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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of form-focused instruction in relation to learner investment in second language (L2) communication and learning. Although positive effects of form-focused instruction have been reported in the instructed second language acquisition literature, most of this research has been conducted from a cognitive-interactionist perspective. Little attention has been paid to the social and cultural factors of form-focused instruction, including learner investment—a desire to learn a second/foreign language taking into consideration learners’ socially constructed identities (Norton-Peirce, 1995). Drawing on second language socialization theory (Duff, 2007) and using discursive practices (Young, 2009) as an analytic framework, this study examines how form-focused instruction influences learner investment in L2 communication in the classroom setting.

Twenty-four high school students in Japan participated in a study, where two Japanese teachers of English team-taught four 50-minute lessons. Each lesson contained a 30-minute treatment period, which consisted of a 15-minute exclusively meaning-focused (MF) activity and a 15-minute form-focused (FF) activity that included attention to both form and meaning. By counter-balancing effects of tasks, target grammar features, and teachers, the study examined whether and how the same learners invested in L2 communication in similar or different ways during the two different types of activities. Data were collected through classroom observations, video-recorded classroom interactions, stimulated recalls, interviews, questionnaires, and diaries. The
interactional data were analyzed quantitatively by comparing the frequency of turns and language-related episodes during FF and MF activities. The same interactional data were also analyzed qualitatively in relation to discursive practices and self-reported data.

The results showed that the FF activities created contexts for learners to establish their identities as L2 learners leading to more engagement in L2 communication than in the MF activities. This suggests that FF activities create a social context that enables learners to communicate in the L2 with greater investment than in MF activities.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Much research has been conducted to examine the effects of instruction on second language (L2) development and positive effects have been reported (e.g., Ellis, 2001, 2006; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Spada, 1997, 2010). These studies have investigated the effects of instruction on L2 learning including grammatical, phonological, lexical and pragmatic ability (Alcon-Soler, 2009; Ammar & Lightbown, 2005; Arteaga, Herschensohn, & Gess, 2003; Bouton, 1994, 1996; Ellis, 2009; Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Izumi, 2002; Trofimovich & Gatbonton, 2006; Vyatkina, 2007; Yang & Lyster, 2010). This research has also explored relationships between different types of instruction (i.e., explicit/implicit) and particular grammar forms (i.e., simple/complex) (Housen, Pierrard, & Van Daele, 2005; Robinson, 1996, 1997, Spada, Lightbown, & White, 2005; Spada & Tomita, 2010; Williams & Evans, 1998), and the effects of different types of corrective feedback on L2 learning (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Han, 2002; Kubota, 1994; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Sheen, 2007). Most of the instructed SLA research has been conducted within a cognitive-interactionist framework, where SLA is regarded as “an internalized, cognitive process” (Zuengl & Miller, 2006, p. 36). There have been lively debates over whether SLA research should be conducted from a wider range of perspectives, specifically the broader social contexts in which L2 learners are situated (e.g., Block, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 1998; Gass, 1998; Hall, 1997; Kasper, 1997; Liddicoat, 1997; Long, 1997; Poulisse, 1997; Zulengler & Miller, 2006).

With this in mind, I carried out a study designed to examine foreign language learning from both a cognitive and social perspective in order to better understand the role of form-focused instruction in promoting learner investment in L2 communication and learning. Form-focused instruction is defined as a type of instruction that draws learners’ attention to form during communicative activities (Spada, 1997, 2010). Research conducted on form-focused instruction indicates that learners improve both in linguistic accuracy and fluency in response to instructional techniques such as corrective feedback, pushed output, typographical enhancement, explicit grammar explanation, and L1 and L2 contrasts (for reviews, see Han, Park, & Combs, 2008; S. Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Russell

---

1 Most of the research in instructed SLA has focused on the acquisition of grammatical features as opposed to other features of language – phonology, pragmatics, vocabulary, etc.
& Spada, 2006; Spada & Tomita, 2010). Furthermore, there is a consensus among mainstream instructed SLA researchers that the positive effects of form-focused instruction are mainly due to opportunities for learners to notice the errors in their own internal linguistic systems and restructure the system to become closer to that of the target language (Schmidt, 2001). This noticing and increased awareness of language is thought to occur during form-focused instruction (Egi, 2010; Ellis, 2001; Long & Robinson, 1998; Spada, 1997).

Thus, mainstream SLA research investigating form-focused instruction has made a considerable contribution to our understanding of the relationship between L2 teaching and learning. However, there seems to be an unquestioned assumption among mainstream SLA researchers that learners will communicate in the L2 when given the opportunity to do so. This is not the case in all second language classroom settings; on the contrary learners’ resistance and silence has been documented in many second language classes, foreign language classes, and multilingual mainstream classes (Canagarajah, 2001; Duff, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004; Goldstein, 2003; Hall & Verplaatse, 2000; Heller, 2006; Nakane, 20007; Pon, Goldstein, & Schecter, 2003; Storch & Hill, 2008). Given such resistance to L2 communication, it is unlikely that learners will create opportunities for noticing or raising their awareness about the target language. A lack of opportunity to practice can seriously hinder L2 learning given that communication practice is an essential condition for L2 learning (Spolsky, 1989). In fact, in Japan, the decrease in students’ English proficiency has been regularly reported in the media since the government began emphasizing oral communication in the English curriculum in the 1990s (Eigosoken, 2006; Ito, 2008; Matsumura, 2009; Nakamura, 2006; Okada, 1999; Oya, 2007; Shirai, 2008; Suiko, 1999; Suzuki, 2010; Ushiroda, 2003a, 2003b).

Some might argue this silence is due to a lack of motivation. However, my experience teaching English to high school students in Japan made me question whether the silence was due to cognitive factors, such as motivation or social factors. This was based on my observations of contradictory but interesting phenomena in the oral communication behavior of my students. That is, when I asked my high school EFL students to communicate in English, they were reluctant and rarely communicated in the L2. When I asked them to communicate in English and to focus their attention on the language forms needed to express their meaning at the same time the same students actively engaged in L2 communication. What led them to communicate more in one instructional activity than the other? It is my view that the concept of learner investment,
which describes learners’ complex, ambiguous, and contradictory attitudes toward L2 learning (Norton Peirce, 1995), best explains this contradictory behavior. In order to better understand learner investment during form-focused (FF) and meaning-focused (MF) activities, I used Young’s discursive practice (2008, 2009) as an analytical tool. This allowed me to examine access to linguistic, identity, and interactional resources available to the participants during FF and MF activities. Thus, the purpose of this study is to empirically investigate the role of form-focused instruction in relation to learner investment in L2 communication and learning with EFL high school students in Japan. The three research questions are:

1. Do FF and MF activities differ in terms of the amount of learner verbal communication?
2. Do FF and MF activities differ in terms of learners’ access to linguistic, identity, and interactional resources?
3. To what extent is learner investment in L2 communication related to FF activities?

