2-3-1997

Promotion of Verbal Interaction through Structured Pair Activities

Vidya Rangachari
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Rangachari, Vidya, "Promotion of Verbal Interaction through Structured Pair Activities" (1997).
Dissertations and Theses. Paper 5303.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.7176>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Vidya Rangachari for the Master of Arts in TESOL were presented February 3, 1997, and accepted by the thesis committee and department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

Marjorie Terdal, Chair

Kimberley Brown

Marcia Silver

Robert Snotora
Representative of the Office of Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

Jeanette DeCarrico, Chair
Department of Applied Linguistics

ACCEPTED FOR PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY THE LIBRARY

by

on 19 March 1997

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Vidya Rangachari for the Master of Arts in TESOL presented February 3, 1997.

Title: Promotion of Verbal Interaction through Structured Pair Activities.

Group work has come to play an increasingly significant role in the second language classroom due to its myriad advantages. Researchers have found that bringing language learners together for various activities provides them with greater opportunities to improve on the quality as well as the quantity of their linguistic output. A small group size and a structured activity are believed to be extremely beneficial to the language learners. In this study, eight ESL students were brought together in dyads and asked to interact verbally for the purpose of performing three types of goal-oriented activities within a specified time limit. The verbal interaction generated by the activities was measured by means of fourteen distinct communication strategies. The main aim of this research project was to identify the most interactive pair activity for further use in the second language classroom.

This study found that the interaction patterns for each activity varied with each pair. In the first activity, even though there was an equal distribution of information among the members of each dyad, one member typically tended to contribute a greater number of strategies than his/her partner. In the second and third activity, where there was an unequal distribution of information, the member who possessed more information utilized more strategies than his/her partner. With regard to the link

between (a) communication strategies, (b) interaction, and (c) successful task accomplishment within a specified time limit, it was found that the use of a greater number of communication strategies resulted in greater interaction as well as an increase in the time taken to successfully accomplish the task. Conversely, the use of a lesser number of communication strategies resulted in lesser interaction as well as a decrease in the time taken to successfully accomplish the task.

PROMOTION OF VERBAL INTERACTION THROUGH STRUCTURED PAIR
ACTIVITIES

by

VIDYA RANGACHARI

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

MASTER OF ARTS
in
TESOL

Portland State University
1997

To

My Beloved Appa

who spread my wings and gave me the courage to fly

AND

My Beloved Amma

who is my strength and my inspiration

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My life is extremely special and significant because I am part of a wonderful family. Without their love, support, and understanding, so many dreams would never have come true and so many other dreams would not even have been worth contemplating. I would first of all like to thank my appa and my amma for giving me so much and asking for so little in return. Even though my appa is no more, he continues to inspire me with his gifts of perseverance and intelligence. I feel proud to have inherited his belief that a sound education is the biggest and best asset anyone can ever possess. Without my amma, my life would have been tremendously dull and incomplete. Her courage in dealing with life's blows is truly amazing and her good humor and tenacity in the midst of chaos never cease to take me by surprise.

My sisters, brothers, brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, nephews, and nieces are the other significant pieces in my life. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to each of them for sharing my world and making it extra special with their inimitable presence.

I would also like to thank my adviser, Marjorie Terdal, for believing in me and restoring my confidence during one of the most challenging phases of my life.

Dr. Shotola's valuable input on the final chapter lent a new sense of direction to my study. Dr. Brown and Dr. Silver were extremely patient with my frequent revisions and gave me some worthwhile suggestions for future research. A big thank you is also due to Margaret Young who was so generous with her time and energy. Without her, this research project would never have seen the light of day. A chunk of my gratitude

goes to the ten students in my study, whose willingness to participate was a major incentive in itself. I would also like to thank Asia and her computer for constantly spurring me on and never giving me a chance to brood.

The folks at Helen Gordon Child Development Center kept my spirits alive at all times with their abundant love. The Writing Center supplied me with a constant stream of humor and generosity and never hesitated in lending a helping hand or a supportive ear. I am also deeply grateful to my special friends in Portland, Freiburg, Jakarta, Secunderabad, and Madras who believed in me and constantly reaffirmed my faith in friendship.

Finally, I would like to say “THANK YOU” to two very special people in my life. One is my wonderful and fun-loving “second mother,” Marjorie Burns, whose unquestioning love and trust will always be a great source of comfort. And the other is Saurabh, who was there during the good times, helped me survive the bad times, and hopefully will be there for evermore....

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Study.....	7
Statement of Research Questions.....	10
Data Collection.....	10
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Introduction.....	13
Modifications in the Role of the Instructor.....	15
Advantages of Group Work.....	20
Treatment of Error in Group Tasks.....	24
Significance of Input and Interaction.....	26
Link Between Negotiation and Comprehension.....	29
Task Type as a Crucial Variable.....	35
Efficacy of Pair Activities.....	37
Significance of Communication Strategies.....	44
Drawbacks of Group Work.....	47

		ix
III	RESEARCH SETTING AND DATA COLLECTION.....	50
	General Information about the Three Activities.....	53
	Transcription of the Data.....	59
IV	ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA.....	69
	The Jigsaw Activity.....	70
	The Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	83
	The Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	97
	The Guessing Game (Part 1).....	111
	The Guessing Game (Part 2).....	124
V	DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS	
	AND CONCLUSION.....	142
	Limitations of the Study.....	154
	Suggestions for Further Research.....	156
	Suggestions for Language Teaching.....	157
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	160
	APPENDICES	
A	Transcription Samples	
B	Exit Criteria for Lower Intermediate ESL Students	
C	Informed Consent Form	
D	The Incomplete Picture Story	
	The Six Pictures Given to the Dyads	

The First Pair's Picture Story

The Second Pair's Picture Story

The Third Pair's Picture Story

The Fourth Pair's Picture Story

E The First Picture Given to the Dyads

The First Pair's Picture

The Second Pair's Picture

The Third Pair's Picture

The Fourth Pair's Picture

F The Second Picture Given to the Dyads

The First Pair's Picture

The Second Pair's Picture

The Third Pair's Picture

The Fourth Pair's Picture

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 The Categorization of the Fourteen Communication Strategies.....	65
2 Total Number of Strategies Used in the Jigsaw Activity.....	71
3 Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete the Jigsaw Activity.....	72
4 Total Number of Strategies Used in the Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	84
5 Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	85
6 Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	86
7 Strategies Used by the Korean Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	86
8 Strategies Used by the Thai Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	89
9 Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	90
10 Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	92
11 Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	93
12 Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	95
13 Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1).....	96

14	Total Number of Strategies Used in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	97
15	Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	98
16	Strategies Used by the Korean Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	100
17	Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	101
18	Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	103
19	Strategies Used by the Thai Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	104
20	Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	106
21	Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	107
22	Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	110
23	Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2).....	110
24	Total Number of Strategies Used in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	112
25	Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Guessing Game (Part 1).....	112
26	Strategies Used by Korean Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	115
27	Strategies Used by Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	115

28	Strategies Used by the Thai Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	117
29	Strategies Used by the Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	118
30	Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	120
31	Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	120
32	Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	123
33	Strategies Used by the Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1).....	123
34	Total Number of Strategies Used in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	125
35	Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Guessing Game (Part 2).....	125
36	Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	128
37	Strategies Used by the Korean Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	128
38	Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	130
39	Strategies Used by the Thai Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	131
40	Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	133
41	Strategies Used by the Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	133

42	Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	137
43	Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2).....	138
44	The Most Interactive Activity for Each Pair.....	143
45	The Least Interactive Activity for Each Pair.....	148
46	Time Taken to Complete Task through Interaction.....	151

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1	Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Korean Dyad.....	75
2	Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Thai Dyad.....	78
3	Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Costa Rican Dyad.....	80
4	Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Saudi Arabian Dyad.....	83

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study explores the patterns and styles of verbal interaction among ESL learners in small group activities. The three activities chosen for this research project are essentially communicative in nature and mainly differ from each other in the way the information is distributed among members of the group. Since the types of activities selected require only two learners at a time, the observation of interaction styles and strategies is restricted to pair work. The focal point of interest is the language that is generated between the second language learners when they are asked to perform different communicative tasks in the classroom.

The linguistic environment of the second language learner has come to play an increasingly significant role in language acquisition. It is the environment that largely determines the type of language that is produced as well as received by the learner of the second language (hereafter L2). Research on the language directed to L2 learners has sought to determine how the speech addressed to nonnative speakers (NNSs), whether children or adults, differs from the language used in adult native speaker (NS) conversation. The main purpose of these studies is to discover the ways in which NS speech undergoes modifications when directed to a NNS of the language.

According to Long (1982), more than 40 studies have been conducted to identify the linguistic and conversational adjustments made by NSs of a language, when communicating with NNSs. These studies are invaluable resources when the

issue of NNS/NS interaction is being examined. But, in a typical language classroom situation, it is unrealistic to include the presence of a significant number of NSs in the midst of NNSs. Usually, it is only the teachers who have a native/native-like proficiency in the L2 and it is difficult for them to constantly interact with every student in the class. To compensate for their inability to provide individual attention/feedback and also to make learners more responsible for their own learning (among other reasons), teachers create opportunities and evolve techniques for increased interaction between the learners.

Group work is one such technique frequently adopted in the language classroom requiring students to work with each other to get useful practice in communicating in the L2. Group work itself may be defined as any goal-oriented activity that makes students come together in pairs or groups that are any size smaller than that of the whole class. In small groups, “roles open to the students are more varied, the very absence of the teacher automatically delegating to them responsibilities, which result in language use of kinds not open to them in lockstep [traditional, teacher-fronted] work” (Long, Adams, McLean, & Castanos, 1989, p. 139). In small group interaction, learners typically try to produce language that is comprehensible to their listeners; at the same time, they receive information in ways that are made understandable to them.

There have been numerous studies undertaken to ascertain the efficacy of NNS/NS interactions in enhancing communication and language skills (Long &

Porter, 1985; Pica & Doughty, 1985; Porter, 1983; Varonis & Gass, 1985a; Varonis & Gass, 1985b). Long and Porter (1985) clearly delineate the myriad pedagogic reasons for initiating and sustaining student-student interaction in the classroom. Some of the more notable reasons include the increase in learner motivation, the sustenance of a conducive learning atmosphere, an improved quality of student work, and greater practice in the L2. In a NNS/NNS interaction, the learners utilize their limited linguistic resources in order to convey information to their language learning peers. When the peers are in a position to hear as well as understand the information that is intended for them, it is labelled as *input*. But it is important to note that not all language gets automatically translated into input; there are times when the listeners struggle to comprehend the message of their speakers. One of the meaningful ways in which learners make input comprehensible is by negotiating with their group members. When learners *negotiate* while interacting in an activity, they ensure that the meaning of an unfamiliar, unclear, or misunderstood word/phrase is clarified in such a way that it satisfies everyone concerned. According to Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, and Linnell (1996), “negotiation between learners and interlocutors takes place during the course of their interaction when either one signals with questions or comments that the other’s preceding message has not been successfully conveyed” (p. 60). Negotiation is instrumental in highlighting a language problem that can subsequently be modified. *Modification* of the language takes place when the learners alter or

change the “incomprehensible utterance” in different ways, so that it is made understandable to their listeners.

It is primarily through negotiation and subsequently via modification that input is made comprehensible. Krashen (1985) strongly believes that *Comprehensible Input* significantly aids second language development. According to Krashen, learners improve in a second language by comprehending utterances that contain target language items a little bit ahead of their current knowledge and which they cannot understand in isolation. The current linguistic knowledge of the learner is termed i while any kind of progression along the comprehension continuum is labelled as $i + 1$. For i to become $i + 1$, the learner has to focus on the meaning of the language rather than its linguistic form: “A necessary condition to move from stage i to $i + 1$ requires the acquirer to be focused on the meaning of and not on the form of the utterance” (Krashen, 1985, p. 70).

Rodgers (1979) believes that an excessive preoccupation with the form of the language, rather than its meaning, can cause the learner to experience feelings of inadequacy and fear. If, on the other hand, the meaning of the intended message is the main criterion for communication, then learners may feel more confident about their abilities and may be willing to experiment with their linguistic knowledge. Therefore, activities that primarily focus on *what is said* (meaning) and not on *how it is said* (form) are capable of fostering real communication among learners. Rodgers, like other proponents of group work, advocates the use of meaning-centered and student-

centered communicative activities in the classroom to increase the general level of motivation.

A student-centered approach causes a shift in limelight in the classroom, as the instructor is no longer perceived as the sole initiator and controller of the language. When evaluating the difference between a class revolving around the teacher and one focusing primarily on the students, researchers have found that the latter is more beneficial to the learners (Bejarano, 1987; Long et al, 1976; Pica & Doughty, 1985; Rulon & McCreary 1986; Taylor, 1983). Learners are in a better position to negotiate the language that they hear, without having to contend with the frequently daunting presence of the instructor (Rulon & McCreary, 1986).

In small groups, learners have more opportunities to verbally interact with their peers and to enhance their communication skills. A factor that affects the quality as well as the quantity of the language that is generated among learners is the size and structure of the group. Studies have highlighted the advantage of pair activities over larger groups with regard to linguistic interaction (Alvarado, 1992; Doughty & Pica, 1986; Senor, 1986; Spelman, 1992; Yule & MacDonald, 1990). Senor (1986) considers students to be more active in pairs since they cannot afford to be uncooperative and reticent with each other, especially if successful completion of the task is their goal. But if the members of the dyad belong to different levels of proficiency in the L2, then the pattern of interaction between them also changes. Doughty and Pica (1986) found that when a more proficient learner and a less

proficient learner are brought together, the former typically negotiated meanings and interacted more frequently than the latter. Alvarado (1992), like Doughty and Pica, discovered that those students who were more verbally active and more proficient tended to overshadow their less active partners during interaction. Yule and MacDonald (1990) believe that if a less proficient member is given a greater chunk of information than a more proficient learner in order to complete an assigned activity, then the former will get more openings to practice and work creatively with the L2.

For certain researchers, it is not merely adequate to have activities laid out for language practice in the classroom; it is imperative to have specific goals set for the learners in order to keep them focused on their task (Doughty & Pica, 1986; Taylor, 1982; Taylor & Wolfson, 1978; Varonis & Gass, 1985b). According to studies by these researchers, conversational practice with no specific aim may be useful, but the learners themselves will benefit more from the interaction if they are made to complete a particular task while communicating in the target language. These types of “structured” tasks, as opposed to their less structured counterparts, ensure a greater degree of involvement on the part of the learners since they have a stake in the outcome. Pica, Kanagy, and Faldoun (1993) delineate four major components of pair activities that, if taken into consideration, will guarantee the greatest language learning opportunities for the participants:

1. **Interactant Relationship**, whereby each participant in the interaction holds a

different but integral piece of information that must be manipulated in order to reach the task outcome.

2. **Interaction Requirement**, whereby both participants in the interaction are required to request and supply this information to each other.

3. **Goal Orientation**, whereby the participants have the same or convergent goals.

4. **Outcome Option**, whereby only one acceptable outcome is possible from their attempts to meet this goal (p. 17).

THE STUDY

Keeping in mind the increasing need for small group verbal interaction, this research project sought to discover and highlight significant types of interactive activities available for use in the L2 classroom. The ultimate goal of the tasks was their successful completion through effective and efficient communication in English.

The structured pair activities chosen for this study were the following:

1. A Jigsaw Activity 2. A Picture Description Task 3. A Guessing Game

1. A Jigsaw Activity was the first task performed by the learners in the classroom. It comprised a picture story consisting of twelve slots with the first and last blanks already filled in for the purpose of giving a definite beginning and predetermined ending to the task. Of the ten slots that were left, pictures were provided for six of them, with one learner being given three pictures and his/her partner handed the other three. There were four slots that remained empty since no pictures had been provided

for them. The rationale for leaving certain slots empty was to give learners an opportunity to negotiate and arrive at a decision as to what type of picture would be most appropriate for a given slot and then, to draw it. *Successful task accomplishment* in this activity was defined by each pair's ability to place the six given pictures in suitable slots and to draw four appropriate pictures of their own in the remaining slots, so that the story would proceed logically from one frame to the next. In order to prevent the subjects from spending an excessive amount of time trying to accomplish the task and also to lend focus to the activity, a fifteen-minute time limit was imposed by the researcher.

2. A Picture Description Task was the second task performed by the learners in the classroom. It comprised a picture that was used by one member of the dyad to describe to his/her partner, with the latter taking on the role of the drawer. The describer had to translate the visual representation into the verbal mode, while the drawer had to interpret the verbal output so that s/he could translate it back into the visual mode. Both members of the dyad were given the opportunity to become the drawer and describer by turns. Once the first picture allotted to the pairs was completed, the two learners switched roles, so that a new visual could be given to them. For the first round, all the describers in the dyads were given the same picture to draw. *Successful task accomplishment* for this part was defined by each pair's ability to get **eight** simple elements of the original picture on to their visual. For the second half of the activity,

which immediately followed the first, the new set of describers have access to a visual that was the same for all of them. *Successful task accomplishment* for this half was defined by each pair's ability to get six complex elements of the original picture on to their visual. In order to prevent the subjects from spending an excessive amount of time trying to accomplish the task and also to lend focus to the activity, a fifteen minute time limit for each half was imposed by the researcher.

3. A Guessing Game was the third task performed by the learners in the classroom. It comprised a series of five words on flashcards, with one member of each dyad taking on the role of the clue giver and his/her partner assuming the role of the guesser. The clue giver could take recourse to any number of words in order to make his/her teammate guess the right words. Like the picture description task, this one too had a second half for another fifteen minutes, where the roles of the guesser and the clue giver were reversed. *Successful task accomplishment* for this activity was determined by each pair's ability to get all the words, without the clue giver giving out a part of the word or the word itself. In order to prevent the subjects from spending an excessive amount of time trying to accomplish the task and also to lend focus to the activity, a ten minute time limit was imposed by the researcher.

These three tasks-the jigsaw activity, the picture description task, and the guessing game-are examples of activities that bring the learners together in the L2 classroom for purposes of generating greater verbal interaction between them.

STATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main aim of this research project was to address the following questions:

1. Which pair activity, among the three chosen for this particular study, promotes the maximum amount of interaction among the learners, with regard to the total number of communication strategies used?
2. Which pair activity, among the three chosen for this particular study, generates the minimum amount of interaction among the learners, with regard to the total number of communication strategies used?
3. Is there any significant link between successful task accomplishment, interaction, and time limit?

DATA COLLECTION

The data for this particular study were gathered from an upper intermediate ESL Listening/Speaking class at a university. The learners in this classroom came from diverse linguistic/cultural backgrounds and ranged between 20 and 26 in age. For

the purposes of the research project, each member of the class was paired with another student who came from a linguistic background other than his/her own in order to avoid any potential lapsing into a common first language. This step was taken mainly to ensure that the learners had no other option but to use English whenever they wished to communicate verbally with each other. The various dyads were then told to spread themselves in different corners of the classroom and a tape recorder was placed between each pair in order to record their linguistic output.

The language that was generated between each of the pairs was transcribed and subsequently analyzed (see Appendix A for transcription samples). The analysis of the interaction was done in terms of the various communication strategies that were used by the different dyads. *Communication strategies* are strategies that are mainly utilized in order to bridge the gap that exists between the learner's limited knowledge of the target language and his/her attempts to communicate effectively by putting this knowledge to use. According to Tarone (1981), "communication strategies are used to compensate for some deficiency in the linguistic system, and focus on exploring ways of using what one does know for the transmission of a message" (p. 287). These strategies, which are largely responsible for modifying the conversational structure, include features such as confirmation checks, clarification, self-repetition, and expansion. All the strategies and their definitions, along with examples, are presented in Chapter 3.

This particular study purports to explore the following research question:

“What types of structured pair activities between NNSs facilitate verbal interaction?”

In the chapters that follow, this question will be answered as exhaustively as possible and the most interactive pair activity will be identified for further use in the second language classroom.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction:

This chapter gives an overview of the different perspectives on group work in language learning and teaching. The adoption of the communicative approach in the language classroom has enhanced the appeal of group activities since students are provided with more opportunities to learn, not just from the teacher but from each other. The learners are no longer seen merely in isolation but are perceived as a cohesive unit that has come together to achieve common goals. Usually, the sheer size of a language classroom precludes the possibility of all the students simultaneously interacting with each other on a regular basis. Therefore, teachers try to break down the class into smaller units, where the opportunities to practice the target language are considerably greater.

In an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting, it may not be extremely efficacious to divide the class into groups for the sole purpose of communicating in the second language, since the students may display a propensity to lapse into their common native language. In an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom, on the other hand, the students are often from diverse linguistic backgrounds. In such a situation, the presence of small groups may work to the advantage of the teacher and the students, especially since the latter will have no option but to talk in English with those learners who do not share their own first language.

Once the students come together in groups with their peers, the stage is set for them to be initiated into group work. Group work itself may be defined as any activity that requires students to come together in pairs or groups that are any size smaller than that of the whole class. In order for group work to be successful, the student-student interaction should be given precedence over the teacher-student alliance (Johnson, 1981). In the more conventional classroom, most of the student language is directed toward the teacher and not the peers. Barnes (1976) elaborates on the distinction between teacher-student talk and student-student talk by referring to the former as “final draft talk” (p. 113) and the latter as “exploratory talk” (p. 113). One of the predominant characteristics of the final draft talk is that it is frequently rehearsed by the student and almost always produced for teacher approval. Conversely, the inherent feature of the exploratory talk is its spontaneous nature, as the students take recourse to the various processes of language rather than its final product.

Webb (1982), like Barnes and Johnson, believes that a key characteristic that distinguishes a cooperative setting from other types of learning settings is the interaction that takes place between the learners. According to Johnson and Johnson (1994), co-operative learning situations create a need for positive interdependence among the students, since the learners realize that their individual goals can be achieved only if the other students in the group also attain their goals. This type of work encourages students to take more responsibility for their learning and also helps them to unearth their own potential.

Making learners more autonomous and providing them with a feeling of self-sufficiency are just some of the reasons for the necessity of group work, according to Long (1976). He clearly delineates the significant factors that make group activities a desired and integral part of the language classroom. Long is of the opinion that students will see language learning as more than a mechanical process if they derive pleasure out of it. Even as the quantity of the language output increases because of the reduced size of the group, the quality of language also undergoes positive changes. The learners become aware of the creativity and flexibility inherent in language and find themselves less inhibited to experiment with it. But Long introduces a note of caution with regard to an unrestrained and often untested use of group work: "A sudden, wholesale abandonment of existing practice is a dangerous undertaking; more advisable would be a gradual introduction or increase in the use of group work" (p. 288). Teachers should explore the level of comfort with the students as well as with themselves when such a learner-centered approach is adopted. The teacher could experiment with the group size, its composition, formation, and internal structure in order to arrive at a combination that is most beneficial to everyone concerned.

Modifications in the Role of the Instructor:

The creation and maintenance of a learner-centered atmosphere through the use of group work redefines the traditional role of the instructor. The teacher is now a person who envisions mutual support and cooperation in the classroom as a replacement for excessive competition and individualism. Another domain that comes

under scrutiny is the extent of teacher control over the structure of student-student interaction. There is a continuum that ranges from absolute control where the students are merely carrying out the teacher's implicit instructions to a stage where the learners have the complete autonomy to handle the task in their own way, with the instructor merely acting as a facilitator (Johnson, 1981, p. 117). A certain degree of "mental flexibility" (Long, 1976, p. 291) is indispensable for everyone in the language classroom during this time of transition. Long (1976) believes that it is the teacher more than the learner who has to accept the redefinition of the hitherto traditional roles: "Teachers...often take quite some time to learn how best to use the 'freedom' thrust upon them by a change from the lockstep [teacher-centered] system" (p. 293).

