in requests for confirmation - host family]

- 1 A: Yukiko to [otooto wa [*\*onaji sai* desu=  
Yukiko and my little brother are the \*same age=  
2 M: [unun [unun =u::n ah onaji toshi? (request for confirmation)  
[uhhmuhhm [uhhmuhhm =uhh:mm ah same age? (confirmation)  
3 A: *hai*  
yes  
4 M: *onaji toshi* (request for confirmation)  
same age  
5 A: *hai* (confirmation)  
yes

The negotiation starts in line 1 with Amy's attempt to say "same age". She has approximated the phrase using a word she is familiar with, a counter for years of age, "*sai*". The host mother responds by modeling the correct phrase and requests confirmation from Amy. Amy confirms that this is what she is trying to say. However, the host mother again models the corrected version for her and Amy confirms it once more. The host mother's modifications to Amy's utterance undoubtedly drew Amy's attention to the difference between her interlanguage and that of her host mother's modified version, however, Amy does not take the opportunity to modify her original utterance based on the negative feedback her host mother has given her. Consequently, such modifications of students utterances may provide important negative L2 input about the state of students' interlanguage, but students may not take the opportunity to modify their utterance immediately after such feedback.

Although student modification of output only occurs 31.4% in response to NS requests for confirmation, nevertheless, they did occur. An example of a negotiation in which the student does modify their output in response to a NS's request for confirmation is given below. Here, Mandy (Ma) is trying to explain to her host mother (M) that eating while driving is commonplace. In line 1, Mandy is trying to formulate the correct form of the verb but makes a mistake by saying "*unten surunagara*" instead of "*unten shinagara*" (while driving). The host mother understands what she is trying to say and provides Mandy with the correct target language version in the form of a request for confirmation. Mandy responds by modifying her original utterance to incorporate the feedback her host mother has just provided.

**Excerpt 7.10 [Negative L2 input - host family]**

- 1 Ma: *amerika de an:o like aruki nagara kuruma de unten suru nagara=*  
in amerika well like while walking, while driving by car=
- 2 M: *=ah unten shinagara?*  
*=ah while driving?*
- 3 Ma: *hai unten shinagara taberu- taberu koto an:o futsuu desu*  
yes eat- eating while driving is well, commonplace
- 4 M: *ah soo*  
is that right?

Essentially, the feedback draws Mandy's attention to the differences between the form she uses in her utterance and the L2 model her host mother provides and gives Mandy an opportunity to modify her utterance to make it more target-like. Thus, because Mandy had access to both what is and

what is not in the L2, she was able to use the feedback to modify her speech. As pointed out previously however, students do not always take opportunities to modify their speech with the feedback given in NS requests for confirmation. Although students were found to only modify their utterances 31.4% of the time in response to NS requests for confirmation, this doesn't necessarily mean that they did not notice the feedback provided for them by the NS. In fact, studies of recasts, an utterance that reformulates a learner's erroneous utterance immediately after the utterance is spoken, show that recasts are very salient to students even if they do not repeat them (Mackey & Philip, 1998; Philip, 1999; Doughty & Varela, 1998). These studies showed that even though students did not incorporate the feedback given in the recasts, because the recast was directly after the unclear or erroneous utterance, and the meaning of the utterance was kept constant in the recast, it was still noticed by the students. This is also supported by Ohta (2001) who found that even though students sometimes exhibited no immediate uptake of corrective feedback given in the form of teacher and peer recasts, they sometimes produced the correct forms later in the class. She concluded that the absence of uptake does not necessarily indicate that the feedback was not effective (Ohta, 2001). Essentially, her study provided additional evidence that corrective feedback is noticed by students and has an effect on students' interlanguage over time. It is this evidence from studies of recasts that supports the idea that even though students do not incorporate NS feedback

from requests for confirmation, they nonetheless notice the feedback and are likely to make use of it over time.

In the classroom, requests for confirmation were used almost as often as requests for clarification. However, in terms of strategy use, request for clarification was used more than any other strategy (13.70% of total strategy use). Similar to that found in the host family setting, students were more likely to modify their output in response to an instructor's request for clarification as opposed to a request for confirmation. Specifically, students modified their output 81.1% of the time in response to instructor's requests for clarification and 36.7% of the time in response to requests for confirmation. The high number of modifications of output in response to requests for clarification seem to reflect the goals and expectations of the classroom. The goal of many classroom interactions is thought to be learning, and the expectation is that students are expected to modify their utterances to make them more comprehensible or accurate. In fact, Lyster and Ranta (1997) point out that corrective feedback and learner uptake in the classroom almost constitute an "adjacency pair", where teachers are expected to provide feedback on students' utterances, and students are expected to incorporate the feedback into their interlanguage by modifying their output. Thus teachers strive to direct students to modify their output and often draw students' attention to the incomprehensibility or inaccuracy of their messages. Nevertheless, instructors' requests for confirmation were not as successful in

getting the students to modify their output. This is possibly because requests for confirmation constitute a less direct way of getting students to notice the difference between their interlanguage and the target-like version of the L2 often provided in requests for confirmation. As mentioned previously however, the absence of uptake does not mean that students haven't noticed the feedback, but that they simply haven't made immediate use of it.

There are some notable differences in student production of modified output in the classroom setting as compared to the host family setting. First, the transcript data suggests that instructors used requests for clarification not only to let students know that their utterances were unclear or incomprehensible but also that they were not linguistically accurate. For example, the following excerpt illustrates a negotiation in the classroom between Amy (A) and Instructor Endo (E). Instructor Endo (E) is asking the students to describe their recent field trip to a small town. Amy triggers the negotiation in line 1 by saying, "*takusan kaimono ga arimasen*" (there's not a lot of shopping) which Instructor Endo (E) sees as an unacceptable utterance. Therefore, he repeats Amy's utterance with a question intonation, essentially seeking clarification of it. However, Amy doesn't respond by modifying her utterance a little but repeats her mistake again. Thus, in line 4, Instructor Endo requests confirmation from Amy that she is talking about shopping. Amy then confirms this, however, it is clear at this point that Amy does not recognize the fact the Instructor Endo is requesting clarification because her

utterance is unacceptable. Therefore, he finally attempts to prompt her to use the correct form by codeswitching into English and requesting clarification. Amy finally understands that she is supposed to modify her utterance and she does so by producing the form, “*dekimasen*” (can’t), however, she does not incorporate the form into her original utterance. Perhaps this is why Instructor Endo gives a model of the corrected version of the utterance at the end of the negotiation. As he does so, it seems as if he is just repeating information the way someone would in free conversation, rather than correcting Amy per se.

**Excerpt 7.11 [Modified output- classroom]**

- |   |   |   |                             |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | A | <i>takusan kaimono ga arimasen</i><br>there’s not a lot of shopping |                             |
| 2 | E | <i>kaimono ga arimasen?</i><br>there’s no shopping                  | (request for clarification) |
| 3 | A | <i>takusan arimasen</i><br>not a lot                                | (clarification)             |
| 4 | E | <i>kaimono shopping?</i><br>shopping shopping?                      | (request for confirmation)  |
| 5 | A | <i>hai</i><br>yes   | (confirmation)              |
| 6 | E | <i>can’t?</i><br>can’t?   | (request for clarification) |
| 7 | A | <i>uh dekiru dekimasen</i><br>uh can can’t                          | (clarification)             |
| 8 | E | <i>ah kaimono ga dekimasen u::n</i><br>ah you can do shopping h::m  |                             |

At first, it is not clear whether Instructor Endo requests clarification because he does not understand Amy’s utterance or because he finds it inaccurate. In fact, he seems to be trying to keep a tone of free conversation and this is perhaps why Amy does not recognize the fact that something is

wrong with her original utterance. It is only at the point where Instructor Endo codeswitches into English as an attempt to get Amy to reconsider her initial utterance that we see perhaps he has understood her original utterance but wants her to modify it to make it more accurate. Lyster and Ranta (1997) have labeled this as the “didactic function” of negotiation, “the provision of corrective feedback that encourages self-repair involving accuracy and precision and not merely comprehensibility” (p. 42). This type of negotiation normally only occurs in the classroom where teachers integrate negotiation of form into their activities, often acting as if there is a comprehension problem even when there is no evidence of communication breakdown. Another example of this is given below, where Instructor Hoshino (H) requests clarification of a lexical item that Student 8 (S8) has mispronounced.

**Excerpt 7.12 [Modified output- classroom]**

- |   |    |   |                             |
|---|----|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | H  | <i>hontoo ni yawarakai mono wa?</i>   |                             |
|   |    | what is something really soft?  |                             |
| 2 | S8 | <i>anoo buta? ((pronounced as bu- in butter))</i>                                       |                             |
|   |    | <i>um buta?((pronounced as bu- in butter))</i>  |                             |
| 3 | H  | <i>un?</i>  | (request for clarification) |
|   |    | what?   |                             |
| 4 | S8 | <i>bata</i>   | (clarification)             |
|   |    | <i>bata</i>   |                             |
| 5 | H  | <i>bata wa nan desu ka?</i>   | (request for clarification) |
|   |    | what is 'bata'?   |                             |
| 6 | S8 | <i>uh bata:a</i>  | (clarification)             |
|   |    | <i>uh butte:r</i>   |                             |
| 7 | H  | <i>soo desu ne bataa nobasu ne tabemono wa- tabemono janakute yawarakai mono wa?</i>    |                             |
|   |    | that's right butter. you draw it out. food- something that is not food that is soft is? |                             |

The excerpt begins with Instructor Hoshino asking the class to give an example of something that is 'soft'. In response, S8 offers the word for butter, 'buda', which is supposed to be pronounced, "bataa" as a Japanese loan word, so Instructor Hoshino requests clarification, "un?" (what?). In response S8 makes another attempt at pronouncing the word, this time saying "bata" (butter), which is closer, but still a bit off. Instructor Hoshino responds by asking for clarification, saying "bata wa nan desu ka" (what is 'bata?'). Again S8 attempts to say butter with the correct pronunciation and finally succeeds, saying "bata:a" (butte:r). Instructor Hoshino confirms that this is the right pronunciation and repeats it for the whole class and then adds a short explanation that the vowel has to be drawn out. This ends the negotiation.