To investigate these questions, I conducted a quasi-experimental study by designing two types of communicative activities: FF activities and MF activities. The former required learners to focus on both form and meaning, while the latter required learners to focus only on meaning. All participants experienced both FF and MF activities, which allowed me to examine whether and how the same learners invested in L2 communication during the two different types of activities. I discuss the results within the framework of language socialization theory which provides reasons that help to explain learners’ situated behaviors (Cole & Zuengler, 2003; Duff, 2002, 2007; Ochs, 1986; Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008; Watson-Gegeo, 2004).

In Chapter 2, I review the literature on communicative language teaching (CLT) and form-focused instruction in general and specifically with regard to their implementation in Japan. I also review theoretical and empirical work on learner investment, discursive practice, and language socialization. In Chapter 3, I describe the methodology of the study, including the research site, participants, materials, instructional treatment, and data collection tools. In Chapter 4, I describe the analyses of the quantitative data and present descriptive statistics for the questionnaire results and amount of communication during FF and MF activities. Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 present the analyses and results of two case studies. These chapters illustrate how learners invested in L2 communication and learning as reflected in the discursive practice.
analysis during FF and MF activities. In Chapter 7, I discuss the results of the study within the framework of language socialization theory. I conclude by pointing to some of the strengths and limitations of this research and by discussing some theoretical and pedagogical implications of the study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter I review some of the literature on communicative language teaching (CLT) focusing on how classroom research has pointed to some of its limitations – particularly the strong version of CLT (i.e., an exclusive focus on meaning). I then describe how the form-focused instruction movement has responded to some of these limitations. This is followed by a review of studies that have documented Japanese EFL learners’ reluctance to participate in communication in L2 classrooms in which a strong version of CLT is implemented. I argue that their reluctance to use the L2 is related to social factors, specifically learner investment, and that form-focused instruction may be a vehicle for them to communicate in the L2 without risking a loss of identity as speakers of Japanese.

2.1. Communicative Language Teaching

CLT focuses on improving learners’ communicative competence through meaningful communication activities, and it has been widely accepted among ESL/EFL teachers (Savignon, 2005). Since many L2 learners who have studied a second/foreign language through grammar-based instruction (e.g., grammar-translation method and the audiolingual method) faced difficulty with communicating in the target language, communicative approaches were proposed to develop learners’ communicative competence (see Hinkel & Fotos, 2002; Savignon, 2001).

The term communicative competence was initially proposed by Hymes (1971) to refer to the ability to use language in a social context. This was in direct contrast to Chomsky’s (1965) notion of linguistic competence, an abstract mental representation of language knowledge. Because Chomsky’s notion of linguistic competence did not include descriptions of language knowledge or use in different social contexts, the notion of communicative competence was developed. Since its introduction, several models of communicative competence have been developed, one of which describes it as consisting of strategic, grammatical, sociocultural and discourse competence (Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980).

As an approach to L2 teaching, CLT was intended to promote learners’ communicative competence through experiencing meaningful communication. Nunan (1991) describes its characteristics as: (1) an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction; (2) the use of

\footnote{Chomsky (1965) made distinctions between competence and performance. Competence refers to knowledge of language, whereas performance is the actual use of language.}
authentic texts; (3) a focus on the learning process; (4) the use of learners’ personal experiences; and (5) a link between classroom learning and real language use outside the classroom (p. 279).

One of the earliest empirical studies reporting the positive effects of CLT on L2 learning was reported in Savignon (1972). She compared three groups of students learning French at a university in the U.S. The first group participated in communication practice, such as negotiation for meaning, requesting clarification, and asking for information. Students in the second group experienced the target language culture through movies, music and art, but English was used in the classroom instruction. The last group completed additional grammar and pronunciation exercises, which learners were familiar with from their regular classes. All of these treatment activities were provided for one hour every week in addition to the regular audiolingual instruction.

The results showed that students who had received communication practice outperformed the other students on the oral spontaneous communication tasks. That is, they were more fluent and produced greater amounts of comprehensible speech. The students in the communicative group also achieved the same level of accuracy on the grammatical tests as the other two groups. Although Savignon’s study is often quoted in support of communication focused lessons, Spada (1997) points out that because the communication practice was added to the grammatical component in their audiolingual instruction, this indicates that the positive effects were the result of attention to both form and communication.

CLT was also influenced by Krashen’s input hypothesis and the idea that comprehensible input is all that is necessary for L2 acquisition (Krashen, 1985). This hypothesis contributed substantially to the strong version of CLT (i.e. no attention to form) (Howatt, 1984). While many language teachers (particularly in North America) adopted the strong version of CLT, it did not take long for teachers and SLA researchers to discover that comprehensible input through meaningful communication was not enough for improving linguistic accuracy despite its benefits for fluency (e.g., Harley & Swain, 1984; Lyster, 1987; Spada & Lightbown, 1989). For example, Spada and Lightbown (1989) reported that francophone students learning English in meaning-based communicative ESL classes attained high levels of English fluency but made specific grammatical errors that were persistent and many of which could be attributed to the learners’ shared first language. Similarly, Harley and Swain (1984) and Lyster (1987) found that students in French immersion programs developed fluency but lacked grammatical accuracy in their L2
production.3 Similar findings have been reported in many other communicative and content-based classrooms where it has been observed that while learners are able to develop their fluency and communicate successfully in their L2, they struggle to attain target-like accuracy in their knowledge and use of several morphological and syntactic features (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Spada, 1997). One response to this observation has been to explore different ways of drawing learners’ attention to language form within communicative instruction. This has become known as the form-focused instruction movement in instructed SLA and it is discussed further in the next section.

2.2. Form-Focused Instruction

There are many definitions and terms that have been used in the literature to describe approaches to L2 instruction that differ in terms of whether the learners’ attention is drawn to form or meaning or both. This includes form-focused instruction (Ellis, 2001; Spada, 1997, 2010), focus-on-form and focus-on-form (Long, 1991), focused-communication and feature-focused (Ellis, 1997), planned and incidental focus on form (Ellis, 2001), and isolated and integrated form-focused instruction (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). In this paper, I use the term form-focused instruction to refer to a type of instruction that draws learners’ attention to linguistic forms in meaning-focused communicative activities (Spada, 1997, 2010).