Long et al.(1976) found that the difference between a class revolving around the teacher (*lockstep*) and one focusing primarily on the students (*small group*) had significant implications for the learners. Their study was carried out in a language classroom, where the lockstep method was the dominant approach. For the purposes of the study, a pair of students were chosen at random and sent to a different room to carry on a discussion that had been initiated in class by the teacher. Recordings were made of the speech of the remaining students in the classroom and also of the two students who were conversing with each other in an adjoining room. Towards the end of class, the pair rejoined the full class for the final ten minute recording of a lockstep continuation of the same discussion. After the tapes were transcribed and analyzed, it was found that there was a greater quantity and quality of language production in the

small group. An interesting related finding was that the students working on the same discussion task, utilizing identical materials, and having the same initial exposure to the task and the language that went with it, were doing a greater variety of things with language when working with another student than with a large group of fellow students and the teacher leading the discussion. Pica and Doughty (1985) conducted a similar study and found that even though the input was more grammatically accurate in the teacher-fronted class, the amount of input and language production for each student was greater in the small group discussion.

Taylor (1983) recognizes that not all teachers would be willing to relinquish their role as the overt leader of the classroom, but for those who want to take the chance, it does promise rich rewards. According to him, those instructors who are oriented towards a communicative approach in the classroom have to create an “environment in which it is possible to engage in task-oriented activities mediated through language, but not focusing on it” (p. 78). Taylor advocates the use of information gap activities in the classroom in order to foster a truly communicative environment. Tasks that require the bridging of information gaps provide students with the scope to experiment with language above the sentence level and to handle information that is new and often unexpected. Small groups are ideal for such information gap tasks since students find an imminent need to communicate while pooling their linguistic resources for the purpose of completing the activity. Even as the students are familiarizing themselves with their new position of control in the

classroom, the teachers have to do their part in maintaining this interactive climate. The instructors should structure and outline the group activities to make them conducive for extensive communication: "We [the language teachers] take the students' communicative attempts in the target language as the starting-off point for our instruction, rather than the rule or the structure of the language" (p. 84). The decentralization of control in the classroom will play a significant part in the learning process, as the students would not be solely guided by the teacher demands, but would be more influenced by what they need to do in order to accomplish their own goals.

Rulon and McCreary (1986) argue that the absence of stress and pressure in the more intimate environs of a group are largely responsible for its success. Learners are in a position to negotiate the language that they hear, without having to contend with the frequently intimidating presence of a teacher. Rulon and McCreary tackle the issue of negotiation of content in their study. They define negotiation of content as "the process of spoken interaction whereby the content of a previously encountered passage (aural or written) is clarified to the satisfaction of both parties, either NSs or NNSs" (p. 182). For the purposes of their study, they chose NNSs who were enrolled in two sections of the same advanced academic listening class. Whole class discussions (with the teacher acting as the prime facilitator) and group discussions that had the same topic as the former were analyzed. The findings revealed that there was no difference between the amount of informational content that was dealt with by the students in groups and by the class that looked to the teacher to provide the necessary lead. One

clear implication of this finding is that students need not always expect the teacher to aid them in their efforts since they are capable of getting the necessary help from themselves and from their peers.

A similar result was obtained by Bejarano (1987), who carried out her study among seventh grade ESL learners in Israel. Her group comprised a total of 781 students who were taught by 18 instructors. Two small group techniques were tested for efficacy against a whole-class approach. The performance of the students was gauged by means of frequent observations as well as the utilization of a specialized achievement test that was administered before and after the experiment. Those students who had taken part in the cooperative learning effort scored higher in the tests than their counterparts who were involved in the traditional, whole class approach. The personal involvement of the students in a meaningful exchange of ideas and information enhanced their performance in the group tasks. The observational component of the study revealed that in classes where the students were communicating with each other, their interaction took up nearly 40%-80% of the class time. On the other hand, those classrooms which were teacher centered had the instructor lecturing for more than 80% of the time, thereby limiting "spontaneous and unhibited language use" (p. 495) by the students. Bejarano recommends the use of small group techniques for bringing about a state of "dynamic cooperation" between learners and building an "intimate learning and social atmosphere in the classroom" (p. 485).

Advantages of Group Work:

Long and Porter (1985) examined the importance of group work in a language learning classroom from a psycholinguistic perspective. Since the success of group work has repeatedly been examined from a pedagogic point of view (increased motivation, conducive learning atmosphere, improved quality of work, greater language practice), the authors contend that this type of activity should be given more significance in a classroom. Studies show that NNS/ NNS conversation, which is sometimes referred to as Interlanguage Talk, is more beneficial to the learners than NS/NNS talk: "Although learners cannot provide each other with accurate grammatical and sociolinguistic input that NSs can, learners can offer each other genuine communication practice" (p. 217). It has been found that learners exhibit a greater degree of manipulation of input when they are trying to negotiate meanings with other learners (or NNSs) rather than with NSs. Part of the reason for this finding may be the initiative taken by the NSs to repair breakdowns in communication as often as possible. In a typical NNS/NS exchange, it is usually the latter who switches topics more often and reactivates communication breakdowns on a more regular basis. The NNS is given few opportunities to play as important a role as the NS in such circumstances. But with a NNS/NNS combination, communication becomes truly a shared activity as both learners use their limited knowledge of English to keep the conversation flowing. Another important related finding is that pairs having a mixed L2 proficiency tend to obtain more practice since they are trying innovative techniques

to access as well as provide information. As there is no startling difference between teacher-initiated and learner-initiated quality of work, especially as far as level of accuracy is concerned, Long and Porter iterate the encouragement of group work in the classroom.

Peer groups may even be responsible for the acquisition of requisite social skills. Looking at language learning from a social perspective, Kramsch (1985) found that learners not only discovered the different uses of language in small groups, but also handled a variety of discourse behaviors such as turn taking and requesting information, which would hold them in good stead when carrying on conversations outside the classroom. In her study, Kramsch collected data from 21 American undergraduates learning German as L2. She divided them into groups and assigned each group a specific topic for discussion. When the data were analyzed, it was found that the absence of a teacher made the students themselves take the initiative to fulfill the necessary group-task functions and group-maintenance functions that kept the discussion flowing along the right channel. In spite of floundering occasionally, the students still managed topics, took turns, and repaired breakdowns by using their own resourcefulness and limited language skills. Kramsch's study clearly illustrates the point that students become more adept at using the L2 when they are interacting with their language learning peers. Interestingly, their independence also comes to the fore within the confines of the group because each member is solely responsible for getting his/her information across successfully to the others.

Bygate (1988) cites group work as an instance of learning the language through use, since the learners are given a chance to test their skills and strengths in the L2 with their peers. He contends that learning can be perceived with clarity in oral discourse as the learners are constantly assimilating new information (in manageable units) from others around them and storing it for future use. In NNS/NNS exchanges, Bygate found that learners often have to make significant decisions with the limited knowledge of the L2 that they possess. Learners have to decide the size of language chunks they want to operate with, adjusting them - where they have the necessary resources - to their listener's level of comprehension. At the same time, as listeners, they intervene at those places where they need the incoming speech to be broken down, by interrupting and requesting clarification wherever necessary. Thus, student-student interaction allows for a certain flexibility within the restricted realm of the learner's knowledge of the L2, by offering an element of choice. The learners are in a position to choose, either individually or through a collaborative effort, the most efficient syntactic units for communication. This type of flexibility and freedom invests the learners with a sense of power that can partially quell their feeling of helplessness and ineptitude in the language classroom.

Rogers (1979) also addresses the issue of learner self-perception in the classroom. The student is typically overwhelmed by the need to avoid embarrassment when communicating in front of the whole class. Therefore, it does not seem surprising that students are more comfortable with choral repetition, where it is hard

for the instructor to single out one particular learner for attention. Rogers warns that such an approach may not be a suitable model for speaking the language since the learners are not using their own words but merely mouthing those of another individual. An inordinate amount of emphasis on the form of the language rather than its meaning may thus cause the language learner to experience a feeling of inadequacy and fear. Rogers, like many other researchers who are strong supporters of group work, advocates an increased use of learner-centered activities in the classroom.

There are a lot of potential benefits of group work, both for the teacher and for the learners. Group work is extremely useful in a classroom where the teachers are unable to give individual attention and feedback to their students. McGroarty (1991) identifies five major advantages related to group work - 1. More opportunity to produce output - Students are provided with a chance to use the target language in ways which would have been denied to them if it had been solely a teacher-fronted class; 2. More redundant language - By breaking the class into groups, the teacher creates opportunities for students to transmit messages to each other that may be more redundant than statements in a text. Studies have shown that a greater redundancy (achieved through deliberate repetition, reinsertion of topic etc.) improves comprehension; 3. Appropriate in the level of linguistic accuracy - Use of group work can provide practice at a level of accuracy appropriate to the learners, in part because the small group interaction, with its greater opportunity for student participation and negotiation, provides more opportunities for learners to correct themselves and each

other; 4. Appropriate in the shape of linguistic units - Group work can sometimes provide the scaffolding needed to help a peer express information that is accurate, not only semantically, but in appropriate linguistic form especially in cases of mixed proficiency levels); 5. More varied in discourse patterns, with specific reference to questions - Students have more opportunities to ask questions, when compared with a teacher-centered class, where the teacher's authority role can discourage question asking. There is also a greater use of referential questions that have the potential to enhance discussions.

Treatment of Error in Group Tasks:

Another important realm that the teacher has to focus on is that of error identification and its subsequent correction. If the instructor assigns group activities to the class, how is the issue of error tackled? This is the main question under investigation in Bruton's and Samuda's study (1980). For their research, they enlisted a group of adult ESL learners attending an in-service English language course at the Institute of English Language Education, University of Lancaster. The learners were videotaped while trying to perform a variety of problem-solving tasks, with no intervention from the teacher. Bruton and Samuda found that the absence of the teacher did not necessarily make the learners ignore their own errors or those of their peers. Instead, they often corrected themselves or their language learning partners whenever it was within their ability.

In Bruton and Samuda's study, error correction was broadly classified under the category of *syntactic error* (errors with tense or verb forms), *lexical error* (use of wrong words), *error in pronunciation*, and *error in understanding* (usually involving a particular command). But at the same time, there were certain errors which were not even noticed by the learners, and even if they were detected after a certain time lapse, the students had no idea how to correct them. When the teacher steps in to facilitate communication, s/he sees only the product of the error and has little or no inkling of the process that has been responsible for bringing the interaction to that stage. S/he is unaware of the accretion of misunderstanding that has taken place and merely rectifies the external manifestation of the error. One of the ways that teachers can concentrate on the process as well as the product of the error is by unfailingly providing post-performance feedback. This type of feedback allows the teacher to discern when the students were on track and when they veered off in the wrong direction. Also, the appointment of a peer observer in every group would be helpful to record the zone(s) of error. The crux of Bruton and Samuda's argument is that students can be made more self-sufficient in group work if they are explicitly taught how to identify errors and tackle them by employing various strategies, before a breakdown in communication occurs. Gardner (1987) argues that error correction in small groups is sometimes given undue attention, especially when its actual contribution to interaction and task completion is negligible. In his study, he employed a communication game called "Describe and Arrange" which required a group of 46 learners to come together

in pairs. In each dyad, one member had a pre-arranged set of pictures, while the other had the identical individual pictures which had to be put in the same order. None of the pictures were numbered, so the learners not only had to find a particular picture but also locate it in the right place. Gardner found that the percentage of self and other-correction was significantly low, when compared with other interaction strategies. Only 13.4 % of the errors were self-corrected and only 6.9% of them were corrected by the peers. An interesting related finding dealt with the use of clarifications. Those pairs who were successful at completing the task used fewer clarifications than those who were unable to reach the goal. Therefore, Gardner infers that seeking clarification on a frequent basis is an indication of a lack of success, rather than a necessary formula for task completion. Gardner was also unable to detect any direct correlation between successful communication and successful completion of task since those pairs who did not reach the goal showed no tangible difference in their verbal patterns when compared with their successful peers.

Significance of Input and Interaction:

The importance of all kinds of verbal interaction for the learners is highlighted by Seliger (1977). His study was based on the hypothesis that L2 learners who played an active role in interaction would show better results in tests when compared with their less active counterparts in the classroom. Seliger defines interaction as “an output speech act by the learner and an input speech act from some other speaker” (p. 265). Out of a pool of more than thirty candidates, he chose three High Input Generators

(HIGs) and three Low Input Generators (LIGs) for observation. The HIGs were classified as those students who hardly ever missed an opportunity for contact and practice in the L2: "By initiating language interaction, the high input generator causes a reflexive response in the form of more language input to himself" (p. 265). On the other hand, the LIGs were typically reticent in class and rarely utilized the openings that were provided to them: "Their (LIG) behavior is reactive to input but they do little to initiate situations which cause more input to be directed to them" (p. 265). The period of observation for the researcher lasted the whole semester which comprised fifteen weeks. Scores of the six students were taken from the placement examination held at the beginning of the term and compared with their achievement in the tests given at the end of the term. It was found that the HIGs had improved a great deal on their scores over the fifteen week period while their less interactive counterparts did not show any dramatic increase. In Seliger's view, the HIGs, who were constantly communicating in the classroom, either with the instructor or with their peers, fared better mainly because they got valuable language practice throughout the semester. The interaction pattern of the HIGs, either in the form of single word utterances or complete sentences, dominated the discourse in the classroom. Based on results of this study, Seliger concludes that the LIGs need to be valuable sources of linguistic input as well as linguistic output in order for them to become more effective communicators in the L2.

Porter's study (1986), consisting of 12 NNSs of English belonging to different proficiency levels and 6 NSs, sought to discern the different ways in which the speakers of the L2 talk to each other and the potential benefit to be accrued from grouping the learners of a language together. Three main issues were addressed in the study: (1) the difference in input to learners provided by native speakers and by other learners at two levels of proficiency, (2) the difference in production when learners spoke to their peers who belonged to other levels and to native speakers, and (3) the level of appropriateness of the language that was employed by the learners with each other. With regard to (1), it was found that, even though it was essential for the learners to come into contact with native speakers outside the classroom, it was advantageous for them to interact with other learners in the classroom. The learners managed to provide input containing at least two crucial interactional features - repairs and prompts - that are believed to aid second language acquisition. The findings show that learners at the intermediate and advanced levels are able to help their conversational partners as much as native speakers, by various interactional devices. When teamed with speakers of a lower proficiency level, the advanced learners were able to provide better quality as well as quantity of input. They were in a position to render the $i + 1$ that is believed to facilitate acquisition. In what he calls the *Input Hypothesis*, Krashen claims that learners improve in a second language by understanding language that contains target language forms that are a little bit ahead of their current knowledge ($i + 1$) and which they cannot understand in isolation. As far

as the difference in production when learners spoke to their peers who belonged to other levels and to native speakers, the level of production for the learners was greater with other NNSs than with NSs. Also, issues such as accuracy and repair work were more or less at the same level, irrespective of whether the listeners were NNSs or NSs. In the case of the level of appropriateness of the language that was employed by the learners with each other, learners were not in a position to provide each other with appropriate sociolinguistic forms. But this finding does not automatically translate into an avoidance of interaction between learners; instead, it brings to light the need for contact with NSs and the necessity for the explicit instruction of appropriate forms and strategies in the L2 classroom in order to further sociolinguistic competence.

Link Between Negotiation and Comprehension:

Pica and Doughty (1985) conducted a study to evaluate the efficacy of group work in the L2 classroom, with specific reference to the possible effects on second language acquisition. Data were collected from three ESL classrooms during group vs teacher-fronted classroom interaction on decision-making tasks. Within the groups, the first task (Task 1) placed each participant as a contributor to the decision by making him/her express his/her arguments and opinions, but did not necessarily require each of them to make the final decision. It was found that the more proficient learners within each group tended to dominate discussions and influence the final outcome, giving fewer chances to the more reticent and less proficient members. In contrast, the second task (Task 2) entailed equal involvement since each member possessed one

integral and indispensable component of the whole puzzle. It was mainly in the realm of negotiation that significant results were obtained. *Negotiation* may be defined as the conversational adjustments made by the learners in their speech, in order to make the input comprehensible to their listeners. During negotiation, the listener indicates to the speaker that the latter's input has not been comprehended and therefore needs to be modified in some way. In a teacher-fronted class, there was little scope of negotiation for the learners since the instructors smoothed the path considerably by taking most of the initiatives and leads themselves. But in the small group tasks, more interesting patterns were observed. Task 1, which did not require equal participation, did not result in a balanced and proportionate amount of negotiation for all the learners. But Task 2, which was like a jigsaw activity, ensured that all the members displayed their skills in negotiation.

Varonis and Gass (1985a) identified four "primes" used by NNSs to negotiate for meanings - 1. A Trigger (T), which is responsible for the lack of a complete understanding on the hearer's part; 2. An Indicator (I), which is a signal used by the learner to indicate that understanding has not been complete; 3. A Response (R), which is the original speaker's attempt to bring about a repair; and 4. A Reaction to the Response (RR), which may help to continue the discourse or may cause another breakdown. If another breakdown occurs, then this whole process is set in motion once again. By delineating these four major features in a characteristic NNS/NNS exchange, Varonis and Gass draw attention to the negotiating skills acquired by learners. In a

later study, Pica (1991) found that negotiation of meaning is mainly crucial for those learners whose comprehension abilities have not reached a developmentally mature stage. She carried out a task with three sets of learners and a female instructor. All the learners were observed for a period of three weeks in order to gauge their interaction patterns and participation styles in class. Based on these observations, some students were classified as High Interactors while the others were categorized as Low Interactors. The High and Low Interactors were then distributed among three groups named Negotiator, Observer, and Listener groups. The students in the Negotiator group were given the opportunity to interact with the teacher, who was providing directions to carry out the activity. The Observer group could not ask any questions or seek the help of the instructor but it could listen attentively to the teacher while she was communicating with the Negotiators. The Listener group had neither the advantages of the Observer Group nor the Negotiator group. It listened to the teacher who read a prepared text containing a comparable amount of original and repeated input. The text did not outline the negotiation moves that had triggered the various modifications, but merely gave the end product. The results revealed that the High Interactors comprehended a bulk of the information and carried out the task, irrespective of whether they were in the Negotiator, Observer, or Listener group. On the other hand, the Low Interactors benefited the most when they were in the Negotiator group since they could draw attention of the instructor to their areas of incomprehensibility, thereby getting an input that was modified and made

comprehensible just for them. Porter concludes that instructors have to identify the Low Interactors in their own classes and make a conscious effort to negotiate meanings with them in order to ensure a higher level of comprehension.

According to Ehrlich, Avery, and Yorio (1988), success with meaning negotiation is largely determined by the point in the discourse at which the necessity for a negotiation arises. They conducted an experiment using four NS-NNS and four NS-NS dyads at the University of Toronto campus. The different dyads were expected to complete the drawing of a set of pictures, with one member taking on the role of the drawer and the other member being the describer. In the NS-NNS dyads, all the NSs were cast as the describers. During the course of the interaction, two distinct type of strategies were employed by the interlocutors: (1) the strategy of skeletonizing and (2) the strategy of embroidering. These two terms were originally coined by Brown (1972), and their definitions have been expanded by these researchers to make them more comprehensive. Skeletonizing occurs when only the bare essentials of a piece of information are provided; on the other hand, embroidering refers to the way in which the speaker describes the same information in much more descriptive and embellished terms. Ehrlich et al found that the skeletonizers typically abandoned negotiation at deeper levels of the discourse mainly because they felt that they were unable to continue with a particular description. But the embroiderers hardly ever gave up and continued to negotiate meaning even when the extent of misunderstanding and confusion made communication difficult. So, while the skeletonizers conveyed all the

necessary details and made no attempts to get more descriptive, the embroiderers were encountering difficulties mainly because they were getting too descriptive.

Communication breakdowns occurred more often in the discourse of the embroiderers as the speakers were unable to zero in on the trouble spot, (as a result of the accumulation of information): “Embroiderers encountered great difficulty in successfully negotiating meaning once they had to negotiate descriptions of practice deeply embedded items” (p. 411). Ultimately, the skeletonizers were more successful at completing the task than the embroiderers because they did manage to get across all the relevant information. Whenever the skeletonizers were unable to convey a particular detail which was not crucial to the identification of an object, they merely abandoned it. The embroiderers who wanted to get all the intricate details accurately were not able to complete the task in the desired manner as they were too involved in trying to negotiate meanings at the deeper levels of the discourse. The researchers conclude that meaning negotiation is at its peak at the superficial stages of the discourse when information can be clarified much more easily. But the deeper and more involved the discourse gets, the harder it becomes to successfully negotiate meanings.

The difference in the pattern of negotiation between a NS/NNS pair and NNS/NNS pair was observed by Pica et al (1996). The main purpose of their study was to detect the linguistic input, the feedback, and the linguistic output of L2 learners in two different situations-(1) with another learner and (2) with a native speaker. Two

different types of jigsaw activities were given to all the adult male volunteers, ten of whom were NSs while the remaining thirty were NNSs. Results of the study revealed that the NSs were better sources of modified output as well as modified input, since they were capable of isolating and signalling the point at which comprehension was impeded, both for themselves and their NNS partners. But with regard to feedback, there was no substantial difference between the NNS and the NS. This was because the NNS seemed to be as adept as the NS to break down a previous utterance into more manageable units, so that the listener would not have an information overload. Pica et al. conclude that interaction between learners could cater to some of their linguistic needs but it falls short of the modified input that a NS is capable of providing an L2 learner.

De Guerrero's study (1986) sought to identify the strategies used for negotiation of meaning by three pairs of Puerto Rican ESL learners. Verbal interactions comprising a pair activity followed by free conversations in English were video-taped and then transcribed. The analysis revealed that the learners typically corrected and repaired the discourse themselves rather than turning to their partners for assistance. In pairs where learners had varying levels of proficiency in English, the more able learner adopted the role of a teacher and directed the course of the interaction: "Higher proficiency seemed to correlate with more aggressive tactics in conversation: starting or changing topics as well as establishing, demanding, and even usurping turns" (p. 11). A significant observation was the near total absence of the use

of Spanish by the learners, even though they had not adequately mastered the English language. De Guerrero attributes this finding to the explicit instruction given at the beginning of the activities to use only English for communication. One factor that de Guerrero highlights is the “unnaturalness of the discourse” (p.11) since the students were conscious of being video-taped while talking in English and were also aware of the constant need to keep the conversation flowing. Looking at both sides of the issue, de Guerrero admits that even though the verbal interaction may be contrived, it does provide the learners with opportunities to communicate in the L2 with their language learning peers. Another important issue that de Guerrero addresses is that of the task-oriented nature of some types of group activities. The initial pair work that was assigned to the students produced more negotiation features than the unstructured talk, mainly because the learners were conscious of the former’s task-oriented approach.

Task Type as a Crucial Variable:

Duff (1986) found that some task types are more conducive to second language acquisition than others. In her study, she employed two types of pedagogic tasks:

(1) Problem-solving tasks and (2) Debates. These two activities were chosen mainly because they did not necessitate the presence of a teacher. Another reason for their choice was their easy adaptation to suit the particulars of learner interests and needs, especially at the intermediate and advanced levels (even though this particular study sought to control the proficiency variable by choosing learners who were in the same proficiency level). A total of eight learners, four Chinese and four Japanese, were

chosen for the study. When the results were analyzed after the successful execution of various controlled learner combinations, it was found that the debates generated a great deal of individual output but resulted in very little interaction. On the other hand, the problem-solving tasks gave invaluable practice to the learners since it was imperative for them to communicate effectively in order to complete the task at hand. Duff advocates the use of creative problem-solving tasks in the second language classroom since it guarantees to bring about a greater degree of involvement for the learners and also provides them with myriad opportunities to try out their knowledge of the L2 in a relatively risk-free environment.