Thus, it is not clear at what point Instructor Hoshino begins to understand that S8 is trying to say "butter". In fact, it is highly likely that Instructor Hoshino knew all along what S8 was trying to say but pretended to not understand in order to prompt S8 to modify his original utterance and make it accurate. These types of didactic negotiation negotiations where students say something that the instructor pretends not to understand in order to elicit modified output are typical in the classroom data as pointed out by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The instructor adopts a pedagogical objective in the negotiation by attempting to draw students to the problems in their output and give them clues to indicate that they need to modify it in some way. Thus, didactic negotiations are quite efficient in terms of eliciting

student production of modified output and this is perhaps why students modify their output more in response to requests for clarification in the classroom than they do in the host family setting.

On the other hand, there are instances of genuine negotiation in the classroom, which Lyster and Ranta (1997) call, "the conversational function of negotiation" (p. 42), where there is a real comprehension problem rather than a perceived one. These types of negotiation are more common in the host family but do occur in classroom interactions, however infrequently. They seemed to occur a lot during tangential talk in Instructor Endo's class. This is perhaps because tangential talk seemed to be less structured so unexpected and unfamiliar topics often popped up that caused comprehension problems. Consider for example, the following negotiation between Instructor Endo (E) and a couple of students, S7 and S2, who are trying to explain what a "dock tour" is. They are in the midst of giving examples of how to use the word "*sekkaku*". Essentially, the sentence "*sekkaku rosu ni kita kara.....*" means "since you've come all the way to Los Angeles...". In the first line, S7 gives an example of "*sekkaku*" in a sentence saying, "since you've come all the way to Los Angeles, you should go on a dock tour", but his pronunciation of "*dokku no tsua*" (dock tour) causes some confusion. This is probably what prompts Instructor Endo's request for clarification in line 2, "*dokku?*" (dock?). In response, S7 tries to clarify by making his pronunciation a bit different so he says, "*daaku tour*". However, Instructor Endo still does not understand so he

requests clarification again, asking if S7 is talking about a “dark tour”. S7 rejects this but then doesn’t seem to know how to clarify (line 5), so Instructor Endo draws a picture of a ‘dock’ on the board and asks S7 if he is referring to a “dokku” (dock). S7 confirms this and then S2 jumps in (line 8) trying to help S7 describe what a dock tour is by saying something about a boat. Instructor Endo picks up on this and requests clarification, saying “booto?” (boat?) and in response, S7 clarifies that it is a “boat slash bus”. (continued below...)

**Excerpt 7.13 [Modified output- classroom]**

- |    |  |                             |
|----|--|-----------------------------|
| 1  | S7: <i>sekkaku Rosu ni kita kara dokku no tsuaa o shita hoo ga ii desu</i><br>Since you've come all the way to Los Angeles, you should go on a dock tour |                             |
| 2  | E: <i>dokku?</i><br><i>dokku?</i>  | (request for clarification) |
| 3  | S7: <i>daaku tour</i><br>dock tour   | (clarification)             |
| 4  | E: <i>dark tour?</i> ((writes on board))<br><i>dark tour?</i>  | (request for clarification) |
| 5  | S7: <i>no u:m</i><br><i>nou:m</i>  |                             |
| 6  | E: <i>dokku?</i> ((draws dock on board))<br><i>dock?</i>   | (request for confirmation)  |
| 7  | S7: <i>hai</i><br>yes  | (confirmation)              |
| 8  | S2: <i>boat desu ga</i><br>it's a boat but..   |                             |
| 9  | E: <i>booto?</i><br>a boat?  | (request for clarification) |
| 10 | S7: <i>bus slash boat</i><br>bus slash boat  | (clarification)             |
| 11 | E: <i>a:h dokku ga mieru basu?</i><br>a:h a bus where you can see docks?   | (request for confirmation)  |
| 12 | S7: <i>hai basu</i><br>yesbus  | (confirmation)              |
| 13 | S2: <i>boat desu booto demo tire ga arimasu</i><br>It's a boat boat but it has tires   |                             |
| 14 | S7: <i>umi to- ni hairu</i><br>it goes in the ocean  |                             |
| 15 | S2: <i>umi no ue ni arukemasu</i><br>It can walk on the ocean  |                             |

- 16 E: *ch!?! ja dooro o hashite umi ni mo hairu?* (request for confirmation)  
 what!?! so it rides on the road and also goes into the ocean?
- 17 S7: *hai hai* (confirmation)  
 yeah yeah
- 18 E: *a soo ja sekkaku rosu ni ittara ne* (((laugh))  
 oh, well then if I ever go all the way to Los Angeles (I'll have to go on it)
- 19 S7: (((laugh))  
 (((laugh))

Next (line 11) Instructor Endo asks if it is “*dokku ga mieru basu*” (a bus that you can see the docks in) and S7 confirms this. However, S2 (line 13) explains that it is a boat but it has tires and S2 adds on that it can go in the ocean. Then S7 clarifies this a bit more by saying that the “vehicle” can “*umi no ue ni arukemasu*” (can walk on top of the water). Upon hearing this, Instructor Endo asks if it can “*dooro o hashite, umi ni mo hairu*” (go on the road and go into the ocean) and S7 confirms this. Instructor Endo then ends the negotiation by using part of the initial utterance, saying “*a soo jya sekkaku rosu ni ittara ne...*” (Really, well, if I go to Los Angeles...) essentially giving another example of how to use “*sekkaku*”.

The analysis of the Excerpt 7.13 (above) indicates that this negotiation was a “conversational negotiation” because Instructor Endo’s requests for clarification were motivated by real comprehension problems. This is perhaps why this negotiation seems to resemble the negotiations found in the host family setting. For example, rather than requesting clarification until the students were able to fully modify their utterances, Instructor Endo tried to decipher the students’ messages and then provide target-like models in the L2

for the students to confirm (lines 6, 11, 16). His target-like models are important in terms of providing positive and negative L2 input about how something can or cannot be expressed in the L2. Consider, for instance, line 16 where Instructor Endo takes all the previous information S2 and S7 gave him such as, *"boat desu booto demo tire ga arimasu"* (It's a boat boat but has tires), and *"umi to- ni hairu"* (it goes in the ocean), and *"umi no ue ni arukemasu"* (it can walk on the ocean) and essentially puts the meaning of these utterances all together in one target-like version, *"dooro o hashite umi ni mo hairu"* (it rides on the road and also goes into the ocean?). Instructor Endo not only provides the students with a model of how such a sentence might be expressed in the L2 by modifying the features of the students' utterances both lexically and structurally but also gives the students negative L2 input about what is not target-like about their utterances. Thus, such modifications of students' utterances are valuable in terms of drawing students' attention to the differences between their interlanguage forms and the target-like versions provided for them by NSs essential to successful SLA. However, something that does not occur in the host family setting as much as it does in the classroom and may prove a hindrance to successful SLA is codeswitching into English. Notice in the above excerpt that not only did the students use English to clarify their utterances, but Instructor Endo also used English (line 4 - *"dark tour?"*) to request clarification. Looking closely, both students, S7 and S2, codeswitched into English a total of six times (lines 3, 8, 10, & 13). They

used the words "tour", "boat", "bus", and "tire" to clarify what a "dock tour" was. All of these words are English loan words in Japanese, but the students did not pronounce them as such. Therefore, it is unclear whether the students are not aware that these words exist as loan words in Japanese so they codeswitched into English to fill a gap, or whether they know these words exist as loan words but they choose not to pronounce them with a Japanese pronunciation because they know Instructor Endo will understand them either way. Either way, Instructor Endo chose not to give them feedback on the pronunciation of these words so the students were not given the negative input that might have drawn their attention to their nontarget-like pronunciation. Thus, the quality of the modified output is perhaps not what Swain (1985) would call conducive to SLA in terms of forcing the student to adjust their message to make it closer to a target-like version. However, the use of English to clarify one's utterance is perhaps inevitable in the classroom, where time constraints often restrict teachers and students from engaging in lengthy and difficult negotiations. Nevertheless, one questions whether the modified output students produce is as effective in terms of facilitating SLA as the modified output that might have occurred in a situation where English could not be used as a resource. For example, the following excerpt is taken from Instructor Hoshino's (H) class, in which the Japanese only rule is more strictly enforced than in Instructor Endo's class, even to the point of sometimes not allowing students to make English words sound like Japanese

words through foreignization. Here the class is talking vending machines in Japan and Instructor Hoshino (H) is asking for examples of what can be bought in a vending machine. In line 1, Susan (S) gives an example of one thing that can be bought in a vending machine, "*hotto miiru*" (hot meals). Notice that she foreignizes "hot meal" into "*hotto miiru*". In the next line, Instructor Hoshino asks Susan to repeat her utterance, saying "*eh?*" (what?), so Susan repeats her original utterance. It is at this point that Instructor Hoshino asks Susan to clarify "*hotto miiru*" (hot meals) by repeating the phrase with a question intonation. Susan clarifies her utterance, this time by basically translating the phrase into Japanese, "*atsui tabemono*" (hot food). Instructor Hoshino (H) then repeats the same phrase and requests confirmation of it. Susan confirms it and then mentions "the station", presumably in an attempt to give the location of these vending machines that sell hot meals. However, Susan's sentence, "*eki desu*" (it's the station), is a minimal attempt at providing this information, so Instructor Hoshino provides Susan with a target-like version of what she is trying to say, "*aah eki de utte imasu ka*" (aah they sell them at the station?). Susan then confirms that this is the message she is trying to convey.

**Excerpt 7.14 [Modified output - classroom]**

- 1 S: *hotto miiru*  
hot meals
- 2 H: *eh?*  
what?