It is claimed that focusing learners’ attention on form during these communicative activities allows them to notice the gap between their interlanguage forms and the target forms, which then encourages them to produce more accurate language. By conducting experimental and quasi-experimental studies on the effect of form-focused instruction, many SLA researchers have reported its positive effects on promoting learners’ accuracy and L2 development (e.g., Ammar & Lightbown, 2005; Benati, 2005; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Egi, 2010; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Han, 2002; Mackey, 2006; Spada, Lightbown, & White, 2005; Radwan, 2005; White & Ranta, 2002; Williams & Evans, 1998). The benefits of form-focused instruction have also been extensively discussed in review papers (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001; Lightbown, 1998; Long & Robinson, 1998; Nassaji & Fotos, 2007; Spada, 1997, 2010; Williams, 2005). For example, Doughty and Varela (1998) found that form-focused instruction

---

3 While students in French immersion programs receive instruction on language forms, this is often provided separately from content-based instruction.
through corrective feedback had a significant positive impact on learning the English past tense
in both oral and written performance. Similarly, White and Ranta (2002) observed positive
effects of form-focused instruction consisting of grammar explanations and including L1/L2
contrasts. Learners who received form-focused instruction showed greater improvement in their
oral production and L2 metalinguistic knowledge than comparison groups. The general
consensus among SLA researchers is that the effectiveness of form-focused instruction is mainly
due to noticing and/or raising learners’ awareness of the target L2 linguistic features. This is
considered as support for the ‘noticing hypothesis’ (Schmidt, 1990, 1994, 2001) and the claim
that noticing promotes L2 learning (see Egi, 2010, for a recent study on the role of noticing in
instructed SLA).

In order to draw learners’ attention to form, the following instructional techniques have
been used: corrective feedback (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Doughty & Varela, 1998, Ellis, Loewen,
& Erlam, 2006; Han, 2002; Lyster, 2004; Mackey, 2006; Nassaji, 2009; Sheen, 2007, 2010;
Spada, Lightbown, & White, 2005; Takashima & Ellis, 1999); typographic enhancement
(Radwan, 2005; Spada, Lightbown, & White, 2005; White, 1998; see Han, Park, & Combs, 2008
for review of typographic enhancement); L1 and L2 contrasts (Ammar & Lightbown, 2005;
Laufer & Girsai, 2008; Spada, Lightbown, & White, 2005; White & Ranta, 2002); and explicit
grammar explanation (Ammar & Lightbown, 2005; Bouffard & Sarkar, 2008; Williams &
Evans, 1998). These techniques have been used during communicative activities, such as

Some researchers have argued that the positive effects of form-focused instruction may
be due to the frequent use of discrete-point tests to measure learners’ progress in instructed SLA
research (Doughty, 2003; Ellis, 2009; Norris & Ortega, 2000). That is, in most studies
investigating the effect of form-focused instruction, the learning outcomes have been measured
by controlled tasks that tap into learners’ explicit and conscious L2 knowledge. Questions remain
as to whether form-focused instruction can also contribute to learners’ unanalyzed, implicit L2
knowledge.

Recent review papers (Mackey & Goo, 2007; Spada & Tomita, 2010) show an increase in the
number of instructed SLA studies that utilized measures of more spontaneous/implicit
knowledge and there is some evidence to support the claim that instruction also contributes to
implicit L2 knowledge.
Most instructed SLA research that has examined the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 learning has been carried out with a cognitive-interactionist perspective. One of the implicit assumptions of this work is that learners are willing to engage in conversational interaction and that in doing so, provide teachers with opportunities to draw their attention to language form and create opportunities for learners to notice the gap between what they say and what they hear in the instructional input. This is not always the case, however. In Japan, for instance, it has been reported that students are reluctant to engage in communicative activities in CLT classrooms (e.g., Kusano-Hubbell, 2002) even though most students can be regarded as highly motivated learners and willing to communicate in English (e.g., Kimura, Nakata, & Okamura, 2001; Yashima, 2002). It is my view that learners’ reluctance to communicate in English is related to the concept of “learner investment” (Norton Perice, 1995), that is, learners’ perceptions of themselves in the broader social context in which their first language identities and the target language co-occur.

Before discussing learner investment and the social and cultural theories relevant to it, I will first describe some research that has documented learners’ reluctance to communicate in English in Japanese EFL classrooms as background information for this study. I will argue that learner reluctance may be difficult to explain using cognitively-based social-psychological motivation frameworks and that their reluctance may be better explained within the concept of learner investment and language socialization theory.

2.3. Communicative Language Teaching in Japan

In Japan, the notion of communicative competence was first introduced in 1989 in “The Course of Study,” guidelines provided by the Japanese government. The oral communication class was then established in high school in 1994 in order to develop learners’ communicative competence (see Takahashi, 2000; Wada, 2002). In 1999, The Course of Study emphasized the development of communicative competence in order to “foster a positive attitude toward communication with foreign people” (MEXT, 1999 as translated into English by Takahashi, 2000, p.3). In 2003, the government implemented an action plan to “cultivate Japanese with English abilities,” which further stressed “students’ basic and practical communication abilities”

---

5 Similar reluctance is reported in Canagarajah (1993) where Sri Lankan students spoke English with a flat intonation on purpose to avoid giving impressions to others that they are “anglicized bourgeois” (p.616).
In spite of government efforts to encourage teachers to teach communicatively to improve learners’ communicative abilities, many learners are reluctant to communicate in English in communication-focused classrooms (Gaynor, 2006; Greer, 2000; Hayashi & Cherry, 2004; Kanno, 2002; Kusano-Hubbell, 2002), and they do not seem to have shown any significant improvement in communicative competence (Oya, 2007; Suzuki, 2010) or overall English proficiency (Amaki, 2008).