Varonis and Gass (1985b) also stress the need for teachers to devise structured activities that will put the negotiation skills of the learners to full use. According to them, the type of task is a crucial variable in acquisition and if a suitable task is not devised, then acquisition may not take place even in a conducive NNS/NNS setting. Varonis and Gass advocate the use of structured two-way tasks in the language classroom, where the information flows in both directions. Nunan (1991) advises teachers to pay special attention to the proficiency levels of the students before structuring interactive tasks for them. In his study, he found that the lower and intermediate levels profited more via interaction when they were involved in *closed tasks* (with a predetermined goal) as opposed to *open tasks* (with a more flexible approach to task accomplishment).

According to McGroarty (1991), it is essential to find out what types of group work actually generate practice in L2. If the learners have to deal with merely linguistic forms in their groups, then there is little scope for active participation and communication. Also, appropriate task selection takes on another dimension when academic knowledge base comes into play. If the teachers have been assigned the task of making the learners proficient in a particular subject, then group work has to correspondingly undergo modifications: "Teachers must balance demands for complexity of linguistic forms and pace of turn-taking with those of the density of new information involved to allow for an optimal balance of language practice and content learning" (introduction p. 50).

Taylor and Wolfson (1978) caution teachers against the use of totally free and unstructured student talk, since it might be a wasted effort: "Encouraging them [the students] to engage in unfocused conversation in class not only robs students of valuable instructional time, but does not even teach them fluency, since such discussions are usually dominated by students who are already fluent" (p. 31). Taylor, in a later article (1982), reaffirms his belief in a more structured approach when he states that a program should be based on issues that "encourage students to accomplish specified task or goals, and not just practice" (p. 37) in the target language.

Efficacy of Pair Activities:

While exploring the hierarchy of efficacious classroom activities with regard to verbal interaction, certain researchers have found that tasks which require learners to

come together in pairs are more successful overall than (1) larger group-oriented activities and especially (2) teacher-fronted tasks. In Senor's (1986) experiment, the second language learners found themselves teamed up with another member of the class for the purposes of using a simple yet innovative technique called the Classroom Pairing System. In the Classroom Pairing System, each pair is handed a picture card that shows a particular aspect of the lesson that is being taught. The students then have the freedom to choose any type of a format, ranging from a question and answer session to simple statements, in order to generate interaction between them. Once a pair is done with its card, it passes the visual on to the next team and in turn gets a new picture from the pair that is sitting right next to it. Even though it needed a lot of practice to overcome the initial confusion of passing the cards, Senor found that the learners began to communicate a great deal once they had warmed up to the activity. While admitting that this technique does not make room for a lot of creativity on the part of the learners (since they have to adhere to a certain format), Senor strongly advocates its use, especially for the benefit of the visually-oriented students. Senor attributes a major chunk of this technique's success to the size of the group. The embarrassment or apprehension of talking to a big group in a foreign tongue is almost negligible since the students have the opportunity to relate to just one other learner at a time. Also, there is a greater chance of all the learners being involved in the assigned task if they are in twos as they cannot afford to slacken off or be uncooperative: "Even

the slowest or most apathetic student participates when the class practices in pairs” (p. 84).

Doughty and Pica (1986) also found evidence in their study that the composition and structure of the group itself has a significant effect on the outcome. In their research, they required the students to (1) come together with a teacher (2) form small groups (referring specifically here to units having more than 2 members) and (3) pairs in order to complete the assigned activity. The pairs produced more language and negotiated to a greater extent than the student-comprised larger group and the teacher-comprised group. At the same time, the study raises some important questions with regard to the negotiating abilities of the individuals who get together to form a dyad. If a more proficient student and a less proficient student make a unit, then there are chances that the former will not find the need to negotiate as much as expected since s/he may understand everything that is being directed towards him/her. On the other hand, the less proficient learner, feeling awkward or embarrassed at his/her position of disadvantage, might remain silent and thereby be unable to process all the linguistic input that comes his/her way. Combining students belonging to different levels of verbal proficiency may have its inherent disadvantages as well as advantages.

Proficiency of the learners is one of the leading variables in Yule and Macdonald's study (1990). They brought together a group of 40 international students (from different linguistic backgrounds) in the Louisiana State University campus and divided them into a Higher Proficiency Group (HPG) and a Lower Proficiency Group

(LPG) based on their TOEFL scores. Each HPG member was paired with a LPG member and the total number of pairs were then further subdivided into two major groups of ten pairs each. The difference between these two groups essentially consisted of who played the dominant role in each pair. For one set of 10 pairs, it was the HPGs who held the greater chunk of information and found themselves in the dominant role while in the other set, the LPGs were given the opportunity to play the more prominent part. The researcher gave each member of the pair a separate map showing a grid of city streets. One learner, labelled the sender (the dominant role) had to verbally retrace a delivery route that was highlighted in his/her map to the receiver (the less dominant role) who in turn had to mark the path on his/her map. There were four specific referential problems incorporated in the design of the task and the manner in which the pairs addressed each problem was the main point under analysis. Successful negotiation was not measured in terms of the number of interaction features used but was determined by the way "the interactants resolved the conflict" (p. 542) that arose periodically. Some intriguing but not completely surprising patterns emerged during the course of the interaction. When the HPGs were the more powerful senders of the information, they tended to treat their less proficient counterparts as being incapable of contributing anything of substance to the discourse and more or less overruled everything that the latter had to say. The tasks were completed with these pairs, but with the minimum amount of interaction and negotiation since the HPGs felt it was their prerogative to outline the course of the activity, with limited

input from the less proficient receiver of the dyad. On the contrary, when the LPGs found themselves in the more important and dominant part of the sender, they clarified and tried to make sense of what the receivers possessed in their own maps, without constantly sidestepping or overruling every discrepancy. According to the researchers, the LPGs are generally more active verbal interactants when cast as senders since it "places them in a type of spoken interaction in which, instead of only responding with passive backchannels, they participate in the joint creation of linguistic structures" (p. 552). Based on the conclusions of this study, it seems obvious that the less proficient members of the group have to be given a more important role in the interaction processes so that they can direct the path of discourse as much and as often as possible and also get valuable verbal skills in the bargain.

Alvarado (1992), in her study, classifies the member of the dyad who directs the course of the interaction not as more proficient but as the more active one. Alvarado's research question in her project deals with patterns of student participation within dyads and the myriad factors that influence them. A total of ten students were observed and studied: six from the University of Florida's English Language Institute and four from the University of Panama's Centro Regional Universitario de Chiriqui. Based on the input from their respective ESL instructors, five of the subjects were categorized as "non-active" while the remaining five came under the heading of "active". The learners were placed in sets in which a "non-active" speaker was paired alternately with an "active" and a "non-active" partner. Two-way, one-way and non-

directional (no specific goal) tasks were given. The analysis was two-pronged. The first part dealt with the measurement of the speech production of each speaker per task in terms of fragments, T-Units, phrases, and words. The second component, which was the more crucial one, dealt with the qualitative analysis of three aspects of discourse: a) Conversation Management, pertaining to the direction and control of the conversation, b) Information Presentation, dealing with the realm of contribution of ideas to the conversation, and c) Interaction, involving the work with the other speaker to solve a particular problem through joint effort. As expected, those students who were judged to be verbally active maintained a strong grip over the activities by managing conversations, contributing information and making decisions more than their nonactive partners. Moreover, speakers tended to maintain "similar patterns of participation regardless of the discourse styles of their partners, the task type or the language" (p. 591). This is a significant point since it reveals that discourse style plays an active role in determining a particular student's performance on interactive tasks.

Using Alvarado's study as the foundation, Spelman (1992) undertook research on the patterns of discourse styles as observed in "active" and "non-active" students. According to Spelman, it is not appropriate to refer to a student-oriented activity as "group work" since this label does not capture all the dimensions of this type of an activity; she prefers calling it an Interactive Communicative Task (ICT) since this title is much more descriptive of what is actually supposed to take place in the language classroom. Her study, which loosely expands on Alvarado's project, addressed two

major questions: 1) What kind of effect does bringing together learners of *similar* discourse styles have on the outcome of ICTs? 2) What kind of effect does bringing together learners of *different* discourse styles have on the outcome of ICTs? The goal of the study was to ascertain which particular combination produced the maximum opportunity for "collaborative negotiation of meaning" (p. 5). Spelman selected eight international students from a freshman level English grammar and composition class and paired them in the following combinations: **A)** Active (Sender)/Active (Receiver), **B)** Non-active (Sender)/Non-active (Receiver), **C)** Active(Sender)/Non-active (Receiver), **D)** Non-active (Sender)/Active (Receiver). The ICT given to the learners was a picture description task which was to be accomplished using only verbal skills. The total number of utterances of each pair was computed and placed under different types of negotiation/interaction categories. It was found that pair A, which consisted of the two most active learners, recorded the maximum number of utterances in each category. Pair B, which had two non-active students placed together, was responsible for the least number of utterances in each category. In pair C, which had an active sender and a non-active receiver, the sender took the initiative for most of the utterances but still, there was some amount of verbal output on the part of the non-active receiver too, unlike the results of pair B. With regard to pair D, although the conversation was controlled by the active receiver, the non-active sender had no option but to respond and negotiate meaning, by virtue of his/her more controlling position. Spelman draws some of the same conclusions as Alvarado with regard to discourse

styles and the degree of “activeness” of the students. Active students took center stage in both combinations in which proficiency styles were mixed. But with regard to bringing together non-active students, it appears as though it would not be beneficial to either member of the pair. Instead, pairing a non-active member with an active member would serve the purpose of generating interaction, even though most of the interaction is initiated by the active member of the dyad. In this connection, Spelman’s study goes one step further than Alvarado’s research project. According to Spelman, the dominance of the active students on task progression and outcome should not be considered detrimental since it was basically their initiative that set the stage for negotiation of meaning: “Without responsibility for the management of the conversation assumed by one of the partners, or shared equally as occurred with the pair of active students, negotiation of meaning...could not have been accomplished” (p. 21).

Significance of Communication Strategies:

It is the inability to communicate efficiently in the language classroom that prompts learners to make use of various strategies while interacting with the instructor or with their peers. Communication strategies are mainly employed in order to forge a link between the learner’s limited knowledge of the target language and his/her attempts to communicate effectively by putting this knowledge to use. Ellis (1984) suggests that a study of the type of communication strategies used by the learners could indicate their possible level of fluency (not accuracy) in the target language.

Ellis considers communication strategies to be conscious as well as problem-oriented since they are used by the learner to make up for what s/he lacks with regard to the target language resources.

In his study, Ellis brought together two sets of young learners-one group comprising six native English speakers in the age group of ten to twelve and another set consisting of six ESL learners belonging to a similar age bracket. Each student was asked to recount a picture story given by the researcher to his/her instructor and the linguistic data were audiotaped. Two distinct types of strategies were isolated for analysis - (1) the avoidance strategy, whereby the speaker gives up or tries to avoid mentioning a certain detail due to its linguistic complexity and (2) the paraphrase strategy, where the speaker does not relay the message directly but gives the information in a roundabout and circuitous fashion. For purposes of comparison of the two groups' employment of these two distinct strategies, a number of key information bits were characterized as being necessary for a good rendition of the tale. The results revealed that the native speakers used both the avoidance and the paraphrase strategy to a much lesser degree than their nonnative speaking counterparts. This was mainly because the native speakers had the requisite skills to communicate the story to their instructor, without having to resort to strategies that would "cover up" their linguistic inadequacies. According to Ellis, a greater use of the paraphrase strategy and a lesser use of the avoidance strategy by a learner would be indicative of an increased level of proficiency since the student is willing to tackle a greater part of the information,

albeit not so efficiently. But the learner who neither paraphrases nor avoids is considered to be acquiring an almost native-like proficiency in the target language since s/he does not have to rely excessively on either type of strategy to communicate.

Ellis (1986) later modified the paraphrasing and the avoidance strategies in order to subsume a greater number of communication strategies under them. He calls them the *reduction strategy* (a more inclusive version of the avoidance strategy) and the *achievement strategy* (a modified and more descriptive version of the paraphrasing strategy). Using the achievement and the reduction strategy as the basis, Khanji (1996) undertook a study comprising 18 pairs of EFL learners at the University of Jordan. These pairs equally represented the low, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. The main research question in Khanji's study was the role of proficiency in the use of communication strategies. He found that the low level students used a greater number of reduction strategies (like repetition and abandonment) since they wanted to "reduce the intended original message due to a perceived inability to overcome the communication problem" (p. 149). With the intermediate group, there was a greater use of achievement strategies like transliteration, as these learners were slowly beginning to discover the creativity and flexibility of language. The advanced group used the achievement strategy of topic shift since they had discovered ways of communicating in an alternate way, once a particular channel was closed. Adopting a psycholinguistic perspective, Khanji delineates the progression of the students from the lower to the higher stages of proficiency. In the early stages of language learning,

the learners are completely under the control of their limited linguistic knowledge. But as they progress along the learning continuum, they begin to control their language and are therefore able to work with it in creative ways. In another study, Khanji (1993) sought to identify the pair activity that generates more achievement strategies than reduction strategies among the learners. He employed two tasks-(1) the interview type of a format where one learner asks questions and the other responds (2) the strategic scenario task where learners are given roles by the instructor and asked to enact scenes from their encounter. The scenario task was more successful in generating achievement strategies than the interview task since the former was flexible, spontaneous and full of opportunities to manipulate the language. If instructors want learners to produce more achievement strategies during their interaction, then Khanji strongly recommends the use of scenario type tasks.

Drawbacks of Group Work:

Even while examining the advantages of structured small group activities involving NNSs, it is important not to lose sight of their drawbacks. One of the major disadvantages of NNS/NNS talk is that pidginized varieties of the language may evolve that may be detrimental to ultimate language proficiency. A pidgin comes into existence when the learners do not strive for accuracy in any domain and utilize their limited vocabulary to convey only the bare essentials of their message. Brumfit (1984) believes that an emphasis on communicatively oriented activities "may result in the development of fluent pidgin, but not of a full fledged language system, capable of

being used with maximum native language-like proficiency" (p. 131). There is also a chance of the learners becoming fluent but "fossilized," since they may not be exposed to correct/accurate forms and it may eventually be a futile exercise in trying to "defossilize" them (Johnson 1992). Fossilization occurs when the learners are given error-ridden forms as linguistic input for extended periods of time, while they are progressing along the learning continuum. Another disadvantage of NNS/NNS pair work is that the learners may get deviant and inaccurate input since their peers' interlanguage is not sufficiently well-developed (Ellis 1984). Also, the negotiation for meanings sought by learners of a monolingual background can lead to the negotiated acceptance of non-standard rather than standard L2 forms (Aston, 138). It is for some of these reasons that researchers suggest the need for a greater amount of NNS/NS interaction. Not only will such an interaction ensure that the learners get the accurate forms of the TL from the NSs, but it also paves the way for the $i + 1$ that learners may need for acquisition to take place (Long 1982). Also, the presence of a NS shifts the sometimes heavy conversational burden from the NNS to the NS's shoulders.

Bringing NNSs together, in the absence of NSs, may have its inherent disadvantages, but in the language classroom, it is perhaps one of the most successful ways for learners to communicate creatively and effectively with their peers. In this study, the students in an ESL classroom were brought together in dyads for the purpose of identifying their communication patterns and interaction styles while performing three different activities. The next chapter provides significant details

about the three communicatively oriented activities and also describes the methods employed to analyze the data that were obtained from them.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH SETTING AND DATA COLLECTION

This chapter gives background information about the participants in the study and the procedure that was adopted to gather data from them. The data for this thesis were collected during the regular meeting of an upper intermediate ESL Listening/Speaking class at a university. The researcher went to the ESL class a week prior to the day of data collection and briefed the students about what the research would entail. All the learners were informed that they need not take part in the study if they did not so desire/did not have the inclination. One factor that the researcher found problematic was the size of the class. The total number of students was eleven and this was not compatible with the design of pair activities, which had the potential of including only ten members and did not allow the extra individual to participate. The ESL instructor for the Listening/Speaking class promised that she would bring in an additional student from a short-term ESL class which takes place in the same building and around the same time as her own Listening/Speaking class.

Two students from the class of eleven did not show up the day the project was scheduled. Fortunately, there was a special ESL program for Japanese students in the same building, which had two Japanese learners as observers. The instructor brought one of them over to the Listening/Speaking class in order to even out the numbers. The chairs in the classroom were then spread out in twos, and a microphone attached to a tape recorder was placed on the table between them. Each student was asked to form a

dyad with someone who did not share his/her own native language. This step was taken to ensure that the students verbally communicated only in English. Out of the ten subjects, five learners were Japanese, two were Thai, and the other three were Saudi Arabian, Costa Rican, and Korean respectively. Five of the learners were male while the remaining five were female. The students were paired in the following manner: Thai male/Japanese male, Korean male/Japanese female, Costa Rican male/Japanese female, Saudi Arabian male/Japanese female, and Thai female/Japanese female.

Nine of the participants had successfully passed the previous level of the ESL Listening/Speaking class. Their presence in the upper intermediate class indicated that they had reached certain milestones with regard to their proficiency in the English language. As far as pronunciation was concerned, they could identify basic falling and rising intonation patterns in English. In the area of listening, they had revealed their comprehension skills by performing tasks like following maps and filling out applications and graphs. As for speaking skills, they could ask for as well as give basic information, ask for and give opinions, and persuade someone of their point of view. (These are just some of the major characteristics of their level of development in the various skill areas. A more comprehensive account of their proficiency is provided in Appendix B which contains the exit criteria for the previous speech level to which the participants belonged.)

The tenth subject of the study was a Japanese female who had been included in the upper intermediate class to bring the number of volunteers up to ten. She was an observer in one of the other ESL classes that was taking place in the same university building. Neither the regular ESL instructor nor the researcher had any information regarding the verbal proficiency of this particular participant who had been brought into this class just for the purpose of this project.

As the researcher wanted to conduct a classroom experiment where the learning atmosphere would be natural and not contrived, she gathered data during a regular class session whose duration was an hour and forty five minutes. The researcher started out by explaining the relevant information in the consent form which the students had to sign before commencing the activities (see Appendix C for a copy of the consent form given to the students). After all the participants had indicated their willingness to participate in the study by signing their names on the form, the research project was set in motion. The students were asked to occupy seats with their partners and turn on the tape recorder when the researcher signalled them to start the first activity. A time limit of fifteen minutes was set for them to complete this activity. Once the different dyads had accomplished the goal, they had to turn off their tape recorders and wait for the second activity to commence before turning on the recorder again. The second task comprised two parts with a fifteen minute limit allotted for each half of the activity. A short snack break was provided for the learners after the completion of this task and before the beginning of the final activity. The last

task on the list also consisted of two parts, with a ten minute limit set for each of the two sections. The tape recorder was once again turned on, so that the learners could record the linguistic output for this particular task also. The researcher was present in the classroom, essentially as an observer, during the entire duration of the project.

When the researcher began to transcribe the tapes, she found that one of them was completely inaudible because of poor recording quality. As a result, the researcher had no option but to eliminate this particular tape from data analysis. So, only the linguistic data from the following four pairs were taken into account: Thai male/Japanese male, Japanese female/Korean male, Japanese female/Costa Rican male, and Saudi Arabian male/Japanese female. The cassette comprising the language of the Japanese female and the Thai female was not used at all.

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE THREE ACTIVITIES

Jigsaw Activity

Total Number of Participants: 8

Total Number of Pairs: 4

A	B
---	---

C	D
---	---

E	F
---	---

G	H
---	---

AB, CD, EF, and GH put the jigsaw together as pairs

The **jigsaw activity** was the first one on the list of tasks to be performed by the learners in the classroom. It comprised a *picture story* consisting of twelve slots with

the first and last blanks already filled. The presence of a picture in the last slot provided a predetermined ending to this activity and was indicative of its goal-oriented approach. Both members of the dyad had to work towards that goal, which was visible to them. Of the ten remaining slots, pictures were provided for six of them, with one partner being given three pictures and the other member handed the remaining three. These visuals were drawn by the researcher and cut out in such a way that they could fill six of the empty slots. The learners in every pair were supposed to look at their own set of pictures first, without showing them to their partners. Having taken a good look at their visuals, they were then expected to talk about them to their teammate and justify why they wanted to place a certain image in a specific slot.

In order to successfully complete the activity, the learners had to come together to decide on the type of pictures for the four remaining slots and, subsequently, draw them. The researcher did not insist that both members contribute to the drawing part of the activity, as long as they just came to a consensus on the logical progression of the story. This activity was modelled on the jigsaw type of task where learners get together in small groups and arrive at a common goal through negotiation and sharing of information. Since it was the learners' communication skills that were being put to the test, it was important that they translate their images into the verbal mode. Within the circumscribed realm of this particular activity, there were many opportunities for the learners to practice their budding linguistic skills, as they were not expected to

make any decision without taking into consideration the views and ideas expressed by their partner.

An issue of consequence with regard to the storyline of the activity was the degree of autonomy and flexibility given to the pairs. The dyads were not in a position to change the beginning or the ending of the story since these pictures had already been placed in their appropriate slots. The first picture was of a young girl feeling extremely cold while gazing at the thermometer that showed a reading of 35 degrees Fahrenheit. The last picture showed the same girl, now dressed in winter gear, standing next to a snowman and smiling. Apart from these two visuals, the researcher also provided the pairs with a sense of direction in the story by giving them pictures (three individually) which would fill six of the empty slots. One picture showed the girl gazing out the window at the snow, another showed her thinking of making a snowman, a third was that of her wearing a sweater while the fourth had her wearing long pants. The fifth showed her getting her cap on and the final visual depicted the young girl leaving her doorstep and making her way into the snow-covered yard. These six visuals had to be placed in suitable slots and their purpose was to give a definite clue as to where the story was heading.

Picture Description Task

Total Number of Participants: 8

Total Number of Groups: 4

A (P1)	B (P2)
Dr*/Des**	Des/Dr

C (P1)	D (P2)
Dr/Des	Des/Dr

E (P1)	F (P2)
Dr/Des	Des/Dr

G (P1)	H (P2)
Dr/Des	Des/Dr

* Drawer

**Describer

P1 = First Picture

P2 = Second Picture

For the second activity, the researcher introduced the **picture description task** which was not as inclusive of the verbal and visual mode as the jigsaw activity. In each dyad, one person took on the role of the drawer while the other member became the describer. The essential difference between the drawer and the describer was that the former had to completely rely on the latter's communicative abilities since the drawer did not have any access to the visual. The describer was in a much more controlling position than the drawer since s/he not only saw the picture during its process of creation but also constantly gave feedback as to whether the image being duplicated was satisfactory or not. Unlike the jigsaw activity, there was a definite and pressing need to get the message across since only the describer had all the information and it was up to this individual to see when and how the goal was reached.

Apart from drawing the picture, the drawer could facilitate the completion of the task by ensuring that the information being relayed was comprehended and executed successfully. It was at this point that the drawer began to assume as crucial a role as the describer. The drawer could also take the initiative, if s/he so desired, by pre-empting any new information that the describer had to offer. If the drawer adopted such a stance, then the describer would not be in a position to continue with his/her

leading role since the prerogative to introduce new information was not solely in the domain of the describer.