- |   |   |                             |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 3 | S: <i>hotto miiru</i><br>hot meals  |                             |
| 4 | H: <i>hotto miiru?</i><br>hot meals?                                      | (request for clarification) |
| 5 | S: <i>hai atsui tabemono</i><br>yes hot food                              | (clarification)             |
| 6 | H: <i>atsui tabemono desu ka</i><br>it's hot food?                        | (request for confirmation)  |
| 7 | S: <i>hai eki desu</i><br>yes it's the station                            | (confirmation)              |
| 8 | H: <i>aah eki de utte imasu ka?</i><br>aah they sell them at the station? | (request for confirmation)  |
| 9 | S: <i>hai</i><br>yes  | (confirmation)              |

What we see in this negotiation is Instructor Hoshino's reluctance to even let students use foreignization as a strategy to compensate for their lack of vocabulary in the L2. This is perhaps why she pushes Susan to say the phrase in Japanese. In addition, after Susan says, "*eki desu*" (it's the station), which does not constitute an accurate sentence, Instructor Hoshino does what we see a lot of NSs do in the host family setting. Namely, she provides Susan with a target-like version of what she thinks Susan intended to say, and then requests confirmation of the utterance. Ultimately then, Instructor Hoshino has pushed Susan to modify her output through requests for clarification, she has provided Susan with negative input about the features of Susan's interlanguage that are not native-like, and she has provided Susan with a target-like model of how encode the message Susan wanted to convey. Thus, this type of negotiation seems to meet the criteria for production of modified output and focus on form by supplying the needed negative L2 input and positive L2 input so important to successful SLA.

In contrast to the previous excerpt, however, the example below illustrates a negotiation in which the student does modify her output in response to the instructor's negative input given in the form of a request for confirmation. In line 1, Susan (S) is giving a daily report on the activities going on as a part of the summer program. She is trying to say that she's posted some information about a dance party on the bulletin board but does not know how to say it so she just points to the bulletin board saying "soko ni" (there). Instructor Hoshino (H) requests clarification saying, "nani?" (what?) and then immediately guesses what Susan is trying to say and provides Susan with a target-language version, "posto shimasu ka" (you're going to post it?) and requests confirmation from Susan. In response, Susan incorporates Instructor Hoshino's feedback into her utterance saying, "hai posto shimashita" (yes, I've posted it).

**Excerpt 7.15 [Modified output -classroom]**

- 1 S: *demo kono dansu paatii wa nan to iu chikyuu kurabu watashimashita oh um kono um*  
 ((shows flyer)) *dansu paatii no koto ah um ano soko ni* ((points to bulletin board))  
 but this dance party what do you call it Earth club I passed it out oh um this um ((shows  
 flyer)) the dance party information ah um well over there ((points to bulletin board))
- 2 Y: *nani? posto shimasu ka?* (request for clarification, request for confirmation)  
 what? you're going to post it?
- 3 S: *hai posto shimashita* (confirmation)  
 yes I've posted it

The above negotiation indicates that there are times when students respond to NS's requests for confirmation by incorporating feedback and modifying their output. And while Susan is given feedback about how to

encode what she wants to say and uses it to modify her output, there is something amiss in this negotiation. Specifically, the L2 version that Instructor Hoshino provides in the form of the request for confirmation, “*posuto shimasu ka*” (you’re going to post it?) is not a native-like form. Essentially, Instructor Hoshino has foreignized the word “post” to “*posuto*” in Japanese. However, using “*posuto*” to mean “to post something up” is not the common usage of the word. “*Posuto*” is a foreign loan word that means “mailbox”. This indicates that the input Instructor Hoshino gives Susan is not native-like and in fact, erroneously leads Susan to think that this is the correct way to express this meaning in Japanese. Thus, instructors from time to time may use their knowledge of English with or without realizing it and provide students with less than native-like alternatives of expressing an intended meaning.

### Summary

To review, this chapter discussed the three different conditions that negotiation is said to promote; comprehensible input, production of modified output, and focus on form in terms of positive and negative L2 input. Negotiations in the classroom and the host family setting were analyzed and discussed in terms of how they met these three conditions and what the implications are toward successful SLA.

A comparison of the host family and classroom data revealed that NSs are more than twice as likely to clarify their utterances in response to students' requests for clarification in the host family than they are in the classroom. In fact, NS clarifications in the classroom were not frequent enough to reach even 5% of total strategy use. That NSs in the host family setting often went to great lengths to explain things to students when they didn't understand indicates that students in the host family had abundant access to comprehensible input and to the rich positive L2 input that is often provided in NS clarifications. In contrast, in the classroom, instructors often responded to students' requests for clarification by opening the floor for other students to provide clarification and students were oftentimes not able to provide the rich positive input that a NS might have been able to provide. On the other hand, when the instructors themselves offered clarifications, the input they provided was similar to the input that was provided in the host family setting. However, possibly due to time constraints, instructors' clarifications did not offer the students as much repetition or as many examples and explanations that host family members did. Thus, the quality and quantity of the comprehensible input and the positive L2 input provided in NSs' clarifications in the host family setting seemed to be more valuable in terms of facilitating the conditions that lead to SLA.

Next, student production of modified output was discussed in terms of how students responded to NS requests for clarification and requests for

confirmation. In the host family NSs make more than three times more requests for confirmation than clarification of students' unclear utterances, while in the classroom, instructors make slightly more requests for clarification than confirmation. In both the host family and classroom setting students were more likely to modify their output in response to requests for clarification than requests for confirmation. This is because students' responses had to do with the way the NS signaled to the student that their utterance had not been understood. In their study, Pica et al. (1989) found that students were more likely to respond to an open signal of request for clarification by modifying their utterances, whereas in response to a modelling signal, essentially a request for confirmation, students would often simply opt to confirm their NS interlocutor's guess or interpretation without modifying their output. However, students modified their output more in response to both requests for confirmation and clarification in the classroom than they did in the host family setting. The difference between the host family and classroom setting may be attributed to a difference in goals and expectations. Namely, the focus in host family interaction is on communication and requesting confirmation may be more efficient than requesting clarification in reducing the time spent on negotiating breakdowns as well as being less face threatening to the student. On the other hand, a focus on learning usually pervades the classroom and therefore teachers often use requests for clarification to push students to modify their output and

notice differences in form even when there is not a comprehension problem (didactic negotiation). At the same time, this focus on learning may explain why students in the classroom modified their output more in response to both requests for clarification and confirmation than they did in the host family setting, simply because they were expected to do so. However, there is some question about the quality of the modified output produced by students in classrooms where instructors allowed the use of English. In general however, NS requests for clarification in both the host family and classroom setting provided students with important information about the state of their interlanguage and pushed students to modify their output to make it more comprehensible. Moreover, in the classroom requests for clarification often led to a focus on form where students were pushed to not only make their utterances more comprehensible, but more linguistically accurate.

In contrast to NS requests for clarification, requests for confirmation did not result in as much student production of modified output. However, studies on recasts show that even when students did not exhibit immediate uptake of feedback given in recasts in the form of repetition or modification of output, there was evidence that the students had noticed the information and that it had an effect on their interlanguage over a period of time (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Mackey & Philip, 1998; Ohta, 2001; Philip, 1999). Moreover, although requests for confirmation did not encourage as much production of modified output, they were still an important source of

negative L2 input that drew the student's attention to discrepancies in their interlanguage and gave the student a target-like model as feedback. The sheer quantity of NS requests for confirmation in the host family setting suggests that students are exposed to more indirect negative L2 input in the host family as compared to the classroom setting. However, the actual content of NSs' requests for confirmations in terms of how they reformulate students' unclear utterances to provide a target-like model and draw students' attention to differences in lexical and structural features reveals that in the host family and classroom setting, the quality of negative L2 input is relatively similar.

In conclusion, in terms of comprehensible input in the form of NSs' requests for clarification, students are more likely to be exposed to more comprehensible input that offers them positive evidence of target-like forms in the host family than they are in the classroom. And this in turn suggests that the host family setting may be more likely to facilitate the conditions that lead to SLA in terms of the rich input that is provided through NS clarifications. On the other hand, the classroom was more facilitative of student production of modified output especially modification of output that focused on form, which is precisely the type of modification that Swain (1985) maintains is so important to L2 mastery. However, while NS requests for clarification and confirmation in the host family did not encourage as much modification of output, the numerous NS requests for confirmation provided students with important negative L2 input that contained a combination of

structural and lexical modification of students' utterances that provided students with feedback on what is and is not possible in the L2. The classroom data also showed that instructors' requests for confirmation were similar in the quality of negative L2 input they provided to students. It is exactly this type of negative L2 input offered through requests for confirmation, similar to recasts, that is likely to be noticed by students and contribute to their interlanguage development over time.

## CHAPTER EIGHT SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has compared the opportunities students have to participate in negotiation and CS use in two different study abroad settings, the host family and classroom setting. The results of this study have shown that while both the host family and study abroad classroom offer students opportunities to participate in negotiation and the use of CS, the amount and quality of the negotiation varies between the two settings in terms of how it creates the conditions thought to be necessary for SLA. Thus, the intention of this chapter is to summarize the results of this study and draw conclusions about what the results indicate in terms of opportunities for SLA through negotiation in the host family and classroom setting.

### **Frequency and Length of Negotiation in the Host Family vs. Classroom**

The analysis of the data in this study revealed that students typically engaged in more and longer negotiations in the host family setting than they did in the classroom setting. Specifically, students engaged in 4.2 more negotiations on average in the host family than they did in the classroom setting. The results also indicated that some students participated in as many as 10 more negotiations per fifty minutes in the host family than they did in the classroom setting. Moreover, the length of negotiations were typically longer in the host family setting for most students than they were in the

classroom. Features of negotiations in the classroom were also different from those in the host family setting. Namely, peripheral negotiations made up approximately 61% of total negotiation in the classroom. In peripheral negotiations, students did not participate directly in the negotiation, but were observers as a part of the class interaction. Thus, the abundance of peripheral negotiations reduced the amount of negotiations students in the classroom were directly able to participate in.