In my MA thesis research and my professional practice as an EFL teacher in Japan, I also witnessed learners’ reluctance to communicate in English. The focus of my MA thesis (Tomita, 2002) was on teachers’ beliefs about CLT in Japanese junior high classrooms. During my classroom observations of the teachers’ practice I also noticed that students were reluctant to participate in communicative activities. Furthermore, when I taught English at Japanese high schools using the CLT approach, I also found that my students were unwilling to communicate with their peers in English. In fact, I experienced strong resistance from some students because I asked them to communicate in English and because I used English in class unlike other English language teachers.⁶

A few studies have examined learners’ reluctance to communicate in English in Japanese EFL classrooms. Regarding the reluctance to listen to a Japanese teacher speaking English, for example, Kusano-Hubbell’s (2002) classroom case study describes her own English teaching experience at a Japanese university where she delivered her instruction in English and tried implementing CLT. In her class, she emphasized the importance of communicating in English by claiming the necessity to “realize their independence as new members of a language community” (p. 83). Her efforts to bring communication into classroom often led to students’ negative attitudes toward listening to a Japanese instructor (i.e., Kusano- Hubbell herself) speaking English. Some students even expressed sarcastic comments, such as, “What is this? A Japanese speaking in English?”(p. 83). Some of the students began to refuse to listen to her lectures/lessons, and some even went to the administrative office to complain about her use of English when teaching in class.

Another study reports Japanese students’ reluctance to listen to their Japanese peers’ speaking English. Kanno (2002) carried out a longitudinal study focusing on a specific group of

⁶ The students complained about my use of English in the classroom since many of them had been in English classes where the teachers used Japanese a great deal of the time.
students called *kikokushijo*, which means returnees from abroad. One of her *kikokushijo* participants, who was fluent in English, was accused of using English in some parts of her conversation by her friends, saying “What are you using English for? Say it in Japanese. Show-off!” (p.41). Although this was not a classroom-based study, this example clearly points to the negative and complex feelings that Japanese EFL students have toward their peers’ use of English. Kanno analyzes this behavior as a reflection of their irritation and intolerance toward the returnee participant’s power over them by speaking a *valued* language, which allows her to belong to the world where they desire to belong but cannot.

Japanese students’ reluctance to speak English has also been reported. Greer (2000) describes how his Japanese students were reluctant to communicate in English during his communicative lessons and how one student intentionally spoke English with a strong Japanese accent and with grammar errors because she was afraid that others might think, “Who does she think she is?” (p.184). Greer interprets her pretending to be a poor English speaker as an attempt to satisfy what her peers wanted others to do: to speak English with non-native like fluency and accuracy.

These studies provide compelling evidence that some Japanese EFL learners are reluctant to speak English especially when the main focus of the lesson is on communication. They tend to resist not only speaking English but also listening to others speaking English. As indicated above, there seems to be an assumption among SLA researchers about learners’ willingness to communicate in English. Many English textbooks used in Japanese EFL classrooms also appear to be made based on the same assumption. This is evident in the quotation below by Gaynor (2006):

[A communicative activity] also presupposes a willingness or motivation on the part of the student[s] to actually speak out in the first place. Standard CLT based textbook exhortations to “ask a friend” or “practice with a partner” assume a willingness or motivation on the part of the students to naturally engage in such activities. (p. 65)

The consequences of students’ refusal to communicate in English while taking classes that follow the communicative curriculum of the Japanese government are considerable. This will no doubt lead to a decrease in the level of Japanese learners’ English proficiency. Indeed, concerns have already been expressed about this. For example, a few years after the implementation of the
oral communication class in 1994, some teachers and researchers reported a decrease in the students’ level of reading, writing, and grammar (Okada, 1999; Suiko, 1999). At that time, the decrease was thought to be mainly due to insufficient time to teach these language skills because teachers had to spend more time in oral communication activities. The situation has become more serious since the government placed greater emphasis on oral communication skills by implementing the action plan mentioned above entitled: “An Action Plan to Cultivate ‘Japanese with English Abilities’” (MEXT, 2003). Ironically, since more emphasis was placed on communication, the decrease in language proficiency has been steadily reported not only in reading, writing and grammar knowledge, but also in communication skills (Ito, 2008; Matsumura, 2009; Oya, 2007; Shirai, 2008; Suzuki, 2010; Tamura, 2010). These reports can be found in Japanese newspapers, education magazines for teachers and parents, and English education websites developed by educators and teachers (e.g., Eigosoken, 2006; Erikawa, 2010; Nakamura, 2006; Ushiroda, 2003a, 2003b). In response to these growing concerns, a special symposium was held on the decrease in the English language proficiency of junior high school, senior high school, and university students in Japan (Yokokawa, 2010).

Some researchers argue that the reason for the decrease in English proficiency is due to a lack of sufficient grammar instruction necessary for English communication (e.g., Matsumura, 2009; Oya, 2007). While this may be one of the reasons, it seems to me that learners’ reluctance to communicate in English is directly related to the decrease in their English proficiency. For example, when reading and writing are combined with oral communicative activities, such as discussions and meaning-focused interactions around the written texts, learners may not participate in these activities and thus do not improve in these skills. What is more, this lack of participation in communicative activities results in insufficient opportunities for learners to practice English, to correct themselves, or to receive corrective feedback from teachers. In other words, they do not have sufficient opportunities to learn English because of their reluctance to communicate in English, while ironically communication is the main focus of the lesson.

As indicated above, I observed such reluctance in my classrooms when teaching at a high school in Japan. Interestingly, however, I also noticed that the same students, who were reluctant to participate in exclusively meaning-based activities, did engage in communicative activities that also required a focus on target grammar structures (i.e., form-focused instruction). Thus, the same student was motivated in some instructional situations (e.g., form-focused instruction) but
not in others (e.g., communication-focused instruction). How can we explain this fluctuation between learner reluctance and active engagement in L2 communication? Since communication practice is one of the important conditions for L2 learning (Spolsky, 1989; Norton Peirce, 1995b), an investigation into Japanese EFL learners’ reluctance to engage in L2 communication is essential if the goals of the Japanese ministry of education are to be met.

2.4. Motivation

One might argue that learners’ reluctance to communicate in English could be explained by their degree of motivation to study English. Extensive research has been conducted to examine Japanese learners’ motivation to study English (e.g., Apple, 2005; Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001; Hiromori, 2009; Irie, 2003; Kimura, Nakata, & Okumura, 2001; Koga, 2010; O’Donnell, 2003; Yamashiro & McLaughlin, 2001; Yashima, 2002). Using a cognitively-based framework of motivation developed by Gardner and Lambert (1972), this research is based on the assumption that learners can be categorized as motivated or unmotivated, by quantifying their commitment to language learning. Some recent motivation studies have moved away from dichotomizing learners in this way and have made efforts to describe the more complex nature of motivation. These studies include self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2002; Noels, 2001a, 2003; Noels, Pelletier, Clement, & Vallernand, 2000), task motivation (Dornyei, 2002; Julkunen, 2001; Kormos & Dornyei, 2004) and the process-oriented model (Dornyei, 2001b; Dornyei & Otto, 1998, as cited in Dornyei, 2001b; Manolopoulou-Sergi, 2004).