In order to establish a smooth communication channel, the drawer as well as the describer had to make sure that they clearly understood what they were trying to convey to each other. Both members of the dyad were given the opportunity to become the drawer and the describer by turns. Once the first picture allotted to the pairs was completed, the two learners switched roles, so that a new visual could be given. For the first round, all the describers in the dyads were given the same picture to draw. It consisted of a man in a conical star-studded hat, wearing a button-down shirt with a pocket and checkered tie. He had small eyes, big ears, a round nose and a broad smile which showed eight of his teeth. Just below his lips was a tiny cleft. Once the learners who were the drawers in the different groups finished recreating the picture, the researcher collected them and introduced the second half of the activity. For this part, the researcher gave a different picture to the groups. It consisted of a cat-like figure with a small travelcase. It was wearing sunglasses, had a camera slung around its neck and wore a flowery beach shirt and beach. A time limit of fifteen minutes was set for each half of the activity.

Guessing Game

Total Number of Participants: 8

Total Number of Groups: 4

A	B
CG*/G**	G/CG

C	D
CG/G	G/CG

E	F
CG/G	G/CG

G	H
CG/G	C/CG

*Clue Giver

**Guesser

The third and final activity scheduled for the group of learners was the **guessing game**. For this task, one member of each dyad was given a list of five words on a piece of paper which s/he had to get across to his/her partner. The clue giver could provide any number of words in order to make his/her partner guess accurately. There was a ten minute time limit set by the researcher for the completion of one half of the activity. For the first half, the words that were provided in the list were **taste, marriage, famous, love and plastic**. Like the picture description task, this one too had a second half for another ten minutes, where the roles of the guesser and the clue giver were reversed. For the second half, the following words were given to one member of each pair: **fire, medicine, past, connect, and laugh**. Before giving the words to the dyads, the researcher showed the list to the Listening/Speaking instructor who indicated that the learners had come across those vocabulary items in class. This step was taken to make sure that no pair approached the activity with a lack of awareness of the meaning of the words provided. Unfortunately, neither the teacher nor the researcher knew the extent of the vocabulary knowledge of the Japanese learner who had been brought into this class just for this project.

This particular task posed certain unique challenges since the clue giver had to be extremely clear and could not afford to mislead the guesser in any way. Unlike the

picture description task where the learners were able to keep each other on track through the visual that was being created before them, the guessing game offered no such leads. The clue giver had little or no idea about what was going on in the guesser's mind until the latter offered some feedback on his/her line of thinking. The further the pair moved from the word and its related associations, the harder it was to bring them back to the target word.

This particular game could be considered a **goal-oriented activity** since the words that the partner was required to guess had already been given by the researcher and it was basically the approach that each team took that was unique. A crucial challenge that this activity faced was with regard to the initial momentum. When this momentum was lost, the pairs struggled a great deal because they tended to veer each other off course.

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE DATA

The researcher first of all transcribed the four tapes that were available for analysis. Each of the tapes had data from a total of five activities-one jigsaw activity, two picture description tasks, and two guessing games. The language generated from each activity was analyzed by means of the verbal interaction patterns exhibited by the various dyads. The nonverbal communication that was observed between the members of each pair was not taken into account during data analysis. The amount of verbal interaction generated by each activity was measured by the number of communication

- a) a single word: KM: *eyes?* (a communication strategy)
- b) two or more words: JF: *sea cool?* (a communication strategy) *how do you spell?* (a communication strategy)

In order to make a comparison of the interaction patterns of the participants with regard to the three tasks, the researcher a taxonomy comprising various communication strategies used by the pairs:

1. **Expansion:** The speaker expands on an existing utterance in order to make it more descriptive.

CM: and she put this clothes *she put this kind of clothes to go outside*

2. **Self-Repetition:** The speaker repeats his/her own complete utterance or part of the utterance, typically for the sake of emphasis.

TM: yeah just glove *just glove* then this picture put pant

3. **Other Repetition:** The hearer repeats the speaker's utterance, usually in order to indicate comprehension. In case the hearer has not understood the meaning of the words completely, then there is always potential for further interaction.

Example:

JF: this picture is she wants to make

CM: *make* yeah

4. **Clarification:** This strategy occurs when one partner signals to the other that s/he could not get the full import of a previously introduced piece of information and, therefore, needs some additional details for the sake of clarity.

Example:

TM: yeah just glove just glove then this picture put pant

JM: *put pant and shoes?*

5. **Approximation:** The speaker is unable to convey the desired information accurately and therefore provides a description that comes as close as possible to the original. This type of an approximation could also involve the coining of a new word in English.

Example:

JF: this picture is she wants to make

CM: make yeah

JF: snow *snowdoll* [for snowman] I don't know

6. **Self-Correction:** The speaker corrects himself/herself in order to prevent a misrepresentation or misinterpretation of the information.

Example:

JM: he dont hand hold carry *he dont carry* just put down

7. Other Correction: The listener corrects the words of the speaker in order to stay on target and also to reveal to the speaker the appropriate word or phrase to be used in that particular instance.

Example:

JF: its a simple check yeah like that and another way side to side

KM: you mean *cross*

8. Temporary Abandonment: This strategy refers to the way in which one member almost gives up his/her contribution to the interaction by revealing an inability to carry out a particular action (it is usually phrased in the **negative**). If the other member does not come to the rescue or if the learner experiencing the difficulty does not repair the discourse soon, there is an imminent threat of a communication breakdown.

Example:

CM: and she *I dont know what to draw*

9. Confirmation Check: The speaker's implicit but unstated question in this strategy is "Did I hear you correctly?" The speaker uses a rising intonation while repeating the words of the other member, in order to indicate that it is a query.

Example:

KM: may may is the season of rose

JF: *lose?*

KM: rose

JF: *roses?*

10. Agreement: This strategy indicates that one member of the pair agrees with the way the other learner is handling the activity. Members of the dyads are promoting task accomplishment by not contributing anything to their partner's ideas or by not creating any opposition to the execution of their partner's idea.

Example:

SM: actually the temperature getting lower that she she is thinking about winter
the snowman ok?
JF: *ok*

11. Turntaking Signal: This strategy is used by one member of the dyad when s/he wants his/her partner to contribute new information to the discourse. The turntaking signal can take two forms:

a) as a leading question asked by the initiator of the strategy to his/her partner

Example:

JF: *one part is what?*
KM: leg
JF: *is it standing or lying?*
KM: lying

b) as a pause after the initiator's incomplete utterance

Example:

CM: *yeah she* [pause]
JF: she looked at outside

12. Negation: The speaker negates a particular claim made by the listener and this aids interaction because the task is more focused in its approach. It is important for negation to be followed by either the introduction of a new piece of information or the

clarification of the existing information; otherwise, there is a distinct possibility of a breakdown in communication.

Example:

KM: take medicine
JF: yeah so...
KM: what kind of medicine?
JF: *no no no take*

13. Introduction of New Information: This strategy is utilized for the purpose of introducing a new idea or piece of information into the discourse. It can be of two types:

a) a response to a turn initiated by the other member

Example:

S: what kind of picture do you think we will draw here?
J: *a girl making a snowman*

b) a self-initiated move

Example:

JM: *very short and big foot*
TM: no leg cant fit leg is very big
JM: *and he wearing sandal*

14. Affirmation: This strategy is used when the speaker affirms to the listener that the latter has successfully understood the former's message.

Example:

J: Ah! triangle hat
T: *yes yes and there are stars on the hat*

The data available from the four tapes were analyzed for the purpose of isolating the different communication strategies used by the dyads. The strategies employed by each of the pairs in the five activities were identified for categorization. One significant step that was taken with regard to the strategies was their subdivision into three sections. Table 1 illustrates the way in which the different strategies were categorized under three main headings.

Table 1

The Categorization of the Fourteen Communication Strategies

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information	Strategies used by the member who possesses less information	Strategies used by either member
1. Expansion 2. Negation 3. Affirmation 4a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn 4b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move	1. Other Repetition 2. Clarification 3. Confirmation Check 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question	1. Self-Repetition 2. Self-Correction 3. Other Correction 4. Temporary Abandonment 5. Agreement 6. Approximation

In the jigsaw activity, where both members possessed an equal amount of information, it was assumed that these three distinctions would ideally not exist and members of the various dyads would contribute more or less an equal number of strategies in order to complete the activity. But with the picture description task as well as the guessing game, these distinctions were expected to come into existence since one member of the dyad possessed more information than the other. In the picture description task, the describer was in a more controlling position since s/he

was the holder of the information. On the other hand, the drawer was in a less controlling position since s/he was the recipient of the information. Similarly, in the guessing game, the clue giver held the information while the guesser was in the more passive role of receiving and interpreting the information that was given to him/her. Therefore, the researcher expected the describers and clue givers in the picture description task and the guessing game respectively to supply or at least contribute a greater proportion of the strategies of (1)expansion, (2)negation, (3)affirmation, (4a)introduction of new information as a response to a turn, and (4b)introduction of new information as a self-initiated move (the list of strategies from the first column). This was mainly because the describers and the clue givers were the ones having the advantage of introducing the information available to them in different ways. They could expand an existing utterance in order to add more details to it (*the strategy of expansion*), negate a claim made by their less “informed” partners (*the strategy of negation*), affirm that the listener has understood their message clearly (*affirmation*), initiate new information into the discourse (*the strategy of introducing new information as a self-initiated move*), and introduce new information by responding to a turn initiated by their partners (*the strategy of introducing new information as a response to a turn*).

Conversely, the researcher assumed that the drawers and the guessers in the picture description task and the guessing game respectively would supply or at least contribute a greater proportion of the strategies of (1)other repetition, (2)clarification,

(3)confirmation check, (4a)turntaking signal as a pause, and (4b)turntaking signal as a leading question (the strategies from the second column). This was because the drawers and the guessers were in the more passive and less controlling role of receiving the information that was directed to them, without having a lot of opportunities to introduce new information on their own. They were in a position to repeat their partner's utterance (*the strategy of other repetition*), clarify the message that was given to them (*the strategy of clarification*), confirm whether they heard a piece of information accurately (*the strategy of confirmation check*), pause at the end of their utterance in order to let their more "informed" partners fill in the missing information (*turntaking signal as a pause*), and ask a leading question (*turntaking signal as a leading question*).

The strategies listed in the third column in Table 1 could be contributed by either member of the dyad, irrespective of the amount of information they possessed. Either member could repeat his/her own utterance (*strategy of self-repetition*), correct himself/herself (*strategy of self-correction*), correct the other individual in case of an error (*strategy of other correction*), abandon the discourse temporarily due to problems encountered (*strategy of temporary abandonment*), agree with a particular point of view (*strategy of agreement*), and give a description that came as close as possible to the original (*strategy of approximation*).

With regard to the strategies that distinguish a member having more information from his/her "less" informed partner and viceversa, a significant issue

arose. If the more “informed” member played a passive role in the discourse, then the researcher anticipated that s/he would contribute more strategies from the domain of the less “informed” member. Similarly, if the less “informed” member wanted to play a more active and controlling role, then the researcher anticipated that s/he would contribute more strategies from the domain of the more “informed” member. But if the more and less “informed” members retained their roles, then the contributions from their respective domains would be greater than those in the domain of the other member. The next chapter analyzes the effects of information distribution on the interaction patterns in each dyad.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

In this chapter, the focus will be on the results of the analysis of the data available from the four pairs. The pairs themselves were placed in the following order:

- First Pair/Tape 1: Japanese Female/Korean Male (JF/KM)
- Second Pair/Tape 2: Japanese Male/Thai Male (JM/TM)
- Third Pair/Tape 3: Japanese Female/Costa Rican Male (JF/CM)
- Fourth Pair/Tape 4: Japanese Female/Saudi Arabian Male (JF/SM)

The language that was generated between the members of the different dyads was categorized solely on the basis of the communication strategies that were utilized in order to complete the tasks. Any linguistic output that was not directly related with task accomplishment was deliberately ignored. This step was taken to ensure that only the language that was employed for the purpose of carrying out a task was taken into consideration. If a pair tended to digress or move away from the task at hand while talking, then that segment of verbal interaction was not analyzed for the identification of communication strategies. An example of a characteristic digression is cited here. This chunk is taken from Tape 2, while the learners were performing the jigsaw activity[the italicized chunk is treated as a digression]:

- TM: Yeah...can you draw a picture?
- JM: Yeah, ok
- TM: Ok...because I am not a good drawer. I like this picture *because I know that you will go to be architecture in the future.*
- JM: *Yeah...I have to do like that*
- TM: *Does architecture popular in Japan?*
- JM: *What?*

TM: *Does architecture popular in Japan?*

JM: *Yeah. Its very popular in Japan*

TM: *Yeah same as in Thailand. Architecture can make a lot of money*

JM: *Oh really? Architecture can make a lot of money in Japan too* (pause)

Once the different communication strategies employed in the activities were identified, they were then placed under one of the fourteen distinct categories that had been created (as described in chapter 3). The taxonomy of strategies was defined and made discrete in such a way that no strategy could be placed under more than one category. After all the strategies had been categorized, the data were analyzed. In the jigsaw activity, the researcher anticipated each member of the dyad to contribute more or less an equal number of strategies since the information necessary to accomplish the task was distributed equally among the pairs. With the picture description task and the guessing game, the researcher expected the describers and the clue givers to have a greater contribution from the list of strategies utilized by members who possess more information (refer Table 1 in chapter 3). With regard to the drawers and clue givers, the researcher anticipated that they would make a greater contribution from the list of strategies utilized by members who possess less information (refer Table 1 in chapter 3).

THE JIGSAW ACTIVITY

The activities themselves were initially analyzed on the basis of their placement in the hierarchy of activities. The first task to be investigated was the

jigsaw activity. Table 2 shows the total number of strategies used by the members of each pair while doing the jigsaw task.

Table 2

Total Number of Strategies Used in the Jigsaw Activity

Pairs	The various members of the dyads	Total number of strategies used
Pair 1	Japanese Female	74
	Korean Male	41
Pair 2	Thai Male	60
	Japanese Male	37
Pair 3	Japanese Female	48
	Costa Rican Male	58
Pair 4	Japanese Female	22
	Saudi Arabian Male	59

The jigsaw activity was a picture story comprising twelve slots with the first and last slots already filled, in order to give a definite beginning and conclusive ending to the task (see Appendix D for the incomplete picture story given by the researcher). Of the remaining ten slots, pictures were provided for six of them, with each member of the dyad being given three (see Appendix D for the appropriate slots for the six pictures given by the researcher). The four remaining slots for which no pictures had been provided were to be filled in by the dyads themselves. The researcher expected the learners to interact a great deal in the initial stages of the activity since both members of the dyad possessed a different piece of information. But what actually occurred in

this study was that the pairs, who were not very fluent in English and did not share a native language, made a hesitant attempt initially to verbally translate their set of images but soon showed the pictures to their respective partners. Interestingly, the participants in each dyad began to warm up to the activity only after taking a look at all the six pictures available to them. Three of the four pairs accomplished the task within the allotted fifteen minute time limit. Only the fourth pair, comprising the Japanese female and the Saudi Arabian male, did not complete the activity at the end of fifteen minutes. Table 3 shows the amount of time taken by each of the pairs to complete the activity:

Table 3

Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete the Jigsaw Activity

Total Time Given	Amount of time taken by Pair 1	Amount of time taken by Pair 2	Amount of time taken by Pair 3	Amount of time taken by Pair 4
15 minutes	14 minutes	10 minutes	13 minutes	15 minutes (did not complete)

Each pair approached the jigsaw activity (comprising the picture story) in different ways. The picture story itself involved a young girl who looked at a thermometer positioned at 35 degrees Fahrenheit. When she looked out her window, she found that it was snowing outside. Seeing all that snow made her want to create a snowman but she found herself dressed inappropriately for the occasion. So, she donned her jacket, her gloves, her snow boots and her pants and ventured outside to build her snowman in the yard.

First Pair's Handling of the Activity:

The first pair, consisting of the Japanese female and Korean male, started out with a certain amount of uncertainty. The Korean was not sure if the first scene depicted snow or rain and wanted his team mate to confirm it. The benefits of sharing the activity with another individual were evident here as the Korean learner realized that he could always turn to his partner in case he was not confident or certain about one of his own ideas.

KM: *do you think is it rain or snow?*

JF: *I think its snow because this is snow so*

KM: *how about this?*

This pair's handling of the activity seemed to indicate that they did not pay a lot of attention to the final picture. As a consequence, their storyline tended to have major discrepancies and they found it quite a challenge to accommodate the six pictures given by the researcher. But there was one feature about their approach to the activity which made it a shared enterprise. They decided that irrespective of their drawing abilities, each of them would graphically represent the two pictures required of them.

This pair characterized the whole story in terms of the different seasons, starting with winter, followed by the distinguishing features of the other seasons and their accompanying scenarios. They broke up the pictures in terms of the different months of April, May, June, and August. During spring and summer, the girl went fishing and then hiking on Mount Hood. She also made a trip to the beach during this time period. But there was no sense of closure to this activity because the pair was

unable to decide what to do with the girl after she went to Mount Hood. So, the ending of the story was abrupt, where the girl was back in her yard and giving finishing touches to her snowman (see Appendix D for the first pair's picture story) . The Japanese learner, more than her Korean counterpart, was pleased with the progression of the task and at the end, it was she who concluded that the activity had been completed.

- JF: *what is this? hiking or something? or no? to Mount Hood or to mountain and volcano ?she's young is that very deep mountain? yeah thats good Mount Hood? no what? oh height ! yeah thats good yeah thats cute thats neat yeah its pretty and we have to ok I think our picture is better than last our picture is better than last sorry true*
- KM: *yeah drawing pictures is hard work*
- JM: *you're sure? you think so?*
- KM: *yeah*
- JM: *but its easy its fun you dont think so ?*
- KM: *this look very childish*
- JM: *yeah and we finished*
- KM: *alright*
- JM: *ok we finished*

Instead of supplying an equal number of strategies to the activity, the Japanese female contributed 74 and her partner provided the remaining 41(total number of strategies used: 115). The turntaking signal was the most frequently used strategy (Japanese-32/Korean-9), followed by the strategy of agreement (Japanese-7/Korean-12). New information was introduced equally by the pair (10 each) and the strategy of confirmation check was employed 11 times (all of them used by the Japanese female). Figure 1 on the following page shows the frequency of the more significant strategies with regard to this particular pair.

Figure 1

Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Korean Dyad

The sum of 115 communication strategies can be misleading in itself since a majority of the strategies were not used to accomplish the predetermined goal. The dyad did pursue a particular storyline but it did not take the course that the researcher had chosen. Instead, it tended to veer off in a totally different direction, right from the second picture itself, which was not placed in the appropriate slot. This particular dyad did use a great deal of communication strategies but they did not accomplish the goal in the expected manner.

Second Pair's Handling of the Activity:

The second pair, comprising the Japanese male and the Thai male, came closest to the researcher's own ideas about how the story should proceed. In their

version of the story, the girl wanted to make a snowman because she saw the freezing temperature and the snow outside and then dressed appropriately for the occasion. Based on their linguistic interaction, as heard in the tape recording, this pair appeared to have arranged the sequence of the available pictures first, and then proceeded to create pictures of their own that would fill the empty slots. Since both of them were busy using their hands in order to lay the pictures in the right order, there was not a great deal of verbal communication at first. Then, the momentum slowly picked up and they began to converse while the Japanese learner was drawing the four remaining pictures. The Thai learner decided to delegate the responsibility of drawing to his Japanese partner since the former was of the opinion that he could not draw properly. Even though the Thai student did not do the drawing himself, he provided the Japanese learner with valuable tips on what the pictures should depict.

TM: *Yes we have finished picture no 5, girl is wearing glove this look good*

JM: *Thank you glove?*

TM: *Yeah just glove just glove then this picture put pant*

JM: *Put pant and shoes?*

TM: *No just pant because this picture oh oh wear shoe already they have already wear shoes*

With this pair, there was not a great deal of interaction because new information was introduced and dealt with rapidly, with the minimum amount of negotiation involved for both parties. There was no clarification, no affirmation or even temporary abandonment with this pair. They seemed to be totally in tune with each other's way of thinking and with the activity. The exchange of information for

this pair followed an efficient pattern, with very little repetition and constant introduction of new information.

TM: *So after this, it should be three picture like this that part of pant and shoes*

JM: *Shoes. Then this picture*

TM: *This picture may put here*

JM: *Oh yeah I think wearing pants and shoes ok*

TM: *Wearing glove and shoes*

JM: *This doesn't take a cap?*

The strategy of introducing new information was used 16 times. The Thai male introduced new information more (14) than his partner (2). The other frequently used strategies were that of turn taking (Thai-5/Japanese-9) and agreement (Thai-7/Japanese-9). Figure 2 on the following page shows the frequency of the more significant strategies with regard to the second pair.

Unlike the Japanese/Korean dyad, which did not proceed with the story in the expected fashion, this particular pair completed the task without discrepancies and in the most appropriate manner,. All the pictures that were provided by the researcher were placed in suitable slots and the four pictures that had to be created by the pair were also executed perfectly (see Appendix D for the second pair's picture story). The total number of strategies totalled only 67, the least employed by any of the pairs. This dyad did not find a great deal of necessity to interact since they knew where the activity was heading. At the same time, they seemed to be experiencing little difficulty in understanding each other's ideas and pieces of information.

Figure 2

Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Thai Dyad

Third Pair's Handling of the Activity:

The third pair, comprising the Japanese female and the Costa Rican male, wanted to make the little girl enjoy the snow with a companion. In their version of the story, the girl first of all asked her mother's permission to step outside into the snow. Then she called her friend, who in turn, asked his mother.

CM: *maybe maybe maybe she call a friend*

JF: *ah ok ok*

CM: *I dont know*

JF: *so she called her friends*

CM: *and tell him that meet her*

JF: *but her friends can couldn't come here*

CM: *ok how can I do that ?*

JF: *she called ok*

CM: *yeah she called her to see if he want to play with her at her home*

JF: *yeah but*

CM: *no but suppose that guy wants to play so he did the same*

JF: *ahh*

CM: *he just go and ask his mother*

After the little boy's mother gave him permission, both friends went out to play and the creation of a snowman got underway. Since the pair was not in a position to change the last frame which showed only the little girl next to the snowman, their story too tended to have an abrupt ending (like the first pair), with no sign of the friend who helped out with the snowman (see Appendix D for the third pair's picture story).

As both members had equal access to the activity, the threat of having a potential breakdown was frequently circumvented. When one of them felt that s/he was getting stuck, s/he turned to the other member for help. When both of them were unable to come up with any viable options, they just moved on to the next piece of information

CM: *she go out she play with the snow*

JF: *yeah yes maybe this order is correct I dont know this line*

CM: *yeah I dont know too what do you think about number two?*

JF: *hmm*

This pair used 106 strategies, with the Japanese female contributing 48 and the Costa Rican male supplying the remaining 58. The most frequently used strategies were turntaking(Costa Rican-13/Japanese-6), agreement(Costa Rican-5/Japanese-25), and the introduction of new information(Costa Rican-25/Japanese-8). Figure 3 on the following page shows the frequency of the more significant strategies employed by this pair.

With regard to the Japanese female's 48 strategies, it was interesting to note that 25 of them comprised the strategy of agreement, whereby the Costa Rican male

typically introduced new information and the Japanese female accepted his suggestions. There was very little dissent on her part, which could be attributed to any number of reasons, including her lower level of proficiency in the English language. Even when the pair decided to make it a truly shared activity by taking turns to draw the remaining pictures, the Japanese learner either let the Costa Rican completely decide how the figures should be created or she waited for approval once she had taken initiative on her own.