Most importantly however, the present analysis showed that the amount of negotiation students engaged in in the classroom or in the host family varied from student to student and from recording session to recording session. Accordingly, certain factors were identified as to why such variation had occurred. The findings indicated that factors that increased negotiation in general seemed to be more prevalent in interactions in the host family than in negotiations in the classroom. To review, the results indicated that when unfamiliar topics arose, students were forced to compensate for their lack of knowledge about the topic in the L2 by negotiating with their NS interlocutors. Talking about abstract and culturally based entities was also likely to require more negotiation. Likewise, students at a lower proficiency level seemed to experience more breakdowns in communication and therefore participated in more negotiation. Similarly, students who were characterized as more talkative and risked saying things beyond their current level of interlanguage were likely to try to participate

more in the interaction, produce more speech, and consequently engage in more negotiation. There is also some indication that because the participation structure in the host family was more symmetrical, as compared to the classroom where student-teacher interactions tended to be more asymmetrical, students were able to openly exchange ideas and information with their host family members, choose topics that interested them, and were therefore encouraged to participate more actively in conversations. As a result, students were more motivated to overcome comprehension difficulties because they were more vested in the topic. The only factor that seemed to affect negotiation negatively was the use English to avoid or decrease communication problems. These findings are not unlike what has been found in the negotiation literature. Specifically, those studies that have looked at the amount of negotiation students engaged in have generally found that students engage in more negotiation when (a) tasks are two-way required information exchange tasks as opposed to tasks that are one-way or where information exchange is optional (Crookes and Rulon, 1988; Doughty & Pica, 1986; Duff, 1986; Long, 1980, 1989, 1990; Pica et al., 1993; Pica and Doughty, 1985; Pica & Doughty, 1988), (b) tasks and topics that are unfamiliar as compared to familiar tasks and topics (Gass and Varonis, 1984, 1985; Pica, 1992a; Plough & Gass, 1993; Selinker & Douglas, 1985; Zuengler & Bent, 1991; Woken & Swales, 1989), (c) participation is symmetric rather than asymmetric (Foster, 1998; Pica, 1987; Pica et al., 1993; Pica and Doughty, 1985; Pica &

Doughty, 1988), (d) students are at a lower proficiency level versus a higher proficiency level (Pica, 1987; Holliday, 1988), and (e) task demands are high and require more production on the student's part rather than easy tasks that require little production (Shortreed, 1993). The only factors identified in the present analysis that are not routinely discussed in the negotiation literature include talkativeness, interest in a particular topic, describing abstract and cultural entities, and the use of English. Although not labeled as such, talkativeness is noted in some studies on negotiation and participant pattern, where tasks involving group work, pair work, and teacher-fronted work were compared (Foster, 1998; Pica & Doughty, 1988). These studies noted that in group work, less active students often remained silent while more active students did all the work, therefore reducing the amount of negotiation less active students directly participated in to overcome problems and finish the task. One can extend this to the host family situation where Amy's interactions with her host family mother are characterized by the host mother being forced to take on most of the "work" in the conversations due to Amy's lack of active participation. As for interest in a particular topic, few studies have mentioned it. One study, Foster (1998), commented in passing that one particular group in her study produced more speech and engaged in more negotiation because they were interested in the topic. Describing abstract and cultural entities is also not specifically mentioned in the negotiation literature, but Shortreed (1993) did note that when tasks were more difficult

*in terms of cognitive demands, students produced more speech and engaged in more negotiation. Essentially, the difficulty in trying to produce these abstract and culturally-based entities resulted in breakdowns that the participants tried to solve through negotiation. Lastly, the use of the students' L1 has not been mentioned in negotiation studies partly because this variable is often controlled for by telling participants that they have to speak in the target language to complete the task. Therefore, because the present study did not have strict control over students' and NSs' use of English, it manifested itself as an important variable in negotiations. Although a lot of the factors identified in the present study have already been somewhat substantiated in other negotiation studies, it is important to note that a lot of the previously mentioned studies have used task elicitation methods such as picture reconstruction, interview, and story telling from which to draw their conclusions. In contrast, the present study examined unelicited negotiation in a classroom and non-classroom setting. Therefore, what is really important about identifying the factors that affected negotiation in both the host family and classroom setting is that it gives us more insight into the types of factors that are likely to increase negotiation in every day, normal, unelicited interactions in both the classroom and non-classroom setting.*

As for the amount of negotiation students participate in and its effect on SLA, it has often been argued that what is important in negotiation studies is not necessarily the amount of negotiation that students engage in, but the

quality of that negotiation in terms of how it promotes the conditions for comprehensible input, modified output, and focus on form. While this may be true, it seems reasonable to assert that the amount of negotiation students engage in may ultimately affect the extent to which opportunities are available to students to be exposed to these three conditions. Therefore, because students participated in more negotiation in the host family than they did in the classroom setting, students may have had more opportunities to improve their command of the target language. Moreover, not only were unfamiliar, cognitively demanding topics more likely to occur in host family conversations, but students were also more likely to be able to openly exchange ideas and information about topics they were interested in in the host family. Consequently, students were more motivated to actively participate in negotiations and to overcome comprehension difficulties. In contrast, classroom interactions and topics seemed to be carefully controlled by the instructor making interactions asymmetric and reducing the chances that difficult and unfamiliar topics might occur. As a result, negotiations were not as long or as frequent as they were in the host family setting suggesting diminished opportunities for students to improve their interlanguage abilities through negotiation. However, the fact that so many of the negotiations that occurred in the classroom were peripheral did not necessarily play a role in decreased opportunities for SLA. In fact, studies show that students who participate peripherally in classroom interactions still

benefit from what goes on in those interactions (Ohta, 2001; Pica, 1992; Pica, Doughty & Young, 1986; Pica, Young & Doughty, 1987). Negotiation studies in particular found that even when exposure to negotiation is only peripheral, students still benefitted from it (Pica, 1992; Pica, Doughty & Young, 1986; Pica, Young & Doughty, 1987). Ohta's (2001) study indicated similar findings when she noticed that students in her study who only peripherally participated in interactions between the teacher and other classmates were sometimes able to use the feedback gleaned from that interaction correctly later on in the class, indicating that they had indeed noticed and benefitted from it. Thus peripheral negotiations in the classroom do not necessarily contribute to fewer opportunities for students to benefit from negotiations and the conditions they provide.

To summarize, students were found to engage in longer and more frequent negotiations in the host family setting than in the classroom setting because conversations in the host family were characterized by a wider variety of topics and symmetric interaction, and students were more motivated to actively contribute to the conversations because they were able to openly exchange ideas and information and choose topics that they were interested in. What this suggests in terms of SLA is that students had more opportunities to benefit from the conditions that negotiation promotes in the host family environment than they were in the classroom setting.

### Trigger Types in the Host Family vs. Classroom

The types of trouble sources that triggered negotiations in the host family setting were similar in some ways and different in others. First, the findings revealed that for all the trigger types, the trouble sources were more likely to be located in the students' utterances than in the NSs' utterances, indicating that the majority of negotiations were caused by students' production problems. NS or student triggered negotiations aside, for both the host family and classroom setting, problems with lexical items triggered more negotiations than any other trouble source. Grammar problems were the next most common trigger type. Grammatically triggered negotiations occurred more than twice as much in the classroom setting as they did in the host family setting, indicating more of a focus on grammar in the classroom. There were also a fair number of negotiations in which the trouble source could not be identified, called "undetermined". More negotiations in the host family setting were labeled undetermined than in the classroom setting precisely because communication breakdowns in the host family could be deeply embedded in the discourse and not immediately visible on the surface.

The fact that most negotiations were over lexical items was not surprising. The negotiation literature has shown that most negotiation occurs over lexical items precisely because they are the most salient units in the talk and carry the most semantic weight (Glahn, 1980; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). Factors that influenced student triggered lexical negotiations in the host

family versus the classroom setting varied. Although Susan's lower proficiency played a role in increasing the number of lexical negotiations she engaged in in both the host family and the classroom setting, the reverse was not true for Lisa, the higher proficiency student. Even though her stronger command of lexis would have suggested fewer lexical negotiations, this only held true for the classroom setting. In the host family setting, Lisa's conversations involved conveying difficult, abstract words related to religion and thereby increased the number of lexical negotiations she engaged in. Thus, regardless of proficiency, lexical negotiation increased in the host family setting if the topic was a difficult one and required the use of abstract words. In both the classroom and the host family setting, student use of English tended to shorten or negate the need for negotiation over lexical items. While in the host family setting only Amy used English on a regular basis, in the classroom setting, all the students had access to and used English, although Instructor Endo seemed to be the most lenient with the use of English. Nevertheless, English played more of a role in negotiation in the classroom setting. Other factors that affected lexical negotiations in the classroom setting but did not play a role in negotiations in the host family were activity type and teaching style. For example, lexical negotiation increased when activities focused on lexis, encouraged discussion on topics that were unfamiliar, abstract, or culturally based in origin, involved less teacher-controlled talk, or motivated students through interest in the topic to

contribute to the interaction. Teaching style also seemed to have played a role in encouraging lexical negotiation. Specifically being referred to here is Instructor Endo's tendency to engage students in tangential talk about personalized topics and his strategy of feigning ignorance of lexical items in order to elicit explanations in Japanese from his students. In such cases, students were motivated to participate more actively, and were pushed to negotiate, thereby increasing the amount of lexical negotiation that occurred.

The factors affecting NS triggered lexical negotiations in the classroom were somewhat similar to those found in the host family setting. Namely, in both settings, NSs adjusted their speech in order to avoid breakdowns and ensure student comprehension. This tendency of Japanese NSs to adjust their speech to NNSs has been noted in studies of Japanese NS-NNS interaction (Iino, 1996; Long, 1983; Richardson, 1997; Skoutarides, 1981). Similarly, "teacher talk", where teachers adjust their speech to their students has been identified in several classroom studies (Chaudron, 1985; Ellis, 1990; Ellis, 1982; 1988; Henzl, 1979; Polio and Duff, 1994). The fact that NSs adjusted their speech not only decreased the amount of lexical negotiation that occurred, but all negotiation in general. However, while host mothers (with the exception of Jamie's host mother) were adept at adjusting their speech, host fathers were not as capable at modifying their speech and this tended to increase the amount of lexical problems. Another factor that decreased lexical negotiation in both the host family and the classroom setting was that sometimes

students were reluctant to interrupt the ongoing talk to request clarification of a lexical item because of face concerns. Specifically, they were often embarrassed to draw attention to their inadequate command of the L2. In the classroom students could also rely on classmates as a resource so they did not necessarily have to engage in negotiation whenever they didn't understand something. Other factors such as activity type were inherent in the classroom situation. In one particular case, lower proficiency students who engaged in a listening exercise were prompted to engage in more lexical negotiation with the instructor to ask about words they didn't recognize in the listening.