Furthermore, some motivation studies have focused on the temporal and situational aspects of learner motivation, which are most clearly represented in the studies of willingness to communicate (WTC) (Clement, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Conrod, 2001; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Donovan, 2003; MacIntyre, Dornyei, & Noels, 1998; Matsuoka, 2004; Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004). WTC was originally developed in first language (L1) studies, and MacIntyre et al. (1998) conceptualized this notion of WTC in second language (L2) motivation studies. They define WTC as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2” (p.547) and proposed a model that describes variable factors influencing WTC. The model consists of six categories; three of them represent temporal, situation specific influences (i.e., communication behavior, behavioral intention, and situational antecedents) and the other three
represent stable influences (i.e., motivational propensities, affective-cognitive context, and social and individual context). In spite of its detailed examination of willingness, most of the WTC studies are quantitative in nature, using Likert-scale type of questionnaires, and have been criticized for insufficient descriptions of WTC in different contexts (see Kang, 2005 for a qualitative study).

Although recent motivation studies have been developed to examine detailed, situation specific changes in learner motivation, they may not be enough to explain why EFL learners, or specifically EFL learners in Japan, tend to be reluctant to communicate in English in exclusively meaning-focused communicative lessons, while the same students actively participate in L2 communication during form-focused activities. For example, working from the assumption that the low proficiency level of Japanese EFL learners might be due to their lack of motivation and WTC, some researchers have examined their motivation and WTC, utilizing Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, Horwitz’ (1988) Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory, and MacIntyre et al.’s framework of WTC. The assumption here may be that the low proficiency learners are reluctant to communicate in English. Ironically, however, the results of these studies often show that lower proficient Japanese EFL learners are generally highly motivated to study English and willing to communicate in English (Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001; Matsuoka, 2004; Yamashiro & McLaughlin, 2001; Yashima, 2002). Therefore, the degree of motivation or WTC questionnaires does not seem to explain learners’ reluctance.

In an effort to interpret these findings, researchers have suggested that Japanese EFL learners’ shyness, politeness and anxiety toward university entrance examinations are likely obstacles to engaging in actual L2 communication in the classroom despite their high motivation and willingness to communicate (Hayashi & Cherry, 2004; Takanashi, 2004). However, my own observations as a teacher of English in Japan suggest that there are other factors at work particularly when the same students are reluctant to communicate in English in one instructional context but not another, regardless of their shyness or politeness. This leads me to believe that learners’ reluctance to participate in L2 communication some of the time is not adequately explained by cognitively-based motivation theories. Another explanation may be found in the notion of learner investment which describes learners’ complex and contradictory engagement in learning within the broader social context (Norton Peirce, 1995a). This is discussed below.
2.5. Investment

Norton Peirce (1995a) defines investment as a learner’s “ambivalent desire to learn” (p.17) the target language with a consideration of the learner’s “socially and historically constructed relationship” (p.17) to the target language. She claims that affective factors, such as motivation, are always changing depending on where the learners are placed in the social power relations. As discussed above, although recent motivation studies consider that motivation is not stable and is always changing depending on situations, there are at least two crucial differences between motivation and investment: 1) power relationships (Norton, 2007) and 2) imagination (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007).

First, taking Foucault’s (1980) and Simon’s (1992) positions, Norton (2000) defines power relationships as “the socially constructed relations among individuals, institutions and communities” (p. 7). Drawing on Bourdieu’s (1977) economic metaphors, she further argues that learners invest in language learning in order to gain symbolic resources (e.g., language) and material resources (e.g., money) that are distributed in society where power relations exist. Such resources increase their symbolic capital, such as prestige and cultural capital, such as knowledge and thoughts that are valued in a certain social class and therefore represent the class. Norton (2000) refers to Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of “right to speak” and considers that learners’ occasional silence or reluctance to communicate signifies their lack of access to that right. She criticizes linguists’ and applied linguists’ uncritical assumption that all interlocutors regard each other as worthy to speak to and worthy to listen to.

The other difference between motivation and investment is imagination (Pavlenko & Norton, 2007). Pavlenko and Norton point out that most SLA research examines learners’ “direct engagement in face-to-face communities” (p.670), and little research has been done to examine learners’ imagined, wider world that is beyond the immediate social community surrounding them.

Using the notion of investment, it might be possible to understand why learners tend to be reluctant to communicate in English in exclusively meaning-focused lessons. In regard to power relationships, Japanese EFL learners are likely to view English as “socially prestigious and associated with Western culture” (Blair, 1997, ¶ 7). This association with prestigious Western culture may cause negative feelings among many Japanese EFL learners in meaning-focused lessons. Since meaning-focused lessons usually require learners to express their opinions, only
students who have already gained fluency may be able to complete the task. Different from other school subjects, such as mathematics or science, being competent in English (in this case, speaking skills) may represent the student’s belonging to the imaginary English speaking community, which may provide them with symbolic and material resources and increase their cultural capital. Not only the speakers but also the listeners can recognize the existence of the imaginary English speaking community even in the classroom. As Kanno (2003) claims, when Japanese EFL learners hear a Japanese peer speaking fluent English, they tend to feel frustrated because the fluent speaker, who is also Japanese, can have access to the imagined English speaking community, while they do not have access to it because of their lack of English competence. What is more, they may feel inferior to be Japanese. In exclusively meaning-focused lessons and activities, learners may feel that their L1 language, culture, and identity are not appreciated and valued by teachers, by peers or even by themselves in the classroom.

In contrast, when learners’ attention is focused on form within communicative practice (i.e., form-focused activities), learners may find more opportunities to participate in communication for the purpose of learning the target form, rather than for the purpose of becoming a fluent English speaker. Thus, they communicate as language learners without risking that they may be considered as fluent English speakers who want to “show off” the prestigious status through their fluent English. In addition, receiving corrective feedback from teachers or peers may give learners the feeling that their “voices will be heard and respected” (Cummins, 2000, p. 44) and this may also enhance learners’ investment in L2 learning to gain the “right to speak.”