Figure 3

Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Costa Rican Dyad

Fourth Pair's Handling of the Activity:

The fourth pair, consisting of a Japanese female and a Saudi Arabian male, could not complete the activity in the time allotted, so the researcher was unsure about

the outcome as well as the progression of the pair's views on the story. What emerged was that the girl was first eating a snack and then drinking a hot liquid, before she prepared herself to face the cold outside the house (see Appendix D for the fourth pair's picture story). The researcher was not sure as to why the dyad introduced the idea of summer in the course of performing this activity, whose story was undoubtedly set in winter.

SM: *I think so it shows she is trying to warm herself*

JF: *hmm hmm*

SM: *and here is the last one we can I think and she starts yeah we we will yeah I am trying to draw that she is now since the weather is changing and she is thinking of two idea two subjects about the winter activity you know and the summer activity yeah*

The Saudi learner had no prior knowledge of the language proficiency of his partner since the latter was new to the class (having been brought over from one of the Japanese short term programs offered at the university). He began by lending a sense of direction to the discourse and soon found that his partner was unable or unwilling to contribute an equal share to the activity. When his frequent attempts to make the task more inclusive met with failure, he just gave up and took complete control.

SM: *and this will be the picture what do you think? she doesnt have yeah because she is wearing the jacket now and you think this picture follow each other or next to each other? or we have to leave blank here what do you think?*

JF: *(silence)*

SM: *like not this one here because this picture doesnt have*

JF: *pants*

SM: *yeah it has pants but it doesnt have hat or its over here there is a problem which picture that we will draw you think it fit? what kind of picture do you think it will be here?*

JF: *(silence)*

As the Saudi male became aware of the lesser degree of proficiency of his partner, he took on the leading role. He tended to take on the responsibility of increased language output, as a result of which very little negotiation took place. His utterances were extremely long, especially when contrasted with the frequent pauses and silence of his partner. Whenever the Saudi male tried to make the activity more inclusive by requesting information or eliciting the opinion of his partner, the latter did not respond immediately. In order to avert a potential breakdown in communication, the Saudi male took the onus of verbal interaction on himself.

This pair used a total of 81 strategies during the course of performing this activity, with the Saudi Arabian male supplying 59 and the Japanese female contributing 22. Out of the Japanese learner's total of 22 strategies, 15 of them were agreement strategies which indicate that she mostly concurred with the Saudi male's ideas and his handling of the activity, offering little or no input of her own. The other two significant strategies were the strategy of turntaking (15) and the introduction of new information(41). The Japanese learner did not employ the strategy of turntaking at all and introduced new information only five times. Figure 4 on the following page shows the frequency of the more significant strategies with regard to this pair.

This dyad, apart from the Japanese/Thai pair, was the only one which did not temporarily abandon the task because of problems encountered with communication or execution of ideas. This was mainly due to the Saudi male's constant bid to keep the communicative channel alive with his contributions to the discourse.

Figure 4

Significant Strategies Used by the Japanese/Saudi Arabian Dyad

THE PICTURE DESCRIPTION TASK - Part 1

The second activity to come under scrutiny was the **picture description task**. This activity was made up of two sections, with a separate picture for each part. A time limit of fifteen minutes was set for each half of the activity. The first half of the second activity was analyzed for the purpose of isolating the communication strategies. Table 4 on the following page shows the total number of strategies used by the members of each dyad while doing the first part of the picture description task.

Table 4**Total Number of Strategies Used in Picture Description Task (Part 1)**

Pairs	The various members of the dyads	Total number of strategies used
Pair 1	Japanese Female (describer)	77
	Korean Male (drawer)	27
Pair 2	Thai Male (describer)	70
	Japanese Male (drawer)	34
Pair 3	Japanese Female (describer)	38
	Costa Rican Male (drawer)	28
Pair 4	Saudi Arabian Male (describer)	41
	Japanese Female (drawer)	14

The first picture given to the describers in all the pairs consisted of a man who possessed the following details in his appearance: (1) a conical star-studded hat, (2) a button-down collared shirt with a pocket, (3) a checkered tie, (4) small eyes, (5) big ears, (6) a round nose (7) a broad smile which showed eight of his teeth and (8) a tiny cleft below his chin (see Appendix E for the picture given to the dyads). Success in this activity was measured by the number of details that each pair was able to get across. If a particular pair managed to incorporate all the eight details in their picture within the time limit, then it would be considered successful. Even if a pair managed to get seven details across, it would not be considered successful. The describers were expected to convey the visual details to the drawers in their respective dyads. All the dyads completed the task on or before the fifteen minutes that was allotted for this half

of the activity. Table 5 shows the amount of time taken by each pair to complete the first half of the picture description task.

Table 5

Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Total Time Given	Amount of time taken by Pair 1	Amount of time taken by Pair 2	Amount of time taken by Pair 3	Amount of time taken by Pair 4
15 minutes	10 minutes	9 minutes	5 minutes	6 minutes

First Pair's Handling of the Activity:

For the first half of the picture description task, the Korean male was the drawer and the Japanese female was the describer. The describer started out by giving an overall description of the individual in the picture which was followed by a part-by-part analysis of the whole appearance. The drawer sought confirmation and clarification at regular intervals during the course of the interaction.

JM: *yes please oh no no this way his eye is long after down is long no*

KM: *its like circle ?*

JM: *yeah yeah yes like that and bottom is black and top is white bottom is black in the eye in the middle of eye bottom is black you have to*

KM: *like this?*

Even though the final picture created by the drawer did not look just like the one given by the researcher, seven of the details were included, with only the cleft missing (see Appendix E for the first pair's picture). This pair used a total of 104 strategies, with the describer supplying the greater chunk of 77 and the drawer providing the remaining 27. Since the describer was the one who held all the information, it was not

surprising that her contribution to the total number of strategies was more than that of the drawer. Table 6 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in her own domain of strategies (column 1) and in the domain of her less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 7 shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in his own domain of strategies (column 1) and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 6

Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese describer)
1. Expansion: 12 2. Negation: 10 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 3 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 23 4. Affirmation: 7 TOTAL: 55	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 2 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 3 TOTAL: 5	1. Self-Repetition: 8 2. Self-Correction: 4 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 5 TOTAL: 17

Table 7

Strategies Used by the Korean Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Korean drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Korean drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Korean drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 2 2. Clarification: 5 3. Confirmation Check: 11 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 1 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 6 TOTAL: 25	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 1 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 1

This pair retained their respective roles in this activity, with the describer in the more controlling position and the drawer in the less controlling and more passive position. The retention of roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Japanese describer had more strategies in her own domain (55) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (5). Similarly, the Korean drawer had more strategies in his own domain (25) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (1). There was no bid made by either the drawer or the describer to exchange roles in the activity. The describer retained her more active role in the discourse and the drawer did not make any attempt to seize control.

Second Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

The second pair’s picture came closest to the one given by the researcher with regard to dimensions and specificity of detail (see Appendix E for the second pair’s picture). The Thai male was the describer and the Japanese male was the drawer. This pair handled the activity in an orderly fashion, without making even one attempt to abandon messages. The describer was not interrupted until he had given all the information he wanted to, and in case the drawer still could not comprehend something, he took the initiative and clarified the unclear message.

TM: *His eye is something like small, small egg, egg, egg*

JM: *Egg?*

TM: *Yeah egg shape he has black eye not all, just only lower half just only half his eye lower*

JM: *Lower? Here?*

The describer introduced most of the information into the activity. The drawer rarely took the initiative since he was preoccupied with executing the commands of the describer. The success of the first activity seemed to have paved the way for the dynamics for this particular task since there was no effort displayed by the less powerful drawer to seize control.

A brief moment of task-related digression, which promoted a greater amount of interaction but delayed task accomplishment, occurred when the describer was trying to get a piece of information as accurate as possible but failed in his attempts. The drawer did not comprehend the reference that the describer was trying to make and there was the threat of a potential breakdown

TM: *Yeah. He wear hat*

JM: *Hat? What kind of hat?*

TM: *Something do you know Merlin?*

JM: *Merlin?*

TM: *King Arthur and the round table knight fairy tale fairy tale...*

But the Thai quickly recovered and made another reference which was easier to grasp.

TM: *its something like triangle hat*

JM: *Ah! triangle hat*

TM: *Yes! Yes and there are stars in the hat*

The only detail that the Thai male missed was the cleft on the chin and towards the end, he gave up, after making a serious bid to describe it:

TM: *He has a neck*

JM: *Neck?*

TM: *Yes no, no, no I don't know what can I call it? This have something longer. There should be some space for neck. It is in the semi-circle shape. I cannot explain it. I think its okay the old one is okay the first one i think the first one is better yeah*

JM: *Ok*

In order to make the picture bear an extremely close resemblance to the original, albeit without the detail of the cleft on the chin, this pair used a total of 104 strategies. Table 8 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 9 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 8

Strategies Used by the Thai Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Thai Describer)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Thai Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Thai Describer)
1. Expansion: 6 2. Negation: 5 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 22 4. Affirmation: 15 TOTAL: 48	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 4 TOTAL: 4	1. Self-Repetition: 12 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 3 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 3 TOTAL: 18

Table 9**Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 4 3. Confirmation Check: 18 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 6 TOTAL: 28	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 1 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 5 TOTAL: 6	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 0

The describer contributed 70 strategies while the drawer supplied the remaining 34. The strategy of introducing new information (Thai-22/Japanese-1), the confirmation check (all 18 supplied by the drawer), self-repetition (all 12 utilized by the describer), and the strategy of turntaking (Thai-4/Japanese-6) were the more significant categories employed by the members of this dyad. This pair also retained their respective roles in the activity, with the describer playing the more active role and the drawer taking on the less controlling and more passive position. This was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Thai describer had more strategies in his own domain (48) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (4). Similarly, the Japanese drawer had more strategies in his own domain (28) than in the domain of the more “informed”

member (6). There was no bid made by either the drawer or the describer to exchange roles in the activity.

Third Pair's Handling of the Activity:

The third pair completed the assigned activity through frequent confirmation and clarification. The Costa Rican male was the drawer while his partner, the Japanese female, was the describer for this half of the activity. The drawer determined the position of the various items in the picture by indicating their possible location to the describer, who in turn affirmed or negated his claim.

JF: *and he is wearing necktie a necktie*

CM: *oh yeah?*

JF: *hm hm*

CM: *ok and he has hands?*

JF: *no*

The describer started out with the face of the man and then slowly moved on to the rest of his physical appearance (see Appendix E for the third pair's picture). Six of the details were accurately transferred to the visual that was being created, with the exception of the cleft and the teeth (all the eight teeth were drawn on the same side instead of distributing them evenly as four each on the top and bottom half of the mouth).

To create a picture with six details intact, the third pair utilized a total of 66 strategies, with a distribution of 38 and 28 between the describer and the drawer respectively. The strategies that were significant in their use were the turntaking signal

(Japanese-1/Costa Rican-6), the confirmation check (all 10 being employed by the drawer), affirmation (all 8 utilized by the describer), and the introduction of new information (all 14 contributed by the describer). Table 10 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 11 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 10

Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese Describer)
1. Expansion: 3 2. Negation: 5 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 14 4. Affirmation: 8 TOTAL: 30	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 1 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 5 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 1 TOTAL: 7

Table 11

Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Costa Rican drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Costa Rican drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Costa Rican drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 3 2. Clarification: 3 3. Confirmation Check: 10 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 4 4b. Turntaking signal as a question: 2 TOTAL: 22	1. Expansion: 1 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 2	1. Self-Repetition: 1 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 1 4. Temporary Abandonment: 1 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 4

As in the first and second pair, this pair also retained their respective roles of describer and drawer in this activity. The retention of roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Japanese describer had more strategies in her own domain (30) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (1). Similarly, the Korean drawer had more strategies in his own domain (22) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (2).

Fourth Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

The fourth pair had a distinctly different level of proficiency. The Japanese drawer, who did not belong to this lower intermediate class but was brought over from a section of beginning level learners, was either reluctant or embarrassed to interact with the other member of the dyad. Her partner, who had basically asserted himself in

the first activity itself, was cast in the controlling role of the describer of the information. The openings given to the Japanese female to contribute to the discourse were few and far between and even when the opportunities did present themselves, she hardly ever utilized them.

SM: *this picture its picture of a man ok and almost we can just find the person in the circle circle circus he tries to make joke you know with people to make them laugh*

JF: *hmmm*

SM: *and can you imagine that person from your experience what kind of clothes you know circus ok there is a person always he try and maybe more than one he always try to make joke by using like unusual cloth unusual colors*

JF: *hmm*

SM: *you know this person this picture shows that person almost half the body you know he start from the top top part and his face and he is wearing he is wearing I believe its a funny hat or*

JF: *ok (laugh)*

Since her partner tended to give a whole lot of information at the same time, the less proficient female learner waited until she could assimilate all the linguistic input that was being directed toward her. Most of the time, she just repeated the utterances of the Saudi describer

SM: *yeah and he has a big smile and you can missing something and his teeth and what else and he is wearing shirt*

JF: *shirt*

SM: *shirt yeah because I told you this picture shows top of this person the half top of the person the half the top*

JF: *the top*

SM: *you can start from there his stomach he has kind of funny tie*

JF: *funny tie*

The task was completed on time and the picture bore a close resemblance to the one given to them by the researcher but the crucial aspects that were sought to make this a

truly shared effort were missing (see Appendix E for the fourth pair's picture). In order to get seven details right, apart from the cleft on the chin, this pair made use of 55 strategies, with the describer contributing 41 to the total number of communication strategies and the Japanese female supplying the remaining 14. Table 12 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less "informed" member's strategies. Table 13 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her more "informed" member's strategies.

Table 12

**Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Describer in Picture Description Task
(Part 1)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Saudi Arabian Describer)	The less "informed" members' strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Saudi Arabian Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Saudi Arabian Describer)
1. Expansion: 2 2. Negation: 1 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 1 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 26 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 31	1. Other Repetition: 1 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 1 TOTAL: 2	1. Self-Repetition: 3 2. Self-Correction: 2 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 3 TOTAL: 8

Table 13

Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 8 2. Clarification: 3 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 2 TOTAL: 13	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 0

Among the strategies used by the Japanese female, the strategy of other repetition (where she was repeating all that the describer was saying) accounted for 8 of the total 14 strategies. The most frequent strategy was the introduction of new information, with all 27 provided by the describer. In this pair also, the drawer and describer retained their respective roles, as revealed by the distribution of strategies. The Saudi Arabian describer had more strategies in his own domain (31) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (2). Similarly, the Japanese drawer had more strategies in her own domain (13) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (1).

THE PICTURE DESCRIPTION TASK - Part 2

For the second half of the activity, the drawer became the describer and vice-versa. A time limit of fifteen minutes was established for this half of the activity also. Table 14 shows the total number of strategies used by the members of each dyad while doing the second part of the picture description task.

Table 14

Total Number of Strategies Used in Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Pairs	The various members of the dyads	Total number of strategies used
Pair 1	Korean Male (describer)	101
	Japanese Female (drawer)	80
Pair 2	Japanese Male (describer)	76
	Thai Male (drawer)	42
Pair 3	Costa Rican Male (describer)	25
	Japanese Female (drawer)	15
Pair 4	Japanese Female (describer)	60
	Saudi Arabian Male (drawer)	70

The picture given for this half of the activity consisted of the following details (1) a cat-like figure with (2) a small travelcase. The cat (3) was wearing sunglasses, (4) had a camera slung around its neck and (5) wore a flowery beach shirt and (6) beach sandals (see Appendix F for the picture given to the dyads). Even though this picture had two details less than the previous one, it was a much more difficult visual, with the details themselves being more complex than the earlier visual. If a pair managed to get

all the six details on their visual within the time limit, then it would be considered successful. Even if a pair was able to get across five details, it would still be considered unsuccessful. The describers were expected to convey the visual details to the drawers in their respective dyads. Two dyads completed the task on or before the fifteen minutes that was allotted for this half of the activity. Table 15 shows the amount of time taken by each pair to complete the second half of the picture description task.

Table 15

Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Total Time Given	Amount of time taken by Pair 1	Amount of time taken by Pair 2	Amount of time taken by Pair 3	Amount of time taken by Pair 4
15 minutes	15 minutes (did not complete)	12 minutes	4 minutes	15 minutes (did not complete)

First Pair's Handling of the Activity:

For this half of the activity, the Japanese female was the drawer while the Korean male was the describer. This dyad was constantly striving to get all the details right. There were many examples during the course of the interaction when the describer was dissatisfied with one aspect of the picture and urged his partner to get it right.

JF: (while trying to get the shape of the cat's face) *is it kind of like this?*

KM: *no*

JF: *is it the other side? could you can I erase?*

KM: *yes you can draw it*

JF: *no ok this way is right? more bigger? or*

KM: *hmm*

JF: *more is that right ?*

KM: *it is like height and wide is four and six*

The different components of the image were dealt with in an orderly fashion and there was a great deal of descriptive information provided.

KM: *its ok and between hair ears he got several hair its like*

JF: *straight or twist?*

KM: *straight and the end of part is curly*

JF: *you mean like this?*

KM: *actually four five is spread*

JF: *you mean this?*

KM: *no straight and other part is curly*

JF: *why is it curly?*

The describer introduced the image of the cat by referring to its three parts: the head, the body, and the legs. He first gave a complete description of the face, along with the sunglasses. Then he talked about the flowered shirt and the camera slung around the cat's neck. He encountered a certain amount of difficulty in talking about the legs and slippers of the cat

KM: *he wear a slipper*

JF: *what kind of slipper?*

KM: *his slipper has is kind of like your all the Japanese people wear*

JF: *like this?*

KM: *no there is a*

JF: *no it is not*

KM: *there is a kind of line between main main foot yeah yeah*

JF: *the most thick or is it ok?*

Finally, the Korean male informed the Japanese listener about the presence of a "golf bag" near the right side of the cat. Even as the drawer was trying to get the dimensions of the bag accurately, their conversation came to an abrupt end since they ran out of time.

This pair got all the six details of the picture right but did not verbally conclude the activity within the time limit provided (see Appendix F for the first pair's picture). The describer got involved with the minor details of the picture, which he sought to get across as accurately as possible. The exact number of hairs on the chin/the head of the cat and the number of buttons on the camera were successfully transferred on to the visual of this dyad. In order to take the task to the point where they did, the dyad used a total of 181 strategies, with the Korean describer supplying 101 and his Japanese drawer contributing the remaining 80. Table 16 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less "informed" member's strategies. Table 17 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her more "informed" member's strategies.

Table 16

Strategies Used by the Korean Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Korean Describer)	The less "informed" members' strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Korean Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Korean Describer)
1. Expansion: 10 2. Negation: 5 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 20 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 29 4. Affirmation: 17 TOTAL: 81	1. Other Repetition: 3 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 3 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 2 TOTAL: 8	1. Self-Repetition: 3 2. Self-Correction: 7 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 2 TOTAL: 12

Table 17

Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 1 2. Clarification: 24 3. Confirmation Check: 10 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 8 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 30 TOTAL: 73	1. Expansion: 1 2. Negation: 1 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 1 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 2 TOTAL: 5	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 1 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 2

New information was introduced by this pair 50 times (Korean-49/Japanese-1). The other frequently used categories were clarification (all 24 supplied by the drawer), turntaking (Korean-5/Japanese-38), expansion (Korean-10/Japanese-1), and affirmation (Korean-17/Japanese-2). The describer retained his active role while the drawer retained her passive role in this activity. The retention of roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Korean describer had more strategies in his own domain (81) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (8). Similarly, the Japanese drawer had more strategies in her own domain (73) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (3).

Second Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

For the second part of the picture description task, the Japanese male was the describer while the Thai male was the drawer. The describer started out by giving the

general dimensions of the cat followed by more specific details about its physical appearance. He spent a certain amount of time describing the cat's face and then moved on to the rest of the picture.

JM: *you should write a face*

TM: *face in what shape*

JM: *he is cat*

TM: *large head?*

JM: *yeah*

TM: *his head is like an orange*

JM: *orange?*

TM: *I mean his face is large shaped*

JM: *yes*

TM: *okay*

JM: *in the middle of the paper he has hair I am not sure he has you know*

TM: *okay never mind*

JM: *not this shape?*

TM: *not this shape*

The shirt was then tackled and this was followed by a description of the camera and the suitcase. Their organized approach was evident when the describer did not try to include a lot of information in a single utterance since he seemed to realize that it would confuse the listener. Instead, he provided one detail at a time and in case he was not clear enough, the drawer stepped in and clarified or provided new information on his own.

JM: *okay he is wearing big sunglass*

TM: *big sunglass rayban sunglass?*

JM: *no common sunglass*

TM: *ok I will draw sunglass*

This pair managed to get all the details across to their visual, with the exception of the flowers on the shirt (see Appendix F for the second pair's picture). In order to

complete the picture in the allotted time, this pair made use of a total of 118 strategies, with the describer being responsible for 76 while the drawer supplied the remaining 42. Table 18 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 19 shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 18

Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese Describer)
1. Expansion: 6 2. Negation: 9 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 11 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 20 4. Affirmation: 14 TOTAL: 60	1. Other Repetition: 5 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 1 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 0 TOTAL: 6	1. Self-Repetition: 5 2. Self-Correction: 2 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 1 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 2 TOTAL: 10

Table 19

Strategies Used by the Thai Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Thai drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Thai drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Thai drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 1 2. Clarification: 4 3. Confirmation Check: 10 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 4 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 17 TOTAL: 36	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 2 4. Affirmation: 2 TOTAL: 4	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 1 TOTAL: 2

The introduction of new information was the most significant strategy with 33 (Japanese-31/Thai-2), followed by the turntaking signal (Japanese-0/Thai-21), affirmation (Japanese-14/Thai-2) and confirmation check (Japanese-1/Thai-9). The retention of the describer’s and drawer’s respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Japanese describer had more strategies in his own domain (60) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (6). Similarly, the Thai drawer had more strategies in his own domain (35) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (4). The describer retained his more active role in the discourse and the drawer did not make any attempt to seize control.

Third Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

In the third pair, the Costa Rican male was the describer while the Japanese female took on the role of the drawer. He included a lot of information in the sentences

that he uttered and the drawer frequently found herself in the position of just executing his instructions.

CM: *and he has wearing like a hawaiian t-shirt*

JF: *hawaiian? yeah!*

CM: *with flowers you know*

JF: *hm hm hm*

CM: *and he his hands he put in the chest you know like this*

JF: *ok*

CM: *and he has a camera on his neck here and he is wearing sandals*

The drawer had little difficulty understanding the information directed to her and she smoothly executed the visual part of the activity.

This particular pair took the shortest amount of time to complete the activity (see Appendix F for the third pair's picture). Their picture had the six necessary components to broadly classify it as a successfully executed task but at the same time, it lacked some of the finer details and pieces of information that the other pairs were striving to get across (the shape and features of the camera, the hair of the cat, the exact position of the suitcase, the beach sandals). One interesting aspect of the interaction with regard to this pair was the amount of information that the describer conveyed in every utterance. Unlike the others, who exhibited a tendency to give only one detail at a time, the Costa Rican learner typically provided more than one integral piece of the image each time he gave instructions. This type of an approach hastened task accomplishment but did not help a great deal with interaction since the drawer was just reduced to the position of carrying out the commands of the describer.