More than twice as many grammatical negotiations occurred in the classroom than in the host family setting. In both the classroom and host family setting, as with lexical negotiations there did not seem to be a dominant factor affecting grammatical negotiation, rather a combination of several factors. First, in both the host family and classroom setting, NSs tended to adjust their speech to the student's level and this tended to discourage NS triggered grammatical negotiation. Moreover, in the host family, because the focus was on communication, NSs were often able to understand students' utterances regardless of the grammatical mistakes made in them, and this often made grammatical negotiation unnecessary. In contrast, the focus on grammar in classroom activities encouraged grammatical negotiation, oftentimes in the form of metalinguistic negotiation. Proficiency level may also have affected the amount of

grammatical negotiation in both the classroom and host family setting. This may have been because students with lower proficiencies still mainly relied on lexis and may have been unable to extend their focus to grammatical aspects of their and their interlocutor's speech. On the other hand, students at a higher proficiency level were more aware of their grammatical competence and at the same time were able to use the L2 to negotiate grammatical aspects of utterances, thereby increasing the amount of grammatical negotiation they engaged in. However, certain factors may have overridden these proficiency effects in the classroom. Namely, regardless of proficiency, the use of English, the use of correction over negotiation to solve grammatical problems, and students using each other as a resource decreased the amount of grammatical negotiation.

Knowing the typical types of trouble sources that students and NSs negotiate over in the host family versus the classroom setting is valuable in terms of knowing what types of comprehension problems students typically face in interactions with NSs in the study abroad environment and what factors are that are likely to affect the types of negotiations that occur. In addition, knowing what participants negotiate about may give us information about the type of L2 information negotiation learners are exposed to through negotiation. The results show that in both the host family and classroom setting the majority of comprehension problems students faced were due to an inadequate command of lexis. This indirectly suggests that the majority of

L2 information imparted through negotiation in both settings was about lexis, and therefore might facilitate SLA in terms of lexical development.

Grammatical negotiations were less common in general but more common in the classroom setting than they were in the host family. This indicates that in the host family setting, as long as a student's lack of grammatical competence does not cause comprehension problems, it is not likely to trigger a negotiation. In contrast, a focus on grammar in the classroom provided students with a lot of opportunities to engage in grammatical negotiation. Thus, the host family setting may not have been as facilitative of grammatical development through negotiation as the classroom setting was.

What is perhaps most important to glean from this section is that students encountered more lexical problems than any other type of communication problem in the host family and classroom setting and that the resulting lexical negotiations were likely to provide students with a variety of L2 lexical information that may have helped their interlanguage development. However, students were more likely to encounter grammatical negotiation in the classroom and this may have positively affected their grammatical development.

### **CS Use in the Host Family vs. Classroom**

The analysis of CS use revealed three basic, important findings. First, both students and NSs used more CSs in the host family than they did in the

classroom setting. Second, the majority of communication strategies used in the host family versus the classroom were interactive communication strategies, which means that they were the type of strategies that required the help of the interlocutor such as requests for confirmation, appeals for help and the like. Third, although the types of communication strategies used in both settings were similar, how they were used and their frequency of use varied greatly.

Besides requests for clarification, all other CSs showed a considerable difference in percentage of use between the classroom and host family setting. First, NSs generally responded to students' unclear utterances in two different ways, they requested confirmation or requested clarification. In the host family setting NSs used more requests for confirmation than any other strategy and they tended to try to "summarize" (interpretive summary) students unclear utterances and request clarification of them. Although they did request clarification, it was only the fifth most frequently used strategy for them. In contrast, NSs in the classroom used more requests for clarification than any other strategy and although they did use requests for confirmation, it was only the fourth most frequently used strategy. The findings suggested that the difference in use between these two strategies in the host family and the classroom setting had to do with a variety of factors. First, NSs in the host family setting may have preferred request for confirmation over request for clarification because it was a fast and easy way to clear up difficulties (Poulisse,

1997), minimize threats to face, and reflected the general practice of attentive listening behavior in Japanese (Clancy, 1986; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Maynard, 1989; Ono & Yoshida, 1996; Strauss & Kawanishi, 1996) allows NSs to give indirect feedback on the students' interlanguage and check their comprehension at the same times, as well as reflects the role of Japanese caretaker as when mothers help their children to get their message across (Clancy, 1986a, 1986b). On the other hand, NSs in the classroom may have preferred the use of requests for clarification over requests for confirmation because of the focus on learning in the classroom. This meant that rather than giving the answer to the student in the form of a model for them to confirm, instructors were more inclined to push the students to modify their own utterances using requests for clarification. Thus, pedagogical concerns outweighed concerns for face and the need to adhere to the Principles of Clarity and Economy (Poullisse, 1997) for fast, easy solutions to clear up students' unclear utterances.

For the most part, students responded to NSs' requests for clarification by clarifying and rephrasing their utterances, however, students could also respond to NSs requests for confirmation by confirming as well as clarifying their original utterance. Students in the host family setting regularly responded to NSs' requests for confirmation with "confirmation", the most frequently used strategy in the host family setting. They rarely clarified or rephrased their original utterance as a result. The reason posited for this was

because it was easier and faster, reflecting the Principles of Clarity and Economy (Poullisse, 1997) as well as less disruptive to the flow of conversation just to confirm with a simple "yes". In the classroom, however, NSs' requests for clarification prompted students to rephrase and clarify their utterances, which were the third and fourth most frequently used strategies. Therefore, students clarified their utterances more than twice as much in the classroom as they did in the host family setting.

When students experienced reception problems, as when they did not understand something in the NS's speech, they could request confirmation or request clarification. In the classroom setting, students used requests for clarification and confirmation equally. However, in the host family setting students tended to request clarification of NSs' utterances more than requesting confirmation. This indicated that in both settings, students' concerns for face were minimal with regard to letting NSs know that they didn't understand something. In both settings, "other repetition" played a major role in requesting clarification and confirmation. Students and instructors used "other repetition" in the classroom all the time. In fact, it was students' most frequently used strategy and instructors' second most frequently used strategy in the classroom. Students and instructors alike used "other repetition" with requests for confirmation and clarification not only because it was a fast, efficient way to pinpoint a word or phrase that was unclear or needed confirmation (reception problem), but also to perform

classroom "functions" such as repeating something so that it may also be heard by other students or to show that feedback provided to them by the instructor had been noticed and incorporated (Pica and Doughty, 1985, 1988). Other repetition was students' second most frequently used strategy in the host family setting but was not used to a great extent by NSs in the host family setting. Other repetition was mostly used by students who experienced reception problems as when they didn't understand a word or a phrase in the NS's speech. Thus, it was a fast and easy way to request confirmation or clarification of something they didn't understand. However, "other repetition" was also sometimes used as part of production problems as when a student appealed for help with a lexical item, the NS provided it, and the student then repeated the word to incorporate it into their utterance.

NSs in the classroom and host family setting responded differently to students' requests for clarification. In the host family setting, NSs worked hard to clarify and rephrase their utterances to make them more comprehensible to students. That NSs in the host family were willing to work hard to make things comprehensible for students was perhaps a reflection of the host family members' role of caregiver in which they felt responsible for making the conversation smooth and maintaining a level of comprehension for the student. On the other hand, instructors in the classroom did not clarify their utterances as often. Instead they used prompts and display questions to push the student(s) to solve their own comprehension problems or

opened up the floor for other students to clarify or solve the problem, meaning that instructors were not just willing to “give students the answer”, but made them work together to overcome difficulties. This reflected the pedagogical focus of learning in the classroom, where students were expected to be active problem solvers. In some cases however, NSs used English to clarify their utterances. In the host family setting, only Amy’s host mother was able to use English well enough to make it a successful strategy. Other host parents who tried to codeswitch into English often could not pronounce it well enough for it to be a successful strategy. Instructors in the classroom used more English than host family members did, mainly because it was a fast and easy way to clear up comprehension difficulties.

NS use of confirmation also seemed to serve an important function in both settings. Confirmation was used most in both settings to confirm that a student’s use of a lexical item, a phrase etc. was accurate. Instructors used confirmation in the classroom more than NSs did in the host family setting. This was probably because the main focus in the classroom was on accuracy, and instructors often used confirmation to confirm the accuracy of a student’s utterance. In fact, it seemed that this was part of the instructor’s role, to confirm or disconfirm a student’s utterance. Without it, interactions seemed incomplete.

Students handled production difficulties very differently in the classroom and the host family setting. For example, in the classroom when

students experienced difficulty trying to say something, they used codeswitching more than any other strategy. This was because English was readily available as a resource in the classroom and it was easiest to use. They also sometimes appealed to their instructor for help in providing the needed word, but this was not a popular strategy in the classroom because students were reluctant to show their inadequate command of the L2 due to face concerns. *On the other hand, codeswitching was not readily available in the host family (except in Amy's case), so students who experienced production difficulties had to resort to a variety of strategies. When they experienced production difficulties, students in the host family setting often appealed for help from their host family member, indicating that concerns for face in this regard were not very important. NSs also used sentence completion when students directly or indirectly indicated that they needed assistance finishing their sentences. One way students indirectly prompted NSs to finish their sentences was to trail off at the end of their sentence to prompt the NS to finish the sentence for them. This meant that NSs had to predict what the student was trying to say in order to finish their sentences. Some may argue that NSs sentence in Japanese may not be strategic behavior, rather, it may reflect a common practice in Japanese conversation for the listener to predict the ends of their interlocutor's sentences and fill them in (Maynard, 1989). Students in the host family setting also resorted to foreignizing and circumlocution to compensate for lexical items that they did not know how to*

say in the L2. The findings revealed that students often started out with the easiest and least cognitively taxing strategies, usually L1 based strategies such as codeswitching or foreignizing and where possible, *mime or gesture*. However, if that did not solve the problem, students moved on to more L2 based strategies, mainly circumlocution. Circumlocution may have been more frequent in conversations where students had to talk about difficult topics. For example, when a topic involved talking about abstract or culturally based concepts or entities, students may have been pushed to attempt more difficult L2-based strategies like circumlocution that required them to use their interlanguage resources creatively.