Recently, there have been a few studies that discuss social factors related to form-focused instruction (Fiori, 2005; Karlstrom & Cerratto-Pargman, 2007; L. Lee, 2008; Luk & Wong, 2010; Rondon-Pari, 2006). Interestingly, many of them have examined the role of form-focused instruction in computer-assisted language learning or online chat forums (Fiori, 2005; Karlstrom & Cerratto-Pargman, 2007; L. Lee, 2008). Most of these studies have examined form-focused instruction within the framework of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory and have suggested positive roles of form-focused instruction in scaffolding and fostering the zone of proximal development (Karlstrom & Cerratto-Pargman, 2007; L. Lee, 2008; Luk & Wong, 2010; Rondon-Pari, 2006). Among these studies, Fiori (2005) compared two types of online chat activities: one that focused on both form and meaning, and one that focused only on meaning. The former required learners
to pay attention to L2 Spanish target forms of *por/para* and *ser/estar* when completing discussion questions. The latter did not mention attention to forms when completing discussion questions. Although her main focus was to examine grammar learning through consciousness raising, she also found that learners who engaged in activities with a focus on both form and meaning produced many sentences, showed active engagement, worked collaboratively, and used little L1. On the other hand, learners with a focus on only meaning tended to go off-task, joke, bully, use L1, and work less collaboratively. Although these studies provide us with useful insights into the socio-culturally positive effects of form-focused instruction on learning, they do not seem to explain why learners invest in L2 communication differently during form-focused and meaning-focused lessons. To my knowledge no study has examined the role of form-focused instruction within the framework of learner investment.

Several researchers have incorporated Norton Peirce’s notion of investment in L2 research in areas other than instructed SLA (Angelil-Carter, 1997; Arkoudis & Love, 2008; Bearse & de Jong, 2008; Byrd Clark, 2008; Early & Yeung, 2009; Flowerdew & Miller, 2008; Gao, Cheng, & Kelly, 2008; Gu, 2008; Haneda, 2005; Kanno, 2003; Kim, 2008; Mckay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 2000; Norton & Kama, 2003; Potowski, 2004; Russell & Yoo, 2001; Skilton-Sylvester, 2002; Trent, 2008). These studies have contributed to SLA research by presenting learners’ complex and contradictory investment in language learning and identities within different contexts. Most of this research has been qualitative and ethnographic in nature. The current study is intended to contribute to research on investment by conducting a quasi-experimental study to compare learner investment in L2 communication within form-focused and meaning-focused activities. The notion of investment may help us understand why some Japanese EFL learners are reluctant to communicate in exclusively meaning-focused communicative activities, while the same learners actively participate in communicative activities that include attention to form and meaning. Learner investment may also allow us to investigate how form-focused instruction plays a crucial role in creating contexts in which students do participate in communication activities, as well as how learners gain the “right to speak” and are given the right to speak in the form-focused activities.

Drawing on Bourdieu’s (1977) concepts of cultural and symbolic capital, many studies discuss investment in terms of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), identity (Weedon, 1997; West, 1992), and imagined communities (Anderson, 1991; Norton,
These theories help us understand how learners negotiate their identities to become legitimate participants of a community or an imagined community and how they gain symbolic and cultural capital distributed in the community. For instance, Norton (2000) presented multiple identities of five women who had immigrated to Canada and showed how and in what situations they invested in learning L2 English. Kanno (2003) described how four Japanese adolescent returnees participated in multiple communities and invested in bilingual and bicultural identities. Dagenais (2003) presented how immigrant parents invested in their children’s multilingualism in their imagined communities.

These theoretical frameworks show how learners invest in language learning and how their ambiguous and contradictory investment are exhibited in different contexts through detailed examination of social, cultural, and historical relations between the learners’ first and second languages. With a greater focus on social dynamics and social classes in relation to learner investment, these theories may not necessarily put emphasis on a single word or gesture that a learner produces or a reason for producing the word or gesture. That is, what learners utter, what their interlocutors’ linguistic or non-linguistic reactions are, and why they utter certain things and react in certain ways may not be the main foci of these theories. As discussed above, I saw my students’ active engagement during form-focused activities and the same students’ reluctance during exclusively meaning-focused activities. This experience has confirmed that learners’ utterances and gestures can signify their investment in L2 communication and learning. Thus, for the purpose of investigating learners’ investment in L2 communication in different instructional activities, I decided to focus on their utterances and gestures and to discuss why they say (or do not say) certain things and do (or do not do) things in certain ways at the moment, referring to their self-reported data. In order to analyze learners’ utterances and gestures during form-focused and meaning-focused activities, I used Young’s (2008, 2009) discursive practice as an analytical framework. Discursive practice allowed me to analyze not only learners’ linguistic and non-linguistic behaviors but also their access to linguistic, identity, and interactional resources that help them to invest in L2 communication and learning. The results of the analysis are discussed within the framework of language socialization theory because it helps us explain why learners say certain things and behave in certain ways at a certain moment. Language socialization discusses linguistic and interactional processes of becoming a member of a community and describes what linguistic and interactional behaviors are expected and appropriate among the
members of a community at a certain moment (Duff, 2002). In the following sections, I discuss the analytical framework, discursive practice, and the theoretical framework, language socialization.

2.6. Discursive Practice as an Analytical Framework

In this study, I use Young’s (2008, 2009) theory on discursive practices as an analytical tool to examine learner investment in L2 communication. According to Young (2008), discursive practice is defined as talk activities that “have their own rules, their own constraints, and their own structures” (p. 57). Discursive practice was developed from Practice Theory (Bourdieu, 1977), which illustrates peoples’ behaviors and performance in relation to culture. According to Young, discursive practice illustrates what people do, how people behave, and how others react to it. Drawing on Bourdieu’s notion of habitus, Young argues that how people act and how they talk are influenced by the values and beliefs shared by the members of a community that they belong to. Therefore, communication is not just conveying messages. Rather, it is a complex activity, where speakers seek for authority and hearers judge whether the speaker is worth listening to or not. Discursive practice in second language research is often discussed in terms of how learners’ participation changes as they co-construct interaction in the L2 with other learners or teachers. For example, Young and Miller (2004) describe interactions between a learner and a teacher during ESL writing conferences and detail how the learner learned the discursive practice of the ESL writing conference (e.g., revision and evaluation) and gradually became a fuller participant of the practice.