This pair used the least number of strategies for this particular activity. Out of 43 strategies that were used, the Costa Rican describer employed 25 while his Japanese partner contributed the remaining 19. The strategy of introducing new information into the discourse took precedence over the others with a total of 12 (all of them supplied by the describer). The strategy of affirmation (Costa Rican-3/Japanese-1), the confirmation check (all 5 contributed by the Japanese drawer) and the strategy of turntaking (all 4 contributed by the drawer) were the other significant categories to be utilized. Table 20 shows the number of strategies used by the describer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 21 shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 20

**Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Describer in Picture Description Task
(Part 2)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Costa Rican Describer)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Costa Rican Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Costa Rican Describer)
1. Expansion: 3 2. Negation: 1 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 1 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 11 4. Affirmation: 3 TOTAL: 19	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 1 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 0 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 2 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 2 TOTAL: 5

Table 21

Strategies Used by the Japanese Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 1 2. Clarification: 1 3. Confirmation Check: 5 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 1 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 3 TOTAL: 11	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 2 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 3	1. Self-Repetition: 1 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 1 4. Temporary Abandonment: 1 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 3

The retention of the describer’s and drawer’s respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Costa Rican describer had more strategies in his own domain (19) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (1). Similarly, the Japanese drawer had more strategies in her own domain (11) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (3). The describer retained his more active role in the discourse and the drawer did not make any attempt to seize control.

Fourth Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

In the fourth pair, the Japanese female was now cast in the role of the more controlling describer while her partner, the Saudi male, found himself in the position of the drawer. The drawer began the activity by initiating the discourse. The describer had no apparent need to volunteer information since her partner offered her different

kinds of possibilities for each aspect of the description and her role was to make the appropriate choice.

- SM: *ok yeah it has long hair or is it huge cat? or small cat? or is it kitten?*
 JF: *small*
 SM: *very small?*
 JF: *no middle*
 SM: *normal?*
 JF: *I think middle*
 SM: *ok and the cat is standing?*
 JF: *standing*
 SM: *and raising her hands ?*

There were very few instances when the describer actually introduced new information on her own, as this particular strategy seemed to be uncharacteristically in the domain of the drawer in this case. The approach adopted by the Saudi male in order to hasten task accomplishment was to present new information to the describer, who either affirmed or negated it.

- SM: *big mouth is it open the mouth?*
 JF: *no*
 SM: *closed it seems to be like she is smiling?*
 JF: *yes*

Unlike the other pairs who introduced topics in a much more orderly fashion, this combination of learners tended to have a haphazard way of approaching the task. This may be largely due to the frequency with which the drawer introduced new information, thereby preventing the describer from being fully in control of the activity. She was denied the opportunity to approach the information as well as the activity in her own way because the drawer tended to direct the interaction.

The Japanese learner started out by giving an outline of the cat's body and soon moved to a description of the camera slung around its neck and followed it up with a brief mention of the suitcase by its side, only to return to the cat's shirt and legs. This inconsistency was not surprising, considering the way the Saudi male was constantly trying to determine the course of the conversation, paying scant attention to the words of the describer.

SM: *and you said*

JF: *and he wear the shirt*

SM: *you said that the hand its*

JF: *right hand*

This pair was not able to complete the task within the allotted time and the researcher had to tell them to stop when time ran out. This pair got four of the details right, with the exception of the beach sandal and the flowered shirt (see Appendix F for the fourth pair's picture). In order to get all these details on their visual, the pair used 130 strategies, with the less powerful drawer contributing the greater number of 70 to the total strategies. Table 22 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the describer in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her less "informed" member's strategies. Table 23 shows the number of strategies used by the drawer in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more "informed" member's strategies.

Table 22**Strategies Used by the Japanese Describer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese describer)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese Describer)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese Describer)
1. Expansion: 3 2. Negation: 5 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 28 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 3 4. Affirmation: 9 TOTAL: 48	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 1 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 0 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 10 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 1 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 11

Table 23**Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Drawer in Picture Description Task (Part 2)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Saudi Arabian drawer)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Saudi Arabian drawer)	Strategies used by either member (Saudi Arabian drawer)
1. Other Repetition: 1 2. Clarification: 3 3. Confirmation Check: 12 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 13 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 35 TOTAL: 64	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 2 2. Self-Correction: 3 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 5

Out of the 31 times that the Japanese describer employed the strategy of introducing new information, 28 of them were as a response to a turn initiated by her Saudi

partner. She did not introduce new information on her own most of the time but was made to do so by her less “informed” drawer who frequently sought responses to the turns initiated by him. The Saudi drawer, on his part, asked a leading question 35 times, when using the strategy of turntaking. Even though the drawer utilized more strategies than the drawer, the two members of the dyad retained their respective roles, as indicated by the distribution of strategies. The Japanese describer had more strategies in her own domain (48) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (1). Similarly, the Saudi Arabian drawer had more strategies in his own domain (64) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (1).

THE GUESSING GAME - Part 1

The final task chosen for the classroom experiment was the guessing game. This activity comprised a set of five words that was given to one member of each dyad which s/he had to get across to his/her partner. The learner who gave the clues (the clue giver) could use any number of words in order to help his/her partner (the guesser) arrive at the right word. If the clue giver in a particular pair gave out a part of a word or the word itself, then it would be considered unsuccessful at accomplishing the task. Like the picture description task, this activity too had a first as well as second half, with the roles being reversed for the latter part of the activity. The first part of the guessing game, comprising the following words-**taste, marriage, famous, love, and plastic**-was analyzed for the purpose of isolating the communication strategies. Table

24 shows the total number of strategies used by the members of each pair while doing the guessing game.

Table 24

Total Number of Strategies Used in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Pairs	The various members of the dyads	Total number of strategies used
Pair 1	Korean Male (clue giver)	65
	Japanese Female (guesser)	44
Pair 2	Thai Male (clue giver)	43
	Japanese Male (guesser)	9
Pair 3	Japanese Female (clue giver)	30
	Costa Rican Male (guesser)	16
Pair 4	Saudi Arabian Male (clue giver)	45
	Japanese Female (guesser)	10

The clue givers were expected to provide clues for the five words to their respective guessers. All the dyads completed the first half of the activity much before the ten minute time limit that had been allotted for them. Table 25 shows the amount of time taken by each pair to complete the first half of the guessing game.

Table 25

Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Guessing Game (Part 1)

Total Time Given	Amount of time taken by Pair 1	Amount of time taken by Pair 2	Amount of time taken by Pair 3	Amount of time taken by Pair 4
10 minutes	6 1/2 minutes	3 minutes	4 minutes	4 minutes and 10 seconds

First Pair's Handling of the Activity:

In the first half of this activity, the Japanese female was the guesser while the Korean male was the clue giver. For the first word **taste**, members of this pair encountered a certain amount of difficulty. The Korean male began by talking about the different kinds of tastes but his partner was at a total loss. She then wanted to know the part of speech so that she could narrow down the list of possibilities. Knowing that the chosen word was a verb did not help her a great deal either. In order not to be repetitive with the clues, the Korean learner introduced new information which confused the guesser.

KM: *when you do this kind of thing , you can feel the feeling like delicious*

JF: *is that noun or verb or*

KM: *verb*

JF: *satisfy?*

KM: *no no when you something, you can feel you can feel like this for example there is a cake I dont know what is this delicious or*

JF: *guess?*

KM: *delicious or not so to confirm this is delicious or not , I do I do*

JF: *like?*

KM: *to identify this*

JF: *imagine no feeling is good or do I know that word? is that easy?*

Towards the end, the clue giver shared one valuable bit of information with his partner which was not permissible as regards the rules of the game-he gave out the initial letter of the word and the result was that the guesser hit on the target word immediately. The second word **marriage** was guessed quickly since the clue giver provided an example for the word so that the guesser would be able to relate to the word much more easily.

KM: *I'll give you second I heard your sister going to do with your sister's boyfriend*

JF: *my sister its real or no? I have a sister*

KM: *yeah you have a sister but she going to*
 JF: *marry? my sister going to marry*
 KM: *so that that noun*
 JF: *married? marry ? get married???*
 KM: *noun noun*
 JF: *marriage? marriage*
 KM: *yeah right!*

The third word **famous** was guessed as soon as the Korean male gave the example of the singer Madonna while the fourth one on the list **love** was related to the idea of a man and woman living together. The last word **plastic** became as elusive as the first word “taste.” The guesser gave the right word twice-the first time, she did not realize she had said it, causing her partner to try various means of drawing her attention back to the word; in the second instance, the guesser once again gave the word but it was lost in a string of utterances as a result of which the clue giver did not even notice it.

KM: *you said it you said it to me kind of aluminum*
 JF: *what plastic ? not plastic?*
 KM: *it is also it can recycling recycle*

Finally, when the Korean male brought about the analogy of the aluminum can and the “other” can, the guesser hit the target but she was still confused as to why her partner was mentioning cans in relation with plastic. In this particular instance, there was a great deal of interaction but it basically took place because of missed opportunities. This pair used a total of 109 strategies in order to get all the five words, with the Korean male contributing the greater share of 65 and the Japanese guesser supplying the remaining 44. Table 26 shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s

strategies. Table 27 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 26

Strategies Used by Korean Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Korean clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Korean clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Korean clue giver)
1. Expansion: 4 2. Negation: 5 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 8 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 18 4. Affirmation: 4 TOTAL: 39	1. Other Repetition: 1 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 13 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 1 TOTAL: 15	1. Self-Repetition: 7 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 3 TOTAL: 11

Table 27

Strategies Used by Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 2 2. Clarification: 1 3. Confirmation Check: 3 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 8 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 4 TOTAL: 18	1. Expansion: 1 2. Negation: 2 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 3 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 1 4. Affirmation: 0 TOTAL: 7	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 2 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 17 TOTAL: 19

The retention of the clue giver's and guesser's respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Korean clue giver had more strategies in his own domain (39) than in the domain of the less "informed" member (15). Similarly, the Japanese guesser had more strategies in her own domain (18) than in the domain of the more "informed" member (7). The clue giver retained his more active role in the discourse and the guesser did not make any attempt to seize control.

Second Pair's Handling of the Activity:

In the second pair, the Thai male was the clue giver while the Japanese male was the guesser. The Thai male started out by identifying **taste** as "one of the sense" (gave examples of sweet and salty taste) and the guesser found it relatively easy to arrive at the appropriate word. The second word **marriage** was identified when the Thai clue giver referred to a ceremony that was responsible for making a man and a woman live together. The next word on the list was **famous** and the clue giver helped his partner relate to it by referring to one of the leading football players of Japan. For **love**, the Thai learner talked about the feeling of being crazy about a woman. Identifying the first four words was relatively easy for this pair. But with the final word **plastic**, they encountered a few obstacles. In the hope of making it easier for the guesser, the Thai uttered a long sentence with a lot of descriptive information about plastic.

TM: *the last one this one is tough the most popular substance you can see this substance you know the word substance? substance is something like material you know material?*

JM: *yes*

TM: *this is the most popular material you can see it everywhere it is not metal
it is not paper this can be uses for making a cup*

JM: *cup?*

When his partner made references to a material that was neither wood nor gold, the Japanese was able to come up with the right word. This pair used a total of 52 strategies, with the Thai clue giver contributing 43 and his less powerful partner supplying the remaining 9. Table 28 shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 29 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 28

Strategies Used by the Thai Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Thai clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Thai clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Thai clue giver)
1. Expansion: 5 2. Negation: 3 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 30 4. Affirmation: 0 TOTAL: 38	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 2 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 3 TOTAL: 5	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 0

Table 29

Strategies Used by the Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 5 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 0 TOTAL: 5	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 2 TOTAL: 2	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 2 TOTAL: 2

The retention of the clue giver’s and guesser’s respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Thai clue giver had more strategies in his own domain (38) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (5). Similarly, the Japanese guesser had more strategies in his own domain (5) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (2).

Third Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

The third pair was also relatively quick in completing the first half of the third activity. The Japanese female was the clue giver while her Costa Rican partner was the guesser. They struggled a little bit with the first word on the list. The clue giver did not refer to the fact that it was a sense in the initial stages of the interaction. She began her role by talking about the feeling of hunger and thirst which seemed to be leading her partner in the wrong direction.

JF: *also hungry but not hungry*

CM: *hm hmmm*

JF: *always you always when you eat or drink something, you feel*

CM: *ah ha*

JF: *so you feel delicious or not delicious*

Finding that she was unable to point him the right way, she quickly recovered and like the first and second teams, she made a reference to the idea of sense. After the first word **taste** was guessed, the task moved along smoothly. The clue given for **marriage** simply mentioned a man and a woman. For the third word (**famous**), the Japanese learner gave examples of President Clinton, an actor, and an actress and her partner guessed the word with relative ease. The fourth one **love** was identified as something that parents give to their children and the guesser did not have any problem finding the appropriate word. Unlike the first and second teams, which struggled to get the final word **plastic**, this dyad experienced no significant difficulties. Even though the Japanese clue giver prefaced her utterance with “the last one is very difficult,” her partner quickly guessed the correct word.

JF: *pencil pencase or*

CM: *pen case?*

JF: *yeah and contain or container or jewels coke or something*

CM: ***plastic** ?*

This pair used a total of 46 strategies, with the Japanese clue giver providing 30 and the Costa Rican male supplying the remaining 16. Table 30 shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 31 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 30**Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese clue giver)
1. Expansion: 1 2. Negation: 1 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 2 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 12 4. Affirmation: 3 TOTAL: 19	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 3 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 0 TOTAL: 3	1. Self-Repetition: 7 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 1 TOTAL: 8

Table 31**Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Costa Rican guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Costa Rican guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Costa Rican guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 3 3. Confirmation Check: 3 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 1 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 5 TOTAL: 12	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 2 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 1 TOTAL: 3

The clue giver retained her more active role while the guesser maintained a more passive role. The retention of roles is evident from the distribution of strategies.

The Japanese clue giver had more strategies in her own domain (19) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (3). Similarly, the Costa Rican guesser had more strategies in his own domain (12) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (1).

Fourth Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

One distinctive characteristic of the fourth pair was that the Saudi male tended to dominate his partner, irrespective of whether he was cast in the less controlling role of the guesser or the more significant and controlling position of the clue giver. In this part of the third activity, the Saudi male was the clue giver while the Japanese female was the guesser. The Saudi clue giver uttered sentences that were very long and packed with information. In his first utterance itself, the Saudi learner provided different perspectives on the word **taste** but it was only the final detail - that of the sweet and salty type of food - that caught his partner’s attention and enabled her to guess the appropriate word.

- SM: *ok the first one is its verb ok that you know when you use this verb you use it with food usually you can use it with another things and its one of the things we have it in our body ok and by using this verb you know is it this kind of food is it sweet or salty*
- JF: *sweet or salty or*
- SM: *how do you know? how can you know that this food is sweet or salty ?*
- JF: *hmmm*

The Saudi learner typically inundated his less proficient partner with an inordinate number of details, all at the same time.

The clue giver moved on to the third word after skipping the second since he claimed not to know its meaning. With the third word, the Saudi male gave his partner more time to process the different bits of information that he was providing. After being told that the word was an adjective, is synonymous with *well-known* and is applicable to Michael Jackson, his partner was able to guess the target word **famous**. The fourth word **love** was identified as being opposite to hate and much stronger than *like*. For the fifth word, the Saudi learner once again confused his listener with a barrage of utterances.

SM: *its kind of material that you use it sometime you go to the supermarket and you done shopping ok the cashier ask you what kind of you want to put your material in it*

JF: *food?*

SM: *you bought the food and that we can make baggage baggage from it there is many kind of material that we use to make the bag that we put it that we put our food when we shop from the supermarket what kind of material that we use it for example this my cloth is made of*

JF: *cotton?*

When the options of paper and cotton were rejected, the Japanese learner guessed the right word **plastic**. Her partner moved back to the second word which had been abandoned in the beginning (he found out the meaning of this word from the researcher). When he mentioned a relationship involving a husband and wife, his teammate came up with **marriage** without any apparent difficulty.

In order to complete this task, the Saudi male/Japanese female used a total of 55 strategies, with the Japanese female contributing only 10 to the Saudi male's total of 45. Table 32 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the clue

giver in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 33 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 32

Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Saudi Arabian clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Saudi Arabian clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Saudi Arabian clue giver)
1. Expansion: 3 2. Negation: 1 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 1 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 21 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 27	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 3 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 7 TOTAL: 10	1. Self-Repetition: 5 2. Self-Correction: 1 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 2 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 8

Table 33

Strategies Used by the Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 1)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 2 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 2 TOTAL: 4	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 5 TOTAL: 5

The retention of the clue giver's and guesser's respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Saudi Arabian clue giver had more strategies in his own domain (27) than in the domain of the less "informed" member (10). Similarly, the Japanese guesser had more strategies in her own domain (4) than in the domain of the more "informed" member (1). The clue giver retained his more active role in the discourse and the guesser did not make any attempt to seize control.

THE GUESSING GAME - Part 2

For the second half of the final activity, the same amount of time that was given to the first half was allotted. As with the picture description task, the roles of the members of the various dyads were reversed - the clue giver became the guesser and vice versa. The words provided for this half of the activity were **fire, medicine, past, connect, and laugh**. Table 34 on the following page shows the total number of strategies used by the members of each pair while doing the guessing game.

Table 34**Total Number of Strategies Used in Guessing Game (Part 2)**

Pairs	The various members of the dyads	Total number of strategies used
Pair 1	Japanese Female (clue giver)	34
	Korean Male (guesser)	9
Pair 2	Japanese Male (clue giver)	23
	Thai Male (guesser)	12
Pair 3	Costa Rican Male (clue giver)	26
	Japanese Female(guesser)	11
Pair 4	Japanese Female (clue giver)	64
	Saudi Arabian Male (guesser)	59

The clue givers were expected to provide clues for the five words to their respective guessers. Three dyads completed the activity before the ten minutes that was given to them. The fourth dyad, comprising the Japanese female and the Saudi Arabian male, could not complete the activity. Table 35 shows the amount of time taken by each of the dyads to complete the activity.

Table 35**Time Taken by the Pairs to Complete Guessing Game (Part 2)**

Total Time Given	Amount of time taken by Pair 1	Amount of time taken by Pair 2	Amount of time taken by Pair 3	Amount of time taken by Pair 4
10 minutes	2 minutes	3 minutes	4 minutes	10 minutes (did not complete)

First Pair's Handling of the Activity:

For the second half of the guessing game, the Korean male was in the role of the guesser and the Japanese female was the clue giver. The first word **fire** was guessed when the clue giver mentioned the hazards of going to bed with a lighted cigarette. The second word **medicine** was guessed in a shorter time than the first word but unfortunately, the clue giver appeared to have misled her listener, even as she acknowledged that he had got the right answer.

JF: *so next one you have headache or stomach ache, what do you think? what do you*

KM: *take medicine ?*

JF: *yeah so*

KM: *what kind of medicine?*

JF: *no no no take*

The guesser got the impression that his partner was looking for a particular brand of medicine but before it got out of hand, the clue giver repeated her first clue. The third one on the list **past** was arrived at when the clue giver referred to the present, future and then significantly paused at the end of the utterance. The fourth was declared to be a difficult word and the Japanese learner signalled the word both verbally as well as through gestures. She showed her fingers getting linked even as she uttered “this finger and this finger is...” and her partner immediately said **connect**. With the final word **laugh**, the clue giver anticipated no problems but it turned out to be much harder than she expected. She referred to the laugh that he uttered after guessing the previous word but her partner was misled.

JF: *ok and number five you are right now* [her partner had just laughed]

KM: *student here?*

JF: *no no what did you do as number*

KM: *answer ?*

JF: *no no no*

KM: *answer the question?*

JF: *yes I know you said this question is very easy, so what did you do?*

The Japanese learner did not give up and continued to stress on the “you...” part.

Finally, he guessed “smile” and her retort was that it is a little bit stronger than smile.

It was only then that he was able to guess the target word.

This pair conducted the activity in a well-orchestrated manner. The only difficulty was with the last word but the clue giver managed to put the activity back on track by not introducing new information and thereby confusing the listener, but by stressing the important pieces of detail that she had already given. In this way, the guesser had the time to process the existing information and at the same time, he was not overwhelmed by a great deal of disparate or even related details. In order to successfully complete this half of the activity, the pair utilized a total of 43 strategies, with the Japanese clue giver providing 34 and the Korean guesser accounting for the remaining 9. Table 36 on the following page shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 37 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 36**Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	The less "informed" members' strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese clue giver)
1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 7 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as self-initiated move: 14 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 22	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 7 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 4 TOTAL: 11	1. Self-Repetition: 1 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 1

Table 37**Strategies Used by the Korean Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2)**

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Korean guesser)	The more "informed" members' strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Korean guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Korean guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 4 TOTAL: 4	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 2 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 0 TOTAL: 2	1. Self-Repetition: 1 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 2 TOTAL: 3

The retention of the clue giver's and guesser's respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Japanese clue giver had more strategies in her own domain (22) than in the domain of the less "informed" member (11). Similarly, the

Korean guesser had more strategies in his own domain (4) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (2). The clue giver retained her more active role in the discourse and the guesser did not make any attempt to seize control.

Second Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

The clue giver for the second pair was the Japanese male while the guesser was his Thai partner. The Japanese treated the first word **fire** as a verb rather than a noun. So, for the first word, the line of thinking that the Japanese adopted was that of a worker who lost his job because his boss did not need him anymore.

JM: *no no sometimes lose job or take a holiday what do you say your boss?*

TM: *what I say to my boss?*

JM: *no no*

TM: *vacation*

JM: *your boss say to you*

TM: *complain ?*

JM: *no no you dont need any more*

TM: *Oh fire*

JM: *yes*

With **medicine**, the clue giver talked about doctors, hospitals, and sickness. The third word **past** was guessed almost immediately when the Japanese learner referred to a time that was not the future. The clue for **connect** was joining something. The final word on the list **laugh** was guessed when the Japanese male referred to the reaction to a comedy movie.

The lack of difficulty with any of the words on the list was revealed when the Thai male, who was the guesser, exclaimed at the completion of the activity, “This is so easy!” Like his counterpart in Team 1, the Japanese clue giver did not want his

partner to approach the word from different angles which would only serve to confuse the latter. He pursued a single line of thought and in case he was not successful, he elaborated on the given information without introducing anything new. In order to guess all the words on the list, a total of 35 strategies were used, with the Japanese male contributing 23 and his Thai counterpart contributing the remaining 12. Table 38 shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 39 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 38

Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese clue giver)
1. Expansion: 1 2. Negation: 5 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 8 4. Affirmation: 0 TOTAL: 14	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 2 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 3 TOTAL: 5	1. Self-Repetition: 2 2. Self-Correction: 2 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 4

Table 39

Strategies Used by the Thai Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Thai guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Thai guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Thai guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 2 2. Clarification: 1 3. Confirmation Check: 2 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 1 TOTAL: 6	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 0 TOTAL: 0	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 6 TOTAL: 6

The clue giver and guesser retained their respective roles in this activity, as indicated by the distribution of strategies. The Japanese clue giver had more strategies in his own domain (14) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (5). Similarly, the Thai guesser had more strategies in her own domain (6) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (0).

Third Pair’s Handling of the Activity:

For the third pair, the Costa Rican male was the clue giver while the Japanese female was the guesser. The Costa Rican learner made the first word **fire** relatively easy to guess by referring to smoking and lighter. The next word **medicine** was tackled the same way as the other teams by talking about a doctor and sickness. The Costa Rican learner introduced the third word **past** by saying that it was hard. After

realizing that his partner was having a difficult time due to his reference to something that was remotely connected with the word, he moved on to talk about it being the opposite of future.