These findings reveal not only that CS use differed greatly in the host family and classroom setting, but that the factors that influenced how CSs were used were inherently different in the host family and classroom setting. In the host family setting, the main factors affecting CS use tended to reflect basic principles for smooth communication. Both students and NSs in the host family showed a preference for using CSs that were fast, efficient (reflecting the Principles of Clarity and Economy) and did not interrupt the flow of communication and at the same time minimized threats to face. CS use also reflected the roles that the participants assumed, with the NS as caregiver taking on most of the “work” in negotiations by helping students with production and reception difficulties, and with the student as “novice”, willing to ask the NS for help and admit their L2 deficiencies. On the other

hand, instructors' and students' use of communication strategies reflected to a large degree the pedagogical concerns of the classroom, which often overweighed concerns for face and general principles of communication. Institutional roles of expert and novice also played a role in the CS strategies they used. As "experts" the instructor's responsibility was to push students to modify their utterances, confirm the accuracy of students' utterances, and create an atmosphere of learning where answers weren't just provided for the students but they were made to actively participate in finding answers to problems.

#### **Negotiation in the Host Family vs. Classroom and the Three Conditions Necessary for SLA**

This section looked at how negotiation met the conditions for SLA; comprehensible input, modified output, and focus on form (positive and negative evidence). For comprehensible input, the data revealed that NSs were more than twice as likely to clarify their utterances in response to students' requests for clarification in the host family than they were in the classroom, indicating that students in the host family had abundant access to comprehensible input and to the rich positive L2 input that was provided in NS clarifications. In the classroom however, because instructors often responded to student requests for clarification by opening the floor for other students to provide clarification, the input provided may not have been as beneficial with regard to focus on form. However, when the instructors

themselves offered clarifications, the input they provided was similar to the input that was provided in the host family setting but they did not offer the students as much repetition or as many examples and explanations that host family members did. Thus, the quality and quantity of the *comprehensible input* and the *positive L2 input provided in NSs' clarifications* in the host family setting seemed to be in line with the type of comprehensible input that negotiation researcher believe provide a focus on form and that is more valuable in terms of facilitating the conditions that lead to SLA (Long, 1996; Pica, 1996).

On the other hand, students modified their output more often in the classroom than they did in the host family setting. This was because NSs in the classroom requested more clarification of students' unclear utterances than they did in the host family setting, whereas in the host family setting NSs were more likely to request confirmation of students' utterances. The difference in the way NSs respond to students' unclear utterances and how it affects whether students modify their output or not was noted in Pica (1992) who found that students were more likely to modify their utterances in response to requests for clarification than they were in response to requests for confirmation. Pica (1992) maintained that this was because in requests for confirmation the NS had already done all the work for the student by repeating, modifying, and modeling the student's utterance and all the student had to do was confirm the NS's interpretation with a simple "yes"

rather than modify their output. The difference in the way NSs in the host family and classroom setting responded to students' unclear utterances primarily had to do with a difference in goals and expectations. Because the focus in host family interaction was on communication, requesting confirmation proved to be more efficient as well as less face threatening to the student. This also explains why students didn't clarify their utterances as much in the host family setting, precisely because it would have taken more time to do so. On the other hand, in the classroom, the focus on learning meant teachers used requests for clarification to push students to modify their output and notice differences in form even when there was not a comprehension problem (didactic negotiation - Lyster & Ranta, 1997). At the same time, students in the classroom modified their output more because they were expected to do so.

The difference in how NSs responded to students' unclear utterances and whether students modified their utterances has important implications toward SLA. First of all, Pica (1996) suggests that NSs' responses to students' unclear utterances (i.e., requests for clarification and confirmation) provide students with negative feedback that pushes them to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the L2. In particular, requests for clarification draw students' attention to form and push students manipulate their interlanguage to not only make their utterances more comprehensible, but also more linguistically accurate. The negative feedback provided in requests for

confirmation is much more indirect and therefore may not be as perceptible to students as with requests for clarification. Nevertheless, requests for confirmation provide positive evidence in the form of a target-like model of the students' original utterance and therefore reveal important and timely information about lexical and structural features of the L2 (Long, 1996).

Although the link between requests for confirmation and SLA appears weak, studies on recasts which are similar to requests for confirmation, show that even when students did not exhibit immediate uptake of feedback given in recasts in the form of repetition or modification of output, there was evidence that the students had noticed the information and that it had an effect on their interlanguage over a period of time (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Mackey & Philip, 1998; Philip, 1999).

In conclusion, in terms of comprehensible input, students were more likely to be exposed to comprehensible input that offered them positive evidence of target-like forms in the host family than they were in the classroom. Consequently, the abundance of comprehensible input suggests that the host family setting may be more likely to facilitate the conditions that lead to SLA in terms of the positive input that is provided through NS clarifications and rephrases. On the other hand, the classroom promoted more student production of modified output especially the type of modifications that drew attention to form, which is precisely the type of modification that Swain (1985) maintains is so important to L2 mastery.

However, while NS requests for clarification and confirmation in the host family did not encourage as much modification of output, the numerous NS requests for confirmation provided students with important negative and positive L2 input that contained a combination of structural and lexical modification of students' utterances that gave students feedback on what is and is not possible in the L2. It is precisely this type of negative and positive L2 input offered through requests for confirmation in the host family setting, similar to recasts, that is likely to be noticed by students and contribute to their interlanguage development over time. Therefore, the field of negotiation research would benefit considerably from longitudinal studies that focus on how negotiation affects interlanguage development over an extended period of time.

**APPENDIX**  
**LIST OF COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND THEIR DEFINITIONS**

1. Request for confirmation	"Requesting confirmation that one has heard or understood something correctly . Repeating the trigger in a 'question repeat' or asking a full question, such as 'You said..?', 'You mean....?', 'Do you mean....?' " (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 191)
2. Confirmation	Confirming what the interlocutor has said or suggested in response to a request for confirmation.
3. Request for clarification	An utterance is considered a request for clarification when the listener has not understood the utterance and seeks to clarify it. "What do you mean?', 'You saw what?' Also 'question repeats' that is, echoing a word or a structure with a question intonation." (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 191)  Ex. 1: Why do you do that? (Williams, Inscoc, & Tasker, 1997: p. 312) Ex. 2: Huh? What?
4. Clarification	Clarifying one's utterance in a host of different ways in response to a request for clarification.
5. Rephrase	Repeating a term, phrase, sentence not quite as it is, but by adding something or changing the order of words. or decomposing. The semantic content does not change. (From "self-rephrasing"). (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 190) Ex.1: NS: Do you happen to know if you have a washer? NNS: Pardon? NS: The rubber washer.. it's the thing which is in the pipe (Dornyei & Scott, 1995: 192)  Ex.2: S: You know heating? J: So it is a heat exchanger S: Radiator (Varonis & Gass, 1985: p.77)  Ex.3: S: What is your purpose for studying English in Ann Arbor? J: silence S: What is your purpose for studying English? (Varonis & Gass, 1985: p.77)
6. Appeal for help	"Occurs when the learner has tries to consult any source of authority: A native speaker, experimenter, a dictionary." (Bialystok, 1990: p. 41) For this study, appeal for help only referred to students' production problems not reception problems. Ex.1: What's the name ..? What do you call.... ? (Dornyei, 1995: p. 58) Ex. 2: I don't know the name... (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 191)

**APPENDIX CONTINUED**  
**List of Communication Strategies and their definitions**

7. Other repetition	Repeating part of a word or whole word or a string of words of someone else's utterance (can be with a question intonation) indicating an indirect request for repetition or a lack of understanding of the repeated portion.
8. Self repetition	Repeating part of a word or whole word / phrase, string of words in one's own utterance usually in an attempt to clarify etc.
9. Asking for repetition	Directly or indirectly requesting repetition when not hearing or understanding something correctly. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997) Ex. 1: Pardon? What? (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: pg. 190) Ex. 2: Huh? Could you please repeat?
10. Point/gesture	Using non-verbal means to indicate an object, word, or action etc. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997)
11. Retrieval	An attempt to retrieve a lexical item by saying a series of incomplete or wrong forms or structures before finding the right one. Several words/ forms are tried before coming up with correct one. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997) Ex. 1: brake, er it's broken broked broke. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 188)
12. Trailing off	Students may do this as an appeal for help. They leave off the end of their sentence usually with vowel elongation to indicate they cannot finish it.
13. Sentence completion	Completing the speaker's sentence for them.
14. Interpretive summary	"Extended paraphrase of the speaker's message to check that comprehension is complete." (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 192) Interpretive summary is at the end of a stretch of unclear utterances and is usually longer. Ex. 1: So the pipe is broken, basically, and you do't know what to do with it, right? (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 192)
15. Approximation	Using an alternative term which expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 188) Ex.1: <u>Plate</u> instead of " <u>bowl</u> " (Dornyei & Scott, 1995: p. 188) Ex. 2: It's like a <u>table</u> instead of " <u>Stool</u> " (Bialystok, 1990: p. 63)
16. Use of all purpose words	Using a general, empty lexical item in place of specific words. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 188) Ex. 1: stuff, thingie, what-do-you-call-it, made, do. (Dornyei & Scott, 1995: p.188)
17. Word-coinage	Creating a non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing L2 word.(Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 189) Ex. 1: Vegetarianist for vegetarian (Dornyei, 1995: p.58 ) Ex. 3: Airball for "balloon" Bialystok, 1990: p. 73)

**APPENDIX CONTINUED**  
**List of Communication Strategies and their definitions**

18. Similar sounding words	Using a word which sounds more or less like the target item but phonologically different. It may not be a word that exists. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997) Ex.1: <i>Sokuro</i> for ' <i>sakura</i> ' (cherry blossom)
19. Code switch	Using L1 words with L1 pronunciation, or L3 with L3 pronunciation in L2 speech. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997) e.g. Students using English with English pronunciation. OR Japanese NS says an English word using Japanese pronunciation where a common loan word may not exist for that particular lexical item.
20. Foreignizing	Using an L1 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997) Ex. 1: ' <i>puresumento</i> ' for ' <i>placement</i> ' in Japanese In this case, the word is not a common loan word in Japanese.
21. Comprehension check	"Asking questions to check that the interlocutor can follow you." (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 192) Ex. 1: <i>This is a pipe. do you know what a pipe is?</i> (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 192) Ex. 2: <i>Do you understand?</i>
22. Literal translation	Taking a phrase, lexical item, idiom etc., compound word or structure in the L1 and translating it directly into L2. (Dornyei & Scott, 1997) Ex. 1: <i>I made a big fault.</i> (Dornyei & Scott, 1997: p. 189)
23. Prompt	Teacher trails off part of sentence where the student has made a mistake to prompt the student to modify their utterance. The vowels in the last word uttered may be elongated. Ex. 1: <i>okaasan no uchi ni....?</i> (to your mother's house?)
24. Display question	When the teacher asks a question to which the answer is already known.