Young (2008, 2009) provides a framework to describe discursive practices, which consists of three resources: identity, linguistic and interactional resources. Those who have access to these resources and gain respect and authority (i.e., linguistic capital) are often considered to be someone who is worth listening to (Young, 2008, 2009). Focusing on these resources, discursive practice can be the best analytical tool of learners’ utterances and behaviors in relation to their investment in L2 communication and learning. Learners invest in language, expecting “a good return” that “will give them access to hitherto unattainable resources” (Norton, 2001, p. 10). Below, I discuss three types of resources of discursive practice.

Identity resources can be examined based on Goffman’s (1979, 1981) participation framework. In the participation framework, participants who are engaged in conversation are categorized into speaker or hearer. According to Young’s (2008, 2009) adaption of the
participation framework into discursive practices, the roles of speaker can be an animator (i.e., the current speaker), author (i.e., the source of the original idea), and principal (i.e., someone whose political view has a strong impact on the interaction). The hearer can be an official hearer (i.e., the person whom the animator is directly speaking to), a ratified participant (i.e., the person whose existence is known among the participants but whose role is not official hearer), and a non-ratified participant (i.e., the person whose existence is not known by the participants). Examining participation roles during FF activities and MF activities in this study should help us to explain how participants create certain identities and how their identities influence the distribution of linguistic and interactional resources, which affects their investment in L2 communication.

Linguistic resources, the second type identified by Young (2008, 2009), consist of register and mode of meaning. To investigate register, Young suggested that we examine vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation used during interactions, as well as paralinguistic features, such as speed and volume of utterances. He also suggested that we pay close attention to overlapped turns and pauses during interactions. Mode of meaning shows the ways of making meaning among the participants, which can be interpersonal (i.e., making social relationships), experiential (i.e., describing an event) and textual (i.e., reporting others’ stories) (Young, 2008, 2009). A close examination of register and mode of meaning should help us understand what linguistic resources are available for the participants and how they are used to create identities during FF activities and MF activities in the present study.

The third type, interactional resources, includes speech acts, turn-taking, repair, boundaries, and non-linguistic characteristics (Young, 2008, 2009). As Young suggests, the selection of speech acts, the selection of the next speaker, and the nature of repair (i.e., who initiates repair and who repairs errors or problems during communication) can reveal power relations among participants. Boundaries are the opening and closing of a practice. Non-linguistic characteristics include gestures, facial expressions, clothing, positioning of the body, and eye contact (Young, 2008, 2009).

In sum, analyzing learners’ discursive practices during FF and MF activities should help us understand when learners invest in L2 communications and why they do so. A more detailed description of the analytic procedures used in discursive practice will be discussed in the Methodology chapter.
2.7. Language Socialization

In this study, I use language socialization as a theoretical framework to explain why learners say and do certain things at a certain time in relation to learner investment. Language socialization is an interactional process of gaining access to membership in a community through language, which is associated with beliefs and values among the community members (Duff, 2007, 2002). Language socialization also exhibits “expected ways of thinking, feeling, and acting” (Ochs, 1986, p. 2) in the community. Ochs (1986) provides a comprehensive description of language socialization as including “both socialization through language and socialization to use language” (Ochs, 1986, p. 2). According to Ochs and Schieffelin (2008), language socialization research originated in investigations of the relationship between first language acquisition and socialization, although the historical relationship between the two is that they have been studied separately within different disciplines: psychology and anthropology/sociology. Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) convincingly argue that language acquisition is part of the process of socialization into a community and that the beliefs and values of the community affect their language acquisition development.

Early language socialization studies examined educational inequities in the U.S. (e.g., Heath, 1983; see Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008, for further historical development of language socialization studies). For example, Heath’s study on child language socialization in the U.S. indicated that the difference in language use at home had an influence on children’s performance at school. As Howard (2008) suggests, most of the early work on language socialization was on children’s language socialization through interactions with their caregivers in a monolingual contexts (Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990). Since the 1990’s, language socialization has been investigated in bilingual and multilingual contexts (e.g., Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Duff, 1995; 2002, 2009; Goldstein, 2003). It has also been applied to a variety of contexts, such as discourses at law schools (Mertz, 1996), graduate students’ conference preparations (Jacoby, 1998), and hairstyling salons (Jacobs-Huey, 2003) (see Duff, 2008, for further information about the fields that language socialization has been applied to). The main contributions of language socialization studies are that they present multiple identity roles that a person plays using language and reveal social structures through examining how people use

Bronson and Watson-Gegeo (2008) categorize language socialization studies into three types, based on how language socialization has been used in L1 and L2 research. First, some studies use *language socialization as a topic* which means that a study did not use methodologies required for language socialization research but discussed topics related to language socialization processes. Second, *language socialization as an approach* includes studies that did not follow the longitudinal method required for language socialization research but examined the data in terms of a language socialization framework. Third, *language socialization as method* refers to studies that satisfied all of the requirements for language socialization studies. Thus, studies with language socialization as method “must encompass a combination of ethnographic, sociolinguistic and discourse analytic methods at a minimum” (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008, p. 50).

Recently, as Duff (2007) claims, many language socialization studies have used the concept of communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) as a tool to analyze data. The concept of communities of practice was developed by the anthropologists, Lave and Wenger (1991; Wenger, 1998), and it has been applied to language socialization research (e.g., Duff, 2007; Morita, 2004; Moore, 1999) as well as research on second language learning using other conceptual frameworks (Flowerdew, 2000; Kanno, 2003; Leki, 2001; Y. Li, 2007; Norton, 2000; Norton Peirce, 1995; Toohey, 2001). While learning tends to be considered as an individual achievement among cognitive psychologists, learning is investigated in relation to community and society by anthropologists. Thus, Lave and Wenger (1991) combine both views and consider learning to entail both individual cognition and social community. In other words, similar to the concept of language socialization, learning does not only mean acquiring skills but also the engagement in activities to become a member of the social community (see Haneda, 2006 for a review). According to Lave and Wagner, learning, identity, and the social world are inseparable because learners develop their identity in a certain society with joint enterprise and mutual engagement in some activities.