- CM: *number three is hard. now we are talking but in the*
 JF: *home?*
 CM: *no*
 JF: *(laugh)*
 CM: *when when once when its they were opposite future...*
 JF: ***past** ?*
 CM: *yeah*

The fourth word **connect** posed a challenge because the guesser thought that the word the clue giver was trying to get at was consent. It appeared as though she did understand the meaning of the given word but she had the wrong form for it.

- CM: *when you put the*
 JF: *consent?*
 CM: *ah the plug you know the plug what do you do? you know*
 JF: *its noun?*
 CM: *yeah*
 JF: *electric? no*
 CM: *no what do you do when you put the*
 JF: *yeah*
 CM: *plug in the I dont know whats the name of the when you put the plug in the thing you see*
 JF: *yeah I see consent ?*

Finally, the clue giver told her that she had got the initial sound right (starting with *co...*) but the Japanese learner was at a complete loss. The Costa Rican acknowledged defeat by giving out the word himself. The final one **laugh** was guessed when the clue giver indicated to his partner that the word was something that she just did (she laughed, maybe in embarrassment because she could not get the previous word.)

In order to get the words, this dyad used a total of 40 strategies (Costa Rican-26/Japanese-14). Table 40 shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 41 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 40

Strategies Used by the Costa Rican Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Costa Rican clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Costa Rican clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Costa Rican clue giver)
1. Expansion: 1 2. Negation: 3 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 7 4. Affirmation: 2 TOTAL: 13	1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 7 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 3 TOTAL: 10	1. Self-Repetition: 1 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 1 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 1 TOTAL: 3

Table 41

Strategies Used by the Japanese Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Japanese guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 1 3. Confirmation Check: 0 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 0 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 1 TOTAL: 2	1. Expansion: 0 2. Negation: 1 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 0 4. Affirmation: 0 TOTAL: 1	1. Self-Repetition: 0 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 2 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 6 TOTAL: 8

The retention of the clue giver's and guesser's respective roles was evident from the distribution of strategies. The Costa Rican clue giver had more strategies in his own domain (13) than in the domain of the less "informed" member (10). Similarly, the Japanese guesser had more strategies in her own domain (2) than in the domain of the more "informed" member (1). The clue giver retained his more active role in the discourse and the guesser did not make any attempt to seize control.

Fourth Pair's Handling of the Activity:

Like the other pairs in the classroom, the fourth dyad also reversed their respective roles for the last part of the final activity. The Saudi male became the guesser while the Japanese female was the clue giver. The Japanese learner started out the activity by giving a leading clue to the first word. She said that it was related to something hot and that it was dangerous. So, after an initial struggle, the Saudi learner guessed that the word was **fire**. The second word was the easiest for this pair and it was arrived at when the Japanese learner said that it was something that was used when one was sick (**medicine**).

The third word **past** was abandoned for two possible reasons. First of all, the clue giver acknowledged that it was difficult and secondly, the Saudi male confused the Japanese learner by asking her a lot of questions.

- SM: *the time is late early you describing the time? you try to describe the time?*
old new
 JF: *this is verb*
 SM: *do you know synoymys for this?*
 JF: *synonms I dont know*
 SM: *you can give the whole situation and blank the word*
 JF: *ahhh*

The guesser reassured his partner by saying that they could come back to this word, after they had completed the other words on the list. The next word **connect** was taken up, but it turned out to be a greater challenge than the third word. The Japanese clue giver began by talking about joining something (after having found out its meaning from the researcher) but soon, got sidetracked when her partner mentioned parties and invitations.

JF: *join*

SM: *party?*

JF: *its verb*

SM: *invite?*

JF: *its verb*

SM: *to join someone*

JF: *something*

SM: *come over? we use it for what? this is verb and what?*

In between, the clue giver actually spoke the word but neither her partner nor she realized it. She reiterated that it was a difficult word but her partner asked her not to give up. He wanted her to move on to the last word **laugh** which was guessed easily when the clue giver referred to the verb that one associated with happiness.

The two abandoned words were taken up once again and since the clue giver did not appear knowledgeable about either of them, the Saudi male essentially chose for her. He decided to try the third word first and verbally recollected all the information that she gave him the first time. This time, the clue giver and the guesser were travelling in a parallel fashion instead of going on the same path.

JF: *for example we work and the store is*

SM: *the what?*

JF: *the store*

SM: *the thief ok the thief stole the thief come to you*

JF: *hmm*
 SM: *come behind you you know the thief*
 JF: *no I cant explain*

Realizing the futility of this approach, the Japanese learner wanted to give up again but her partner refused to acknowledge defeat. A new line of thought was taken up and this time, the guesser closely approximated the word instead of getting the right one because the clue giver pointed out this particular direction to him. She assumed that **passed** and **past** had the same meaning and provided clues for guessing the former instead of the latter. She talked about leaving a building behind while travelling in a car and the guesser immediately came up with the word **passed** which, as already indicated, was not the right one.

The pair moved on to the fourth one which was not guessed even after a great deal of interaction. Remembering that the clue giver mentioned parties earlier, the Saudi male once again continued with that idea. But his Japanese partner was not able to offer any leads of her own or confirm whether the guesser's own leads were correct because she was not very confident about the meaning of the word. She mentioned something about joining a party (which was misleading in itself) and when her partner continued with this line of thought, she negated his claims.

JF: *go to the party everyone*
 SM: *at some party?*
 JF: *everyone join*
 SM: *talking?*
 JF: *not talking*
 SM: *dancing ? yes?*
 JF: *no*

The activity came to an end because of lack of time, with the guesser still not having got the right word. The fact that he was the one who did not want to give up was obvious when his utterance “you can do it, you can do it...” was the last one for this part of the activity. They used a total of 123 strategies with the Japanese learner contributing 64 and her Saudi partner supplying the remaining 59. Table 42 shows the number of strategies used by the clue giver in her own domain of strategies and in the domain of her less “informed” member’s strategies. Table 43 shows the number of strategies used by the guesser in his own domain of strategies and in the domain of his more “informed” member’s strategies.

Table 42

Strategies Used by the Japanese Clue Giver in Guessing Game (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	The less “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses more information (Japanese clue giver)	Strategies used by either member (Japanese clue giver)
1. Expansion: 2 2. Negation: 10 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 9 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 8 4. Affirmation: 4 TOTAL: 33	1. Other Repetition: 2 2. Clarification: 0 3. Confirmation Check: 1 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 1 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 5 TOTAL: 9	1. Self-Repetition: 19 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 3 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 0 TOTAL: 22

Table 43

Strategies Used by the Saudi Arabian Guesser in Guessing Game (Part 2)

Strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Saudi Arabian guesser)	The more “informed” members’ strategies used by the member who possesses less information (Saudi Arabian guesser)	Strategies used by either member (Saudi Arabian guesser)
1. Other Repetition: 0 2. Clarification: 4 3. Confirmation Check: 3 4a. Turntaking signal as a pause: 4 4b. Turntaking signal as a leading question: 22 TOTAL: 33	1. Expansion: 2 2. Negation: 0 3a. Introduction of new information as a response to a turn: 0 3b. Introduction of new information as a self-initiated move: 7 4. Affirmation: 1 TOTAL: 10	1. Self-Repetition: 1 2. Self-Correction: 0 3. Other Correction: 0 4. Temporary Abandonment: 0 5. Agreement: 0 6. Approximation: 15 TOTAL: 16

The Japanese clue giver introduced new information 8 times as a self-initiated move and 9 times as a response to a turn initiated by the guesser. Out of the 26 times that the Saudi male used the strategy of turntaking, 22 of them were as leading questions. Such an increased use of leading questions showed that the Saudi guesser may have wanted to gain control of the interaction and direct its course, even though he possessed less information. In spite of the Saudi male’s attempts to seize control, the pair still retained their respective roles, as revealed by the distribution of strategies. The Japanese clue giver had more strategies in her own domain (33) than in the domain of the less “informed” member (9). Similarly, the Saudi Arabian guesser had more strategies in his own domain (33) than in the domain of the more “informed” member (10).

Based on the distribution of strategies in the guessing game and the picture description task, it appeared as though the members of the various dyads retained their roles and made no bid to either seize control or relinquish control. But, in this connection, it is important to isolate two strategies - (1) turntaking signal as a leading question and (2) introduction of new information as a response to a turn - and indicate their relevance to the issue of dominance and control in the activities. The turntaking signal as a leading question is a strategy in the domain of the less "informed" member, but its presence in significant numbers reveals a crucial point. It shows that the passive partner wants to take initiative and play a more active role by asking queries that direct the interaction along a particular course. On the other hand, the strategy of introducing new information as a response to a turn is found in the domain of the more "informed" member, but its presence in significant numbers also reveals a crucial point. It shows that the active member is playing a less dominant role by introducing new information, not on his/her own, but as a response to a turn initiated by the other member. Apart from the Saudi/Japanese dyad, none of the other pairs had significant numbers of either strategy. When the Saudi member had less information and his Japanese partner had more information, these two strategies were utilized in large numbers. In the second part of the picture description task, the Japanese describer introduced new information 28 times as a response to a turn while the Saudi drawer utilized the turntaking signal 35 times as a leading question. Similarly, in the guessing game, the Japanese clue giver introduced new information 9 times as a response to a turn while

the Saudi guesser used the turntaking signal 22 times as a leading question. So, even though the Japanese female and the Saudi male retained their respective roles, their use of these two strategies revealed a slightly altered pattern. By introducing new information as a response to a turn 28 times and 9 times in the picture description task and the guessing game respectively, the Japanese female was found to be slightly passive in the more active role. She was a “Low Input Generator” (Seliger, 1977) as well as a “Low Interactor” (Pica, 1991) who did not fully utilize the opportunities for increased interaction with her partner. By using the turntaking signal as a leading question 35 times and 22 times in the picture description task and the guessing game respectively, the Saudi male was found to be slightly active in the more passive role. He was a “High Input Generator” (Seliger, 1977) as well as a “High Interactor” (Pica, 1991) who constantly sought opportunities for increased interaction with his partner.

In the jigsaw activity, where the distribution of strategies was expected to be more or less equal, there was typically one member who utilized more strategies than the other. In the first pair, the Japanese female used more strategies (74) than her Korean partner (41). In the second pair, the Thai male utilized a greater number of strategies (60) than his Japanese partner (37). In the third pair, the Costa Rican male used more strategies (58) than his partner (48). In the fourth pair, the Saudi Arabian male contributed more strategies towards task accomplishment (59) than his Japanese partner (22). So, even though the information was equally divided between the

participants in each dyad, one member interacted more than the other by using a greater number of communication strategies to complete the activity.

This chapter discussed the ways in which the data obtained from the dyads were analyzed on the basis of the number and types of communication strategies used. The following chapter will answer the research questions, delineate the limitations of this study, and suggest possibilities for future research.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

This chapter will primarily focus on the research questions that were the basis of this study. After an in-depth investigation of all the three questions, the limitations of this research project will be identified. The chapter will then conclude with suggestions for future research and the implications of the findings of this study on language teaching.

Research Question #1

Which pair activity, among the three chosen for this particular study, promotes the maximum amount of interaction among the learners, with regard to the total number of communication strategies used?

The identification and subsequent isolation of the most interactive pair activity was much more complex than initially anticipated due to the varying numbers of communication strategies used by the pairs for each of the activities. The second picture description task resulted in the highest combined total number of strategies among all the activities. It was also the most interactive activity for three out of the four pairs in the study (the Costa Rican/Japanese dyad was the exception). Table 44 on the following page shows the most interactive activity for each pair.

Table 44

The Most Interactive Activity for Each Pair

Pair	Most Interactive Activity	Member	Individual Strategy Use	Total Strategies Used
Pair 1	Picture Description Task (Part 2)	Japanese Female (Describer)	101	181
		Korean Male (Drawer)	80	
Pair 2	Picture Description Task (Part 2)	Japanese Male (Describer)	76	118
		Thai Male (Drawer)	42	
Pair 3	Jigsaw Activity	Costa Rican Male	58	106
		Japanese Female	48	
Pair 4	Picture Description Task (Part 2)	Japanese Female (Describer)	60	130
		Saudi Arabian Male (Drawer)	70	

The reason for a high use of strategies in the picture description task could be attributed to the complicated and detailed nature of the picture given to the dyads. Except for the strategy of agreement, the remaining thirteen communication strategies were utilized and they ranged between 2(*strategy of other correction*) and 126 (*strategy of introducing new information*) in frequency of occurrence. The combined total number of strategies used by the four pairs was 469. But it is essential to note that the 469 strategies were not equally distributed among the four pairs. The first dyad, comprising Korean male and the Japanese female, contributed the highest number of

strategies (181) to the combined total. The Korean male in the Japanese/Korean dyad could be considered an “embroiderer” (Ehrlich et al, 1988) who described the contents of the picture in embellished and descriptive terms. He had to negotiate meaning more often than the other describers because he was giving a lot of about the different components of the picture. On the other hand, the least number of strategies was contributed by the third pair comprising the Costa Rican male and the Japanese female (40). The Costa Rican describer was a “skeletonizer” (Ehrlich et al, 1988) who conveyed only the necessary details and did not want to get into the more complex levels of the picture. As far as the other two dyads were concerned, the second pair, comprising the Japanese male and the Thai male, utilized 118 strategies while the fourth pair, consisting of the Saudi Arabian male and the Japanese female, used 130 strategies.

The number of strategies contributed by each pair was also not equally distributed among the members of the dyad. This was mainly because the information for this activity was unevenly divided between the members of each pair. The describers in the picture description task had access to more information than the drawers. As a result, it was the describers in the various dyads who contributed a greater share of strategies, except for the fourth pair. In the first dyad, the Korean describer contributed 101 strategies while in the second pair, the Japanese describer provided 76 strategies. The Costa Rican describer in the third dyad provided 25 strategies and the Japanese describer in the fourth dyad contributed 60 strategies. In

the fourth pair, the Saudi drawer used more strategies (70) than his partner (60). In spite of being cast in the more passive role of the drawer, the Saudi male consistently made use of leading questions(35) in order to direct the course of the activity. As a result, the less proficient describer introduced most of the new information into the activity by responding to his queries (28) and rarely took initiative on her own (3). But as the more dominant describer or sender of the information, the Japanese learner supplied a greater number of strategies (60) when compared with her contribution as drawer or receiver of the information (14). Like Yule and Macdonald's study (1990), this study also found that there was increased verbal output on the part of the less proficient member when she was cast in the more dominant role. But with regard to directing the path of the discourse as much and as often as possible, this study obtained results that were contrary to Yule and Macdonald's findings. The Japanese describer did not get a great deal of openings to direct the activity and even when they did manifest themselves, she did not always utilize them.

As already noted, the Costa Rican/Japanese dyad did not use the maximum number of strategies in the picture description task. They used the maximum number of strategies in the jigsaw activity (106). The reason for a high use of strategies by this pair in the jigsaw activity could be attributed to the essential discrepancy between the dyad's version and the researcher's version of the picture story. The pair may have found it challenging to put their own story back on track, in order to make it correspond with the six visuals given by the researcher. Unlike the picture description

task, where the information was unequally distributed, the jigsaw activity gave an equal share of information to both members. As a result, the researcher expected both members of the dyad to contribute an equal number of strategies. But the Costa Rican male contributed more strategies to the total (58) than did his Japanese partner (48). He introduced new information 25 times as a self-initiated move while the Japanese member utilized this strategy only 8 times. The Japanese female agreed with her partner's ideas 25 times, compared with the 5 times that the Costa Rican male agreed with her.

While exploring the most interactive pair activity with regard to the total number of communication strategies used, no single activity could be isolated since there was an absence of consistency with the pairs. For the Costa Rican/Japanese dyad, unlike the other three pairs, the picture description task did not result in the use of the maximum number of communication strategies. It is important to note here that the highest use of communication strategies by a pair did not automatically translate into an equal amount of interaction for each member. Typically, in the task where information was unequally distributed, the individual who possessed more information interacted more with the less informed partner than vice versa. But even in the activity where the information was equally distributed, the pattern of interaction was not found to be even. The Costa Rican male in the Costa Rican/Japanese dyad contributed more strategies and consequently interacted more with his partner in the jigsaw activity, even though they started out by having an equal share of information.

In the process of identifying the most interactive pair activity, it was found that the tasks that generated the maximum number of communication strategies for each pair resulted in an unequal number of strategies and consequently, an unequal amount of interaction for each member of the pair.

Research Question #2

Which pair activity, among the three chosen for this particular study, generates the minimum amount of interaction, with regard to the total number of communication strategies used?

The second part of the guessing game resulted in the lowest combined total number of strategies among all the activities. It was also the least interactive activity for three out of the four pairs in the study (the Saudi/Japanese dyad was the exception). Table 45 on the following page shows the least interactive activity for each pair.

The reason for such a low use of strategies in the second part of the guessing game could be attributed to the lack of difficulty that the pairs experienced while trying to guess the five words accurately. Apart from the strategy of agreement and other correction, the remaining twelve communication strategies were utilized and they ranged between 2(*strategy of self-correction*) and 64(*turntaking signal*) in frequency of occurrence. The combined total number of strategies used by all the pairs was 238. But just like the second part of the picture description task, this activity also

did not have an equal distribution of strategies among the pairs. The second pair, comprising the Japanese male and the Thai male, contributed the least number of strategies (35) to the combined total. The maximum number of strategies was contributed by the fourth pair, comprising the Saudi male and the Japanese female (123).

Table 45

The Least Interactive Activity for Each Pair

Pair	Least Interactive Activity	Member	Individual Strategy Use	Total Strategies Used
Pair 1	Guessing Game (Part 2)	Japanese Female (Clue Giver)	34	43
		Korean Male (Guesser)	9	
Pair 2	Guessing Game (Part 2)	Japanese Male (Clue Giver)	23	35
		Thai Male (Guesser)	12	
Pair 3	Guessing Game (Part 2)	Costa Rican Male (Clue Giver)	26	37
		Japanese Female (Guesser)	11	
Pair 4	Picture Description Task (Part 1) /	Saudi Arabian Male (Describer / Clue Giver)	41/45	55/55
	Guessing Game (Part 1)	Japanese Female (Drawer / Guesser)	14/10	

The number of strategies contributed by each member of the pair also varied in the guessing game mainly because the information was not equally distributed among

the members, as in the picture description task. The clue giver in the guessing game had access to more information than the guesser since the former was the one who had been given the list of five words that had to be guessed. As a result, it was the clue givers in the various dyads who contributed a greater number of strategies to the total. The Japanese clue giver in the Japanese/Korean dyad supplied 34 strategies and the Japanese clue giver in the Japanese/Thai dyad contributed 23 strategies. In the Costa Rican/Japanese dyad, the Costa Rican clue giver provided 26 strategies while the Japanese female in the Saudi/Japanese dyad contributed 64 strategies. Unlike the other dyads where the clue givers initiated all the new information, the Japanese clue giver in the Saudi/Japanese dyad introduced new information more often as a response to a turn (9) than as a self-initiated move (8). For this pair, as already mentioned, this activity did not generate the least number of communication strategies. They used the minimum number of strategies in the first part of the picture description task (55) and the first part of the guessing game (55). In both these activities, it was the more proficient Saudi male who held a greater chunk of the information. Like Yule and Macdonald's study (1990), this study also found that when the more proficient member was the more powerful sender of the information, there was a minimum amount of interaction involved to complete the activity. The reason for a decrease in interaction may be attributed to the more proficient member's successful attempts to outline the course of the activity, with limited input from the less proficient member of the dyad.

While investigating the least interactive activity with regard to the total number of communication strategies used, no single activity could be isolated since there was a lack of uniformity among the pairs. For the Saudi/Japanese dyad, unlike the other three pairs, the second part of the guessing game did not result in the use of the minimum number of communication strategies. It is important to note here that the lowest use of communication strategies by a pair did not automatically translate into a low amount of interaction for each member. Typically, in the task where the information was unequally distributed, the individual who possessed less information interacted less with the more informed member than vice versa.

In the process of identifying the least interactive pair activity, it was found that the task that generated the minimum number of communication strategies for each pair resulted in an unequal number of strategies and consequently, an unequal amount of interaction for each member of the pair.

Research Question #3

Is there any significant link between successful task accomplishment and interaction processes, with regard to time limit?

This study was undertaken with the stipulation of a certain time limit for each of the activities mainly in order to make the participants focused as well as task conscious. The jigsaw activity was allotted fifteen minutes, the picture description tasks had a time limit of fifteen minutes each, and the guessing games were allotted

ten minutes for each half. Before the start of each activity, the various dyads were told the amount of time they had in order to complete the task. Since none of the activities were undertaken without a time constraint, the researcher is unsure of the outcome of the activities in the absence of a time limit. Table 46 shows the time taken by each pair to complete the various activities through the process of interaction.

Table 46

Time Taken to Complete Task Through Interaction

Activity	Members of Each Pair	Time Taken by Each Pair	Strategies Used	Successful Accomplishment of Task
Jigsaw Activity 15 minutes	JF/KM	14 min	115	No
	TM/JM	9 min	67	Yes
	JF/CM	13 min	106	No
	JF/SM	15 min*	81	No
Picture Description Task (Part 1) 15 minutes	JF /KM	10 min	104	No
	TM /JM	9 min	104	No
	JF/CM	5 min	66	No
	SM/JF	6 min	55	No
Picture Description Task (Part 2) 15 minutes	KM /JF	15 min*	181	Yes
	JM /TM	12 min	118	Yes
	CM/JF	4 min	40	Yes
	JF/SM	15 min*	130	No
Guessing Game (Part 1) 10 minutes	KM/JF	6. 30 min	109	No
	TM/JM	3 min	52	Yes
	JF/CM	4 min	46	Yes
	SM/JF	4.10 sec	55	Yes
Guessing Game (Part 2) 10 minutes	JF/KM	2 min	43	Yes
	JM/TM	1. 20 min	35	Yes
	CM/JF	2 .42 min	37	No
	JF/SM	10 min *	123	No

* did not complete the activity

In the jigsaw activity, successful task accomplishment was defined by the placement of the six pictures in the appropriate slots and the drawing of suitable pictures in the remaining slots within the time limit. Out of the four pairs, only the second dyad (TM/JM) successfully completed the activity within the time limit. This pair used a total of 67 strategies during the process of interaction. Even though the first pair (JF/KM) and the third dyad (JF/CM) concluded the activity within fifteen minutes, they could not be considered successful since their respective stories did not have a logical progression or conclusion. The fourth pair (JF/SM) could not bring either the activity or its interaction to a close in the allotted time.

The first part of the picture description task was not accomplished successfully by any pair. Success in this part of the task was determined by each pair's ability to get all eight details of the picture on to the visual that was being replicated. None of the pairs was able to convey the detail of the cleft on the chin. Even though the four dyads did not successfully complete the activity, they did bring their interaction to a close before the time limit. For the second half of the picture description activity, success was determined by each pair's ability to get all six details of the picture on to the visual that was being replicated. Only the second pair (JM/TM) and the third pair (CM/JF) were able to successfully complete the part of the activity within the time allotted. The second pair used 118 strategies while the third pair used 40 communication strategies. The first pair (KM/JF) was successful at completing the task but did not bring its interaction to a close within the time limit (total strategies

used: 181). The fourth dyad (JF/SM) could neither complete the activity successfully nor bring its interaction to a close within fifteen minutes.