## REFERENCES

- Alanen, R. (1992). *Input enhancement and rule presentation in second language acquisition*. Masters in ESL thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu
- Allwright, R. (1980). Topics, turns and tasks: Patterns of participation in language learning. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.) *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Acquisition Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Arthur, B., Weiner, R., Culver, M., Lee, Y., & Thomas, D. (1980). The register of impersonal discourse to foreigners: Verbal adjustments to foreign accent. In D. Larsen-Freeman (ed.), *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research* (pp. 111-124). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Aston, G. (1993). Notes on the interlanguage of comity. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 224-50). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: Looking at and through the diary studies. In H.W. Seliger & M.H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 67-103). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. (pp. 100-18). London: Longman.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication Strategies: A psychological analysis of second-language use*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bialystok, E. (1984). Strategies in interlanguage learning and performance. In A. Davies, C. Cramer & A. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp. 37-48). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bialystok, E., & Kellerman, E. (1987). Language strategies in the classroom. In B. Das (Ed.), *Communication and learning in the classroom community* (pp. 160-175). Singapore: SEAMEO RELC.
- Bialystok, E., & Frohlich, M. (1980). Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 5 (1), 3-29.
- Blau, E.K. (1982). The effect of syntax on readability for ESL students in Puerto Rico. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16 (4), 517-28.
- Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1989). Communication strategies in L1 and L2: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 253-68.
- Bongaerts, T., Kellerman, E., & Bentlage, A. (1987). Perspective and proficiency in L2 referential communication. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9, 171-200.

- Brecht, R., & Davidson, D., & Ginsberg, R. (1995). Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism, Vol. 9* (pp. 37-66). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Brown, J.D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 256-289). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extraversion and the ESL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 32, 109-132.
- Carroll, J. (1967). Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1, 131-151.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. London: Heinemann.
- Chaudron, C. (1983). Simplification of input: topic reinstatement and their effects on L2 learners' recognition and recall. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (3), 437-58.
- Chaudron, C. (1985). Comprehension, comprehensibility and learning in the second language classroom, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 216-232.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms. Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chun, A., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, A., & Luppescus, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 537-547.
- Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language socialization across cultures* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of Japanese. In D. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition* (pp. 373-524). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cook, H. (1997). The role of the Japanese masu form in the caregiver-child conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 695-718.
- Cornu, A., & Delahaye, M. (1987). Variability in interlanguage reconsidered: LSP vs. non-LSP IL talk. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6, 145-152.
- Crookes, G. & Rulon, D. (1988). Topic and feedback in native speaker/non-native speaker conversation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 675-681.
- Davis, K. (1992). Validity and reliability in qualitative research on second language acquisition and teaching: Another research comments...*TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 605-608.
- Davis, K. (1995). Qualitative theory and methods in applied linguistics research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 427-453.

- Day, R., Chenoweth, N., Chun, A., & Leppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native-nonnative discourse. *Language Learning*, 34, 19-45.
- Denzin, N. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Denzin, N. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. (pp. 500-515). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeKeyser, R. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 104-119). Lexington MA: D. C. Heath.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1985). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Review Article: Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47 (1), 173-210.
- Doughty, C. & Pica, T. (1984). Information gap tasks: do they facilitate second language acquisition? Paper presented at the 18th Annual TESOL Convention, Houston, TX.
- Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: An aid to second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20 (2), 305-325.
- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, p. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk. Taking task to task. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Dufon, M. (2000). The acquisition of negative responses to experience questions in Indonesian as a second language by sojourners in naturalistic interaction. In B. Swierzbin, F. Morris, M. Anderson, C. Klee, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Social and Cognitive Factors in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 77-97). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenstein, M., & Starbuck, R. (1989). Investment in topic and verb system accuracy of advanced L2 learners. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition (Vol. 2): Psycholinguistic issues* (pp. 125-137). Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

- Ellis, R. (1985). Teacher-pupil interaction in second language development. In S.M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 69-85). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Enomoto, S., & Marriott, H. (1994). Investigating evaluative behavior in Japanese tour guiding interaction. *Multilingua*, 13 (1-2), 124-154.
- Erlich, S., Avery, P., & Yorio, C. (1989). Discourse structure and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 397-414.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1980). Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, Utrecht, 5, 47-118.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1982). Phatic, metalingual and metacommunicative functions in discourse: Gambits and repair. In N. Enkvist (Ed.), *Impromptu speech* (pp. 77-103). Abo, Finland: Abo Akademi.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1986). Strategic competence in foreign language teaching. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Learning teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 179-193). Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1987). From product to process: Introspective methods in second language research. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 5-23). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19 (1), 1-23.
- Freed, B. (1991). *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Freed, B. (1995a). Language learning and study abroad. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism*, Vol. 9 (pp. 3-33). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Freed, B. (1995b). What makes us think that students who study abroad become fluent? In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism*, Vol. 9 (pp. 123-148). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gass, S. (1988). Integrating research areas: A framework for second language studies. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 198-217.

- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Language Learning*, 34 (1), 65-89.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1985a). Variation in native speaker speech modification to nonnative speakers. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 7, 37-58.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1985b). Task variation and NS/NNS negotiation of meaning. In Gass, S. & Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 71-86). New York: Plenum Press.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 282-302.
- Glahn, E. (1980). Introspection as a method of elicitation in interlanguage studies. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht*, 5, 119-128.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 3, Speech Acts.
- Gremmo, M., Holec, H., & Riley, P. (1978). Interactional structure: the role of role, *Melanges Pedagogiques*, University of Nancy, CRAPEL
- Guntermann, G., (1995). The Peace Corps experience: Language learning in training and in the field. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism*, Vol. 9 (pp. 149-169). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haastrup, K., & Philipson, R. (1983). Achievement strategies in learner/native speaker interaction. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 140-158). London: Longman.
- Hashimoto, H. (1993). Language acquisition of an exchange student within the homestay environment. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 4 (4), 209-224.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 401-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hayashi, M., & Mori, J. (1998). Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We Do "finish each other's sentences". In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S. Sohn, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/ Korean Linguistics Vol. 7* (pp. 77-91). Stanford: CSLI.
- Henzl, V. (1979). Foreigner talk in the classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 159-167.
- Hiraike-Okawara, M., & Sakamoto, T. (1990). Japanese foreigner register in the use of vocabulary. In K. Osamu & W. Jacobsen (Eds.), *On Japanese and How to Teach it*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

- Holliday, L. (1988). Let them talk: A study of native-nonnative interaction in conversation. Working Papers in Educational Linguistics 4 (pp. 89-100). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.
- Holmen, A. (1985). Distribution of roles in learner-native-speaker interaction. In E. Glahn & A. Holmen (Eds.), *Learner Discourse* (pp. 70-89). Copenhagen: Angelica et Americana 22, Department of English, University of Copenhagen.
- Holmes, J. (1978). Sociolinguistic competence in the classroom. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hosoda, Y. (2000). Other-repair in Japanese conversations between nonnative and native speakers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11 (1), 39-63.
- Huebner, T. (1995). The effects of overseas language programs: Report on a case study of an intensive Japanese course. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism, Vol. 9* (pp. 171-193). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Iino, M. (1996). "Excellent Foreigner!": Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations- An ethnographic study of dinner table conversations between Japanese host families and American students. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Iino, M. (1998). Issues of video recordings in Language studies: a case of remote video observation of dinner table interactions in homestay settings. AAAL 1998 Annual Conference paper.
- Imamura, A. (1987). *Urban Japanese Housewives*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Johnson, P. (1981). Effects of reading comprehension on language complexity and cultural background of a text. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15 (2), 169-81.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Communication strategies*. New York. Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 200-215.
- Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (1997). *Communication Strategies*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some (non-) implications for the classroom. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 142-61). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Kellerman, E. Ammerlaan, T., Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1990). System and hierarchy in L2 compensatory strategies. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 163-178). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kellerman, E. and Bialystok, E. (1997). The psychological plausibility in the study of communication strategies. In Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (Eds.), *Communication Strategies* (pp. 31-48). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Kinging, C. (1995). Task variation and repair in the foreign language classroom. In M. Haggstrom, L. Morgan, & J. Wiczorek (Eds.), *The foreign language classroom: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 55-69). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Kramsch, C. (1985). Classroom interaction and discourse options. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 169-183.
- Krashen, S. (1980). The Input Hypothesis. In Alatis, J. (Ed.) *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 168-180). Washington, D.C. : Georgetown University Press.
- Labarca, A., & Khanji, R. (1986). On communication strategies: Focus on interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8, 68-79.
- Lafford, B. (1995). Getting into, through and out of a survival situation: A comparison of communicative strategies used by students studying Spanish-abroad and 'at home'. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism, Vol. 9* (pp. 197-121). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language research*. New York, Longman Inc.
- Lauerbach, G. (1982). Face-work in reparaturen-ein charakteristikum von lerner/native speaker-diskursen. *L.A.U.T. paper no. 81, series B. Trier*.
- Lebra, T. (1976). *Japanese Patterns of Behavior*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, 259-278.
- Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-41.
- Long, M. (1985a). Input and second language acquisition theory. In Gass, S. & Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Long, M. (1985b). A role for instruction in second language acquisition Task-based language training. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 77-100), Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Long, M. (1989). Task, group, and task group interactions. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL*, 8 (2), 1-26.
- Long, M. (1990). The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 649-666.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W. & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-227.
- Long, M. & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 268-285), Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82 (3), 357-371.
- Loschky, L. (1989). *The effects of negotiated interaction and premodified input on second language comprehension and retention*. (Occas. Pap. No. 16). Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, ESL Department.
- Loschky, (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: What is the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16 (3), 303-323.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Lynch, B. (1992). Evaluating a program inside and out. In J. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, B. (1997). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackey, A., & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development. Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal*, 82 (3), 338-356.
- Magnan, S. (1986). Assessing speaking proficiency in the undergraduate curriculum: Data from French. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19 (5), 429-438.