With regard to the first half of the guessing game, three pairs successfully completed the activity before the time allotted. Success in the guessing game was determined by the guesser's ability to get all the five words accurately, without the clue giver stepping in to give out parts of the word or the word itself. In the first pair (KM/JF), the Korean clue giver gave out the initial sound of one of the words to his partner. As a result, this pair was considered to be unsuccessful in accomplishing this particular part of the guessing game. The second pair (TM/JM) used 52 strategies while the third pair (JF/CM) utilized 46 strategies. The fourth pair (SM/JF) utilized 55 communication strategies in order to successfully accomplish the task within the time allotted. It also appeared as if the members of the various dyads did not have to interact a great deal in order to accomplish the task within the time limit. The combined total number of strategies used by all the pairs was 262 (this activity ranked second in the list of least interactive activities). In the second half of the guessing game, the first pair (JF/KM) and the second pair (JM/TM) successfully completed the activity within the time allotted. The first pair utilized 43 communication strategies while the second pair used 35 strategies. The third pair brought its interaction to a close within ten minutes but could not be considered successful since the clue giver gave out one of the words instead of allowing the guesser to handle this aspect of the

activity. The fourth pair could neither complete the task successfully nor conclude its interaction in the time that was provided.

Based on the results of this study, the following trends may be observed:

a) If a pair uses a greater number of communication strategies, then there is a corresponding increase in the interaction but there is a lesser chance of the task getting successfully accomplished within the time limit.

b) If a pair uses a lesser number of communication strategies, then there is a corresponding decrease in the interaction but there is a greater chance of the task getting successfully accomplished within the time limit.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The main aim of this study was to identify various types of interactive activities available for dyads and to isolate the patterns of verbal participation in them. But the study itself has certain inherent limitations. First of all, only one type of combination with regard to the three activities has been tried. This particular combination starts with the jigsaw activity, followed by the picture description task and culminates in the guessing game. If the hierarchy of the activities had been changed, there is a possibility that the results of the study would have been correspondingly different.

Another limitation of the study is that the nature of the tasks themselves made comparison between them a challenging endeavor. The jigsaw activity comprised a

picture story, the picture description task involved the replication of a visual, while the guessing game required the learners to guess five unrelated words. If the activities had more similar to each other, then a comparison would have been correspondingly easier. With regard to the jigsaw activity, a distinct limitation was the researcher's inability to quantify the successful progression and outcome of the picture story. If the placement of the pictures in the different slots could have been more clearly delineated, then it would have been information easier to identify successful task accomplishment. Another distinct limitation of this study is the imposition of a time limit for all the activities. The need to get the task completed within the stipulated time may have acted as a deterrent to a greater amount of interaction. The study itself was conducted in a classroom setting where the atmosphere is typically formal. The linguistic output of the learners may have shown some significant changes if the recordings had taken place in a more casual and informal setting.

Another drawback of this study is that second language development itself is not measured directly but is approached indirectly through the interaction process. Therefore, the researcher has no clear way of knowing whether language development has taken place through interaction for the participants in this study. As far as the findings themselves are concerned, it is difficult to generalize on the basis of the limited data available from the speakers. There were only four pairs available for this research project and all the conclusions are based on the data that were obtained from them.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The effect of the absence of a time limit on the interaction processes of the different activities would be a significant area of future research with regard to this study. These tasks could be carried out without a time constraint to observe any changes in the pattern of interaction. In this study, the imposition of a time limit allowed most members of the dyad to accomplish the task but for certain participants, it negatively affected their interaction. Another suggestion in the realm of new research is the switching of partners for each activity in order to observe the effect of an unfamiliar partner on the process of interaction. It might also be significant to pair a native speaker with a nonnative speaker to observe the latter's linguistic modifications while performing the activities.

The issue of mixing proficiency levels and its impact on verbal interaction was observed in only one instance. New research could combine proficiency levels in more dyads to detect changes in participation levels. Another potential area of future research could be the investigation of interaction styles in dyads from a homogenous background instead of a heterogenous background. Like De Guerrero's study (1986), it would be worthwhile to determine when and why the learners lapse into their common language during the course of performing the various tasks. Future research may also be able to test the effect of gender and/or culture on negotiation patterns and participation styles.

The relationship between the total words spoken and the total number of strategies used by each pair has not been explored in this study. Therefore, new research methods could be designed to establish a stronger link between the total verbal output and the total number of communication strategies utilized by each dyad. It would also be worthwhile to have inter-rater reliability with regard to coding the various communication strategies in order to lend a greater amount of accuracy to the results of the study.

The pair activities themselves could be modified to investigate issues like second language development, vocabulary acquisition, and other correction, instead of merely analyzing interaction patterns. The activities used in this study were essentially disparate and had no connection with each other or with any text that was a part of participants' curriculum. Future research could integrate these activities into the curriculum in order to observe any differences in the level of student participation. The sample size could also be increased for the purpose of making the results of the study more generalizable.

SUGGESTIONS FOR LANGUAGE TEACHING

Extensive research has been undertaken to establish the efficacy of group activities for language learners. The success of this student-centered approach should act as an incentive for its increased use in the classroom. It is essential for teachers to rely on group work to foster an environment of dynamic cooperation and interaction

among the learners. Instructors need to realize that students are capable of doing certain types of activities by themselves and require little interference when trying to accomplish a particular task. At the same time, teachers should not completely relinquish their role in the classroom. They should be readily available to assist the students in case a problem arises. In this study, it was found that the Japanese female in the Saudi/Japanese dyad was not aware of the meaning of one of the words and as a result, she tended to mislead her partner. If the teacher pays attention to the interaction taking place in the various dyads, s/he could step in at this point and clarify the meaning for the learner. Also, postperformance feedback, like that suggested by Bruton and Samuda (1980), would help the teachers to discern when the students were on track and when they tended to veer in the wrong direction.

With regard to distribution of information for activities, the instructor has to ensure that the less proficient learner is given more information so that s/he gets valuable practice in verbal skills. The more proficient learner, on his/her part, should be given less information so that s/he does not dominate. In case the more proficient learner tends to dominate even when s/he has less information, it could be advantageous in its own way. As Spelman (1992) suggests, the more proficient member is continuously eliciting information from his/her reticent partner and giving the latter frequent opportunities for increased interaction.

In order to generate a great deal of interaction among the learners, the instructors have to design activities which not only require an unequal distribution of

information but also involve the transmission of complex details between the members of the dyad. The reason for the highest use of communication strategies in the second part of the picture description task could be attributed to (a) the complicated and detailed picture given to the dyads and (b) the difference in the amount of information held by the drawer and describer in each pair.

Before selecting dyadic activities, the teacher needs to decide whether to give precedence to time limit or interaction, with regard to successful task accomplishment. If the task has to be accomplished through an increased amount of interaction, then there should be a corresponding flexibility with time limit. On the other hand, if a fixed time limit is given to complete the activity, then there may be a decrease in interaction between the learners, but there is a greater chance of the learners completing the activity.

The data results suggest that the learners' use of communication strategies during the process of interaction enhances their ability to successfully complete the task. Therefore, the teacher needs to encourage the students to interact not only with each other but even with him/her, when information is introduced/exchanged in the classroom. Language instructors should present the material in manageable units of oral expression and should strive not to completely overwhelm the learners with their linguistic knowledge and proficiency.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alvarado, C. S. (1992). Discourse styles and patterns of participation on ESL interactive tasks. TESOL Quarterly, 26, 589-593.
- Aston, G. (1986). Trouble-shooting in interaction with learners: The more the merrier? Applied Linguistics, 7(2), 129-143.
- Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. Harmondsworth: Penguin Education.
- Bejarano, Y. (1987). A cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 21(3), 483-498.
- Brumfit, C. (1984). Communication methodology in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruton, A. & Samuda, V. (1980). Learner and teacher roles in the treatment of oral error in group work. RELC Journal, 11(2), 49-63.
- Bygate, M. (1988). Units of oral expression & language learning in small group interaction. Applied Linguistics, 9(1), 59-82.
- De Guerrero, M. C. M. (1986, June). Strategies of peer interaction in the monolingual ESL class. Paper presented at the Annual University of South Florida Linguistics Club Conference on Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Teaching.
- Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? TESOL Quarterly, 20(2), 305-325.
- Duff, P. A. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: Taking task to task. In R. R. Day (Ed.) Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 147-181). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ehrlich, S., Avery, P., & Yurio, C. (1989). Discourse structure and the negotiation of comprehensible input. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11(4), 397-414.
- Ellis, R. (1984). Communication strategies and the evaluation of communicative performance. ELT Journal, 38(1), 39-44.

- Ellis, R. (1988). Classroom second language development: A study of classroom interaction and language acquisition. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Gardner, D. (1987). Communication games: Do we know what we're talking about? ELT Journal, 41(1), 19-23.
- Johnson, D. W. (1981). Student-student interaction: The neglected variable in education. Educational Researcher, 10(1), 5-10.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, H. (1992). Defossilizing. ELT Journal, 46(2), 180-189.
- Johnson, K. A. (1995). Understanding communication in second language classrooms. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Khanji, R. (1993). Interlanguage talk: The relation between task types and communication strategies among EFL Arab learners. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 428-436.
- Khanji, R. (1996). Two perspectives in analyzing communication strategies. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 34(2), 144-154.
- Kramsch, C. L. (1985). Interaction processes in group work. TESOL Quarterly, 19(4), 796-800.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. New York: Longman.
- Long, M. H. (1976). Group work in the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language: Problems and potential. ELT Journal, 31(2), 285-292.
- Long, M. H., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castanos, F. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. F. Fanselow & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL '76 (pp. 137-153).
- Long, M. H. (1982). NS/NNS conversation in the second language classroom. In M. A. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), On TESOL '82 (pp. 207-225).
- Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 19(2), 207-228.

- McGroarty, M. (1991). What can peers provide? Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages & Linguistics, 40-55.
- Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. TESOL Quarterly, 25(2), 279-294.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985a). Input and interaction in the communicative classroom: Teacher-fronted vs. group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985b). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7(2), 233- 248.
- Pica, T. (1991). Classroom interaction, negotiation, and comprehension: Redefining relationships. System, 19(4), 437-452.
- Pica, T., Kanagy R., & Faldoun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), Tasks and language learning (pp. 9-34). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Pica, T., Porter, F. L., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? TESOL Quarterly, 30(1), 51-84.
- Porter, P. A. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. R. Day (Ed.) Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 200-222). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Rogers, J. (1979). We have ways of making you talk. Guidelines, 1, 77-87.
- Rulon, K. A., & McCreary, J. (1986). Negotiation of content: Teacher-fronted and small-group interaction. In R. R. Day (Ed.) Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition (pp. 182-199). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Seliger, H. W. (1977). Does practice make perfect?: A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. Language Learning, 27(2), 263-278.
- Senor, V. (1986). Let your students do the talking: Pattern practices in a partner system. In B. Snyder, W. H. Bartz, & J. B. Goepper (Eds.), Second language

- acquisition: Preparing for tomorrow: Selected papers from the annual meeting of the central states conference on the teaching of foreign languages (pp. 87-92). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Spelman, M. (1992, November). The importance of discourse style in pairing students for interactive communicative tasks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English.
- Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. TESOL Quarterly, 15(3), 285-293.
- Taylor, B. P., & Wolfson, N. (1978). Breaking the free conversation myth. TESOL Quarterly, 12(1), 31-39.
- Taylor, B. P. (1982). In search of real reality. TESOL Quarterly, 16(1), 29-42.
- Taylor, B. P. (1983). Teaching ESL: Incorporating a communicative, student-centered component. TESOL Quarterly, 17(1), 69-85.
- Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. M. (1985a). Nonnative/nonnative conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. Applied Linguistics, 6, 71-90.
- Varonis, E. M., & Gass, S. M. (1985b). Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury Press.
- Webb, N. M. (1982). Student interaction and learning in small groups. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 421-445.
- Yule, G., & Macdonald, D. (1990). Resolving referential conflicts in L2 interaction: The effect of proficiency and interactive role. Language Learning, 40(4), 539-556.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION SAMPLES

TRANSCRIPTION SAMPLES

ACTIVITY NO. 2: PICTURE DESCRIPTION TASK Part 1

Third Pair: Costa Rican Male/Japanese Female

Drawer: Costa Rican Male

Describer: Japanese Female

- JF: ok so can you draw man? (**new information as a self-initiated move**)
CM: a guy ?(**clarification**)
JF: yeah (**affirmation**)
CM: ok uh uh a guy (**self-repetition**)
JF: yeah wait a minute wait a minute (laugh)
CM: hmm
JF: ok she has a big nose (**new information as a self-initiated move**)
CM: she? (**confirmation check**)
JF: no he has a big nose (**self-correction**)
CM: he has a big nose (**other repetition**)
JF: and he is smiling (**new information as a self-initiated move**)
CM: is he smiling? (**confirmation check**)
JF: we can his teeth (**new information as a self-initiated move**)
CM: we can see his teeth (**other repetition**)
JF: his teeth his teeth (**self-repetition**)ok (laugh) and he wear cap (**new information as a self-initiated move**)
CM: cap? (**confirmation check**)
JF: cap cap (**self-repetition**) square square cap (**expansion**)
CM: oh ah a hat (**other correction**)
JF: and you have to draw some stars in hat (**new information as a self-initiated move**)
CM: in the hat? (**confirmation check**) Jesus!
JF: ah ah and he has two ears (**new information as a self-initiated move**) big ears (**expansion**)
CM: ah ah
JF: he is wearing (**new information as a self-initiated move**) wearing shirt (**expansion**)
CM: what ? (**clarification**)
JF: shirt (**self-repetition**)
CM: shirt shirt (**other repetition**)? a t-shirt (**expansion**)? or (turntaking signal as a pause)
JF: not t-shirt (**negation**)
CM: ok
JF: and he is wearing necktie (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) a necktie (**self-repetition**)
CM: oh yeah? (**clarification**)a

JF: hm hm (**affirmation**)
 CM: ok and he has hands? (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
 JF: no (**negation**)
 CM: no? (**confirmation check**)
 JF: and can you draw collar (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) collar (**self-correction**)
 CM: what? (**clarification**)
 JF: like collar (**approximation**) collar (**self-repetition**)
 CM: collar? (**confirmation check**) oh like this? (**clarification**)
 JF: hmm hmm (**affirmation**)
 CM: in his necklace ? like a necklace? (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
 JF: no not necklace (**negation**)
 CM: like when you put (**turntaking signal as a pause**)
 JF: yeah (**affirmation**)
 CM: Jesus! I dont know how to do that (**temporary abandonment**)
 JF: hmm (**affirmation**) good and he has a pocket left (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
 CM: here ? (**clarification**)
 JF: yeah (**affirmation**)
 CM: ok yeah
 JF: and we can see two buttons (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
 CM: two buttons in the (**turntaking signal as a pause**)
 JF: no no (**negation**) under the necktie (**expansion**) good
 CM: ok (**affirmation**)
 JF: and his tie is check (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
 check (**self-repetition**)
 CM: his tie? (**confirmation check**)
 JF: his necktie is check (**self-repetition**) yeah good
 CM: hmm
 JF: no stripes (**negation**) check (**self-repetition**)
 CM: like this? (**clarification**)
 JF: yeah (**affirmation**)
 CM: ok
 JF: and can you draw his arms (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
 CM: arms? (**confirmation check**) and where is like his arms are like? (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
 JF: just down (**introduction of new information as a response to a turn**)
 CM: just down arms (**confirmation check**) ? ok Jesus Christ where's the (**self-correction**) where his hands? (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
 JF: good (**affirmation**) thats it
 CM: thats it?(**confirmation check**) (laugh)

ACTIVITY NO. 3: GUESSING GAME Part 1

Second Pair: Japanese Male/Thai Male

Guesser: Japanese

Clue Giver: Thai

- 1) TM: okay first word is verb (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
- JM: verb? (**confirmation check**)
- TM: is verb when you eat sugar (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
- JM: when I eat?(**confirmation check**)
- TM: no no (**negation**) when you eat sugar you will feel that sugar sweet (**expansion**) when you eat salt then you feel salt (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) can you guess this word ? (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
- JM: yeah (**affirmation**)
- TM: this is something like you can feel it (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) sense sense (**self-repetition**) one of the sense (**expansion**)
- JM: sense?(**confirmation check**)
- TM: see smell (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
- JM: taste?
- TM: yes (**affirmation**) taste
- 2) TM: next second word I love my woman very much (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) I want to live with her (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) but before I live with her I have to do one ceremony (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) what is it?(**turntaking signal as a leading question**)
- JM: marriage?
- TM: yeah (**affirmation**)marriage
- 3) TM: this is third..kasu (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
- JM: kasu? (**confirmation check**)
- TM: kasu is a base football player in your country (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) he is (**turntaking signal as a pause**)
- JM: famous?
- TM: yes (**affirmation**)
- JM: very good
- 4) TM:four I like one woman very much (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) I crazy her (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) I want to live with her(**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)
- JM: love?

TM: yes how can you do it ?you

5) TM:the last one this one is tough the most popular substance(**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) you can see this substance (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) you know the word substance substance is something like material (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)you know material? (**turntaking signal as a leading question**)

JM: yes (**affirmation**)

TM: this is the most popular material (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) you can see it everywhere (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) it is not metal (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) it is not paper (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)this can be uses for making a cup (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)

JM: cup?(**confirmation check**)

TM: making a plate (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**) making a (**turntaking signal as a pause**)

JM: I see (**affirmation**) gold? (**approximation**)

TM: no not gold (**negation**)not metal (**negation**)is not metallic (**negation**) is something is very use many way (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)you can see everything made on it (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)

JM: wood? (**approximation**)

TM: no not wood (**negation**) it is a chemical (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)chemical material (**expansion**) but more serious your pen (**introduction of new information as a self-initiated move**)your pen is made from it (**expansion**)

JM: plastic?

APPENDIX B

EXIT CRITERIA FOR LOWER INTERMEDIATE ESL STUDENTS

APPENDIX B

SPEECH LEVEL II EXIT CRITERIA

By the end of this class, students should:

Pronunciation

- 1) Recognize and produce reduced forms containing the "be" and "have" auxiliary forms (e.g. They're, I've, We've etc) and the negative contraction (e.g. Haven't, aren't, etc). Students should also recognize reduced forms of English such as "whatcher", "otta", "doncha", "whaddaya", "mightuh" and "shoulduh".
- 2) Recognize and practise producing some commonly used phonemic contrasts such as the "th" sounds (ð/θ) and the vowel sounds ɛ, æ, and ɪ.
- 3) Be aware of the basic stress patterns in:
 - one, two and three syllable words.
 - two-and three-word verbs. For example, the major stress is often placed on the second word as in:
take ^ˈpart in cut ^ˈdown on look ^ˈup to
- 4) Be able to identify stressed words (from pitch, clarity and loudness of pronunciation) that signal important information.
- 5) Be aware of the principles of sentence stress. For example, students should know that content words such as nouns and verbs are usually stressed, but function words such as prepositions are usually unstressed. They should also recognize the schwa sound in unstressed syllables.
- 6) Be able to identify thought group boundaries in a simple passage and begin to produce them in their speech.
- 7) Be able to identify basic intonation patterns in English such as:
 - falling intonation with WH questions as in:
What's your name? →
 - rising intonation on yes/no questions as in:
Are you American? →
 - falling intonation with statements as in:
I study at PSU. →

-- falling intonation with imperatives as in:

Sit down! →

-- rising intonation on statements to express questions as in:

You're tired. →

-- rising intonation on all items in a series except the last as in:

I went to the bank, the store and the post office. →

-- rising intonation on tag questions to indicate uncertainty as in:

You're Dr. Brown aren't you? →

-- falling intonation on tag questions to indicate certainty as in:

You're Dr. Brown aren't you? →

- 8) Understand common pronunciation terminology such as the words "fluency", "intelligibility", "accuracy", "stress", "rhythm", "intonation", "voiced", "unvoiced", "lip", "palate" and "tongue".

Listening Skills

- 9) Demonstrate listening comprehension by performing practical tasks such as following maps and filling out applications and graphs.
- 10) Recognize 30 new American idioms and slang expressions.
- 11) Be able to make basic inferences by using contextual clues to understand implied messages in short conversations (see Interactions II exercises).

Academic Skills

- 12) Be able to complete a partial outline of a 5-minute lecture of the kind found in Interactions II and use the information from this outline to answer comprehension questions.

- 13) Demonstrate the basics of classroom interaction skills such as interrupting the teacher, asking questions, and asking for repetition and clarification.

Speaking and Communication Skills

- 14) Ask and answer questions using:

- simple present, present continuous and present perfect tenses.
- simple past and past continuous tenses.
- simple future tense (will and going to).
- the modals (can, could, may, might, should, ought to, had better, must, and have to).
- the question words (who, what, where, when, why, how much, how many).
- basic tag questions.

- 15) Perform a majority of the following functions:

- ask for and give information
- elicit information
- give appropriate excuses in various situations (e.g. forgetting an appointment, turning down an invitation etc.)
- ask for and give advice using "should", "ought to" and "had better".
- ask for and give opinions.
- express agreement and disagreement.
- make comparisons between two or more things.
- compliment, criticize and complain.
- persuade someone of their point of view.
(for examples of these functions and the level to which students should perform them, see Interactions II and Person to Person Book II).

- 16) See # 13.

Cultural Skills

- 17) Be aware of the causes, symptoms and treatment of culture shock.

- 18) Be aware of the common forms of non-verbal communication in the USA, particularly the use of:

- eye contact
- gestures and facial expressions
- personal spacing
- time

- 19) See # 13.

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

**Project Title: Promotion of Interaction in the Second Language Classroom Through
Structured Pair Activities**
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, _____, agree to voluntarily participate in this research project.

I understand that I will be paired with another ESL student for each of the three activities.

The first activity will be a jigsaw type activity, where my partner and I have to place a set of pictures in the right slots and create some pictures of our own. The second activity will be a picture description task, where my partner and I will get a chance to draw as well as describe a set of pictures. The third activity will be a guessing game, where my partner and I will get a chance to draw as well as guess the picture that has been drawn.

It will take about 45 minutes to complete all the three tasks. A tape recorder will be used to record the language that I produce while carrying out the various activities.

I understand that this study will cause no kind of risk to me.

Vidya Rangachari, the researcher, has told me that the purpose of the study is to find out which particular pair activity generates the maximum amount of interaction among the learners. I may not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this study. But the study may serve to identify the most communicative pair activity for further use in the ESL classroom.

Vidya Rangachari has offered to answer any questions I have about the study and what I am expected to do. I can contact her at 725-7843 at any time during the course of the study.

Vidya has promised that all information I give will be confidential to the extent permitted by law, and that the names of all people in the study will be kept confidential.

I understand that I can withdraw my participation from this study without hurting my course grade or my relationship with my teachers at Portland State University.

I have read and understood the above information and agree to take part in this study.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

If you have concerns or questions about this study, please contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Committee, Research and Sponsored Projects, 105 Neuberger Hall, Portland State University, 503/725-3417.

APPENDIX D

THE INCOMPLETE PICTURE STORY

<p>1</p>
			<p>4</p>

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

THE INCOMPLETE PICTURE STORY

1

2

3

4

8

5

9

10

11

12

THE FIRST PAIR'S PICTURE STORY

THE SECOND PAIR'S PICTURE STORY

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

THE THIRD PAIR'S PICTURE STORY

11

12

8

THE FOURTH PAIR'S PICTURE STORY

APPENDIX E

THE FIRST PICTURE GIVEN TO THE DYADS

THE FIRST PAIR'S PICTURE

THE SECOND PAIR'S PICTURE

THE THIRD PAIR'S PICTURE

THE FOURTH PAIR'S PICTURE

APPENDIX F

THE SECOND PICTURE GIVEN TO THE DYADS

THE FIRST PAIR'S PICTURE

THE SECOND PAIR'S PICTURE

THE THIRD PAIR'S PICTURE

THE FOURTH PAIR'S PICTURE