- Marriott, H., (1995). The acquisition of politeness patterns by exchange students in Japan. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context: Studies in Bilingualism, Vol. 9* (pp. 197-224). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martin, G. (1980). English language acquisition: The effects of living with an American family. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 388-390.
- Maynard, S. (1986). On back-channel behavior in Japanese and English casual conversation. *Linguistics*, 24, 1079-1108.
- Maynard, S. (1989). *Japanese Conversation: Self Contextualization Through Structure and Interactional Management*. Norwood: Ablex.
- McMeekin, A. (1998). The Use of Communication Strategies in the negotiation of meaning between native speakers and beginning learners of Japanese. Unpublished paper.
- Meara, P. (1994). The year abroad and its effects. *Language Learning Journal*, 10, 32-38.
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California; Sage Publications.
- Mitchell, B. (1988). *Communicative Language Teaching in Practice*, London: CILT.
- Mito, K. (1993). *The effects of modelling and recasting on the acquisition of L2 grammar rules*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of ESL.
- Moehle, D. (1984). A comparison of the second language speech of different native speakers. In H. Dechert et al. (Eds.), *Second language productions* (pp. 26-49). Tubingen: Gunter Narr.
- Moerk, E. (1992). *A first language taught and learned*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.
- Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 47 (3), 203-210.
- Ohta, A. (1995a). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 2, 93-121.
- Ohta, A. (1995b). The impact of teacher stance on the use of affective particles in classroom narratives. In H. Nara & M. Noda (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 1995 ATJ Conference on Literature, Language and Pedagogy* (pp. 163-172). Middlebury, VT: Association of Teachers of Japanese.
- Ohta, A. (1999). Interactional routines and the socialization of interactional style. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 31, 11, 1493-1512.
- Ohta, A. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ono, T., & Yoshida, E. (1996). A study of co-construction in Japanese: We don't finish each other's sentences. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese /Korean Linguistics Vol. 5* (pp. 115-130). Stanford: CSLI.

- Ozaki, A. (1989). *Requests for Clarification in Conversation Between Japanese and Non-Japanese*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 132-146.
- Philip, J. (1999, March). *Constraints on "noticing the gap": A study of NNS' apperception of recasts in NS-NNS interaction*. Paper presented at the 1999 Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Stanford, Connecticut.
- Pica, T. (1987a). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning*, 38, 1, 45-73.
- Pica, T. (1987b). Second language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 3-21.
- Pica, T. (1988). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning*, 39, 45-73.
- Pica, T. (1991). Classroom interaction, participation, & comprehension: Redefining relationships. *System*, 19, 437-452.
- Pica, T. (1992). The textual outcomes of native speaker/non-native speaker negotiation. What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text in context: Cross disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198-237). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Pica, T. (1993). Communication with second language learners: What does it reveal and the social and linguistic processes of second language acquisition? In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Language, communication, and social meaning* (pp. 434-464). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Pica, T. (1994). Review Article: Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 3, 493-527.
- Pica, T. (1996a). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 1, 59-84.
- Pica, T. (1996b). Do second language learners need negotiation? *IRAL*, 34 (1), 1-21.
- Pica, T., Doughty, C., & Young, R. (1986). Making input comprehensible: Do interactional modifications help? *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 72, 1-25.
- Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (4), 737-758.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985a). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 233-48.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985b). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1988). Variations in classroom interaction as a function of participation pattern and task. In J. Fine (Ed.), *Second Language Discourse: A Textbook of Current Research* (pp. 41-55). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 11, 63-90.
- Pica, T. & Long, M. (1986). The linguistic and conversational performance of experienced and inexperienced teachers. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berducci, & Newman (1991). Language Learning through interaction. What role does gender play?. *Studies in second Language Acquisition* , 13, 343-376.
- Pica, T., & Lincoln-Porter, F. & Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1995). What can language learners learn from each other? Only their researchers know for sure. *Working papers in Educational Linguistics, Vol. 11. No. 1*. University of Pennsylvania.
- Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction and research. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning . Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9-34). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Plough, I., & Gass, S., (1993). Interlocutor and task familiarity: Effects on interactional structure. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning . Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 35-56). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Polio, C., & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78 (3), 313-326.
- Porter, P. (1986). How learners talk to each other : Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. Day (ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*, (pp. 200-224). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Poulisse, N. (1987). Problems and solutions in the classification of compensatory strategies. *Second Language Research*, 3, 141-53.
- Poulisse, N., Bongaerts, T., & Kellerman, E. (1987). The use of retrospective verbal reports in the analysis of compensatory strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 213-219). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Poulisse, N., Bongaerts, T., & Kellerman, E. (1984). On the use of compensatory strategies in second language performance. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 8, 70-105.

- Poulisse, N. & Schils, E. (1989). The influence of task- and proficiency-related factors on the use of compensatory strategies: A quantitative analysis. *Language Learning*, 39, 15-48.
- Poulisse, N. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris/Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Poulisse, N. (1993). A theoretical account of lexical communication strategies. In R. Schreuder & B. Weltens (Eds.), *The Bilingual Lexicon*. (pp. 157-189) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Poulisse, N. (1997). Compensatory strategies and the principles of clarity and economy. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies* (pp. 49-64). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, B. (1997). A sociolinguistic perspective on L2 communication strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies* (pp. 279-303). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Raupach, M. (1983). Analysis and evaluation of communicative strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (pp. 199-201). London: Longman.
- Ridley, J. (1991). *Strategic competence in second language performance: a study of four advanced learners*. CLCS Occasional Paper No. 28. Trinity College Dublin.
- Richardson, C. (1997). *A Study of Japanese "Foreigner Talk"*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Rosing-Schow, D., & Haastrup, F. (1982). *The use of communication strategies in classroom and spontaneous discourse*. Unpublished MS, Department of English, University of Copenhagen.
- Rost, M., & Ross, S. (1991). Learner use of strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. *Language Learning*, 41 (2), 235-73.
- Rulon, K., & McCreary, J. (1986). Negotiation of content: Teacher-fronted and small group interaction. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 182-199) Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation, *Language*, 53, 361-82.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165-209). London: Academic Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (Technical Report No. 9). Hawaii: University of Hawaii Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *"Talking to learn": Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching (IRAL)* 10, 209-30.
- Selinker, L., & Douglas, D. (1985). Wrestling with "context" in interlanguage theory. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 190-204.
- Siegal, M. (1994). *Looking East: Identity construction and white women learning Japanese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Silver, R. (1999) Input, Output and negotiation: Conditions for second language development. Paper presented at Second Language Research Forum 1999, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Skoutarides, A. (1981). "Nihongo ni okeru forinaa tooku." *Nihongo Kyooiku*, 45, 53-62.
- Snow, C. (1988). Conversations with children. In R. Fletcher & M. Garman (Eds.), *Language acquisition 2nd edition* (pp. 69-89). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, Sage Publications.
- Strauss, S., & Kawanishi, Y. (1996). Assessment strategies in Japanese, Korean, and American English. In N. Akatsuka, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese /Korean Linguistics Vol. 5* (pp. 149-166). Stanford: CSLI.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. & Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1991). French immersion and its offshoots: Getting two for one. In B. Freed, (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 91-103). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-143). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (3), 371-391.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.

- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30, (2), 417-431.
- Tarone, E. (1984). Teaching strategic competence in the foreign language classroom. In S. Savignon & M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching* (pp. 127-136). Reading MA: Addison Wesley.
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trosset, C. (1986). The social identity of Welsh learners. *Language in Society*, 15, 165-191.
- Tweissi, A. (1990). 'Foreigner talk' in Arabic: Evidence for the universality of language simplification. In M. Eid & J. McCarthy (Eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics II. Current issues in linguistic theory* Vol. 72 (pp. 296-326). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van den Branden, K. (1997). Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning*, 47 (4), 589-636.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the language learner*. New York: Longman.
- VanPatten, B. (1988). How juries get hung. Problems with the evidence for a focus on form in teaching. *Language Learning*, 38 (2), 243-260.
- Varonis, E. & Gass, S. (1982). The comprehensibility of non-native speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 4 (1), 41-52.
- Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985a). Miscommunication in native/nonnative conversation. *Language in Society*, 14 (3), 327-343.
- Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985b). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6 (1), 71-90.
- Wagner, J. & Firth, A. (1997). *Communication strategies at work*. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies* (pp. 323-344). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- White, L. (1989). The adjacency condition on case assignment: Do learners observe the Subset Principle? In S. Gass & J. Schacter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 134-158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willems, G. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. *System*, 15, 351-364.
- Williams, J., Inscoc, R., & Tasker, T. (1997). Communication strategies in an interactional context: the mutual achievement of comprehension. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies* (pp. 304-322). New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Woken, M., & Swales, J. (1989). Expertise and authority in native-nonnative conversations: The need for a variable account. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition (Vol. 2): Psycholinguistic issues* (pp. 211-227). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

- Wren, D. (1982). A case study of the treatment of oral errors. *Selected Papers in TESOL*, 1, 90-103.
- Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1985). Negotiation in context. A review of Research. In J. Lantolf & A. Labarca (Eds.), *Research in second language learning: focus on the classroom: proceedings of the 6th Delaware Symposium on Language Studies* (pp.212-223). Norwood, N.J: Ablex Publishing.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1991). The other side of the page: Integrating the communication strategies and negotiated input in SLA. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/ second language pedagogy research* (pp. 142-161). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1990). Eliciting the performance of strategic competence. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 179-194). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Zuengler, J. (1993). Explaining NNS interactional behavior: The effect of conversational topic. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics* (pp. 184-195). New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Zuengler, J., & Bent, B. (1991). Relative knowledge of content domain: An influence on native-non-native conversations. *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 397-415.