Although I had planned to use communities of practice as an analytical tool early on in this research, I decided not to in the end. This was based on the observation that my participants did not have any joint enterprise or mutual engagement. That is, while most of my participants
had an ambiguous desire to study English, they tried not to show it in class or in front of their peers. Thus, there was little mutual engagement. A similar decision was made in a study by Pon et al. (2003) in which the participants also did not have joint enterprise or mutual engagement. Instead of communities of practice, I use discursive practice as an analytical tool and language socialization as a “topic” and “approach,” following Bronson and Watson-Gegeo’s (2008) categorization. As discussed above, studies on learner investment are often discussed in terms of identity, communities of practice, and imagined community. They provide insights about learner investment in relation to social structures and power relations based on interviews, diaries, and observations. My teaching experience at Japanese high schools revealed that learners’ utterances and behaviors would indicate their investment during English classes. In order to discuss learners’ linguistic and non-linguistic behaviors in relation to learner investment, I needed a theoretical framework that focuses on how learners use language and examines why they produce such utterances. Language socialization best fits these needs. Specifically, I was inspired by second language socialization studies that examine utterances and behaviors that encourage or hinder further communication, such as repetitions (Duff, 2000), incomplete turn-constructional-units (He, 2003), silence (Pon et al., 2003), and negative reactions from peers (Pon et al., 2003).

To my surprise, few studies have investigated learner investment in terms of language socialization. This might be because the main goal of language socialization studies is often to illustrate how a newcomer uses language to be socialized into a community. However, a recent study by Kim (2008) used language socialization as a framework to investigate investment in language and identity. In response to the increasing number of Generation 1.5 university students in North America, she conducted a qualitative multiple-case study to examine investment in languages and identities of seven Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian undergraduate students in Canada. Exploring the results in terms of language socialization, she demonstrated how they negotiated investment in languages and identities. For example, two of her participants felt pressure not to use L2 English in front of other Korean friends and found ways to speak English while keeping solidarity with Korean peers after negotiating their investment in languages and identities.

---

7 Generation 1.5 university students are university students who immigrated at a young age to their host countries with their first generation parents.
Below are the research questions motivating this research. These are explored through an analysis of discursive practices and interpreted within a framework of language socialization.

2.8. Research Questions

(1) Do FF and MF activities differ in terms of the amount of learner verbal communication?
(2) Do FF and MF activities differ in terms of learners’ access to linguistic, identity, and interactional resources?
(3) To what extent is learner investment in L2 communication related to FF activities?

As outlined in the next chapter, communicative activities that draw learners’ attention to both form and meaning are referred to in this study as FF activities and communicative activities that draw learners’ attention only to meaning are referred to as MF activities. Based on the relevant findings in the literature review and my experience as an English teacher at Japanese high schools, I hypothesized that learners would produce a greater amount of L2 communication during FF activities than during MF activities. I also hypothesized that FF activities would provide learners with access to a greater variety of resources (i.e., linguistic, identity, and interactional resources), which would enable them to experience language socialization that would lead them to further investment in L2 communication and learning.
Chapter 3 Methods

This chapter describes the design and methodology of the study. It includes a description of the research site, the participants and the development of the instructional materials. This is followed by a description of how the instructional treatments (i.e., FF and MF activities) were implemented. The data collection tools used in the study are also described, including diaries, stimulated recalls, classroom observations, and interviews.

3.1. Research Site

The data were collected at a private Christian senior high school in a southern part of Japan. This senior high school was located near the downtown area in a middle-sized city, with its kindergarten, high school, and four-year college, all contained on the same campus. Since the senior high school had dormitories, some students came from far away, seeking a better education. The high school provides five areas of study: a regular program, an academic program, a sports program, a music program, and an English program. The students are required to pass the entrance examination to be admitted into one of the programs. After they enter high school, they are required to take a test at the end of every academic year in order to continue the program or to transfer to a different one.

Below I briefly describe what the research site looked like as I approached it for the first time. The first thing that caught my eye after getting off a bus were large colorful boards on both sides of the hill leading to the campus gates. These boards praised the individual students’ achievement in sports and music, such as winning first place in a student violin competition. In addition to these boards, the road from the bus stop to the campus was surrounded by tall trees with cherry blossoms in spring and Christmas lights in winter. At the gate, I could already hear the sounds of musical instruments from the high school building, such as the piano and the flute, as well as students’ loud voices from the gym and the soccer field.

The high school building consists of junior and senior sections, both of which are in the same building. The building is about 100 years old with a newly built library, where many students spend their after-school hours reading books and chatting with friends over books. On the upper floor, there is a chapel with long wooden seats and a
grand piano. During my classroom observation sessions in December, I often listened to the choir practicing for their Christmas chorus. Walking to classrooms, I always heard students and teachers greeting each other whenever they passed by, saying “Konnichiwa (Hello),” and they also greeted me when I was waiting for the participants in the hallway. Overall, the school was a very pleasant environment and I was fortunate to be welcomed by the administrators, teachers and students in order to carry out my research.

3.2. Participants

Once I obtained the approval and the completed consent forms from the principal and the English department chair, I approached two English teachers who were in charge of the first-year senior high school English course: one Japanese male teacher of English and one American female teacher of English. They team-taught the English course in the academic year of 2007-2008. The Japanese teacher, Mr. Matsuda, was a substitute homeroom teacher when he initially provided me with his consent, and later became a full-time homeroom teacher. The American teacher, Ms. Johnson, had been in Japan for more than five years as an English teacher at this high school, as well as a missionary member at churches in this city. At the time she gave her consent, Ms. Johnson was in charge of my target students. However, she was not in charge of them in the following academic year, when I conducted the quasi-experimental study. Instead, the English department chair, Mr. Honda, participated in this study.

Twenty-four female high school students from one class participated in this study. They were first year high school students (15-16 years old) in the English program at the beginning of the study in December 2007 and second year students (16-17 years old) at the end of the study in January 2009. Although I was able to collect the student consent forms at the beginning of the study, it took much longer than I had expected to collect the consent forms from their parents. Many students tended to forget to bring the form home or to bring it back with the parent’s signature, or they lost it somewhere. Noticing these tendencies during my daily visits to their classroom, I reminded them about the consent forms regularly (i.e. during lunch breaks, cleaning time, between classes etc.). Because of

---

8 The names of teachers, students, and school are all pseudonyms.
this frequent reminder, the students started calling me, “Douisho san (Ms. Consent Form).”

By the end of the fall term, 24 students provided both student and parent consent forms. I chose the first fourteen students as candidates for the ten focal participants in my study. All of the 24 participants were asked to complete a questionnaire, to be observed during classes, and to complete a set of tasks during the classroom treatment sessions. In addition, the focal participants were asked to complete interviews and stimulated recalls, to be audio and video recorded during the classroom treatment sessions, and to keep diaries. To account for possible attrition with the focal participants due to opportunities to join a study abroad program or to transfer to a different program or school, I selected the first 14 students as candidates for the focal participant group hoping that at least ten of them would remain in the program and complete all of the data collection tasks.

I interviewed the 14 participants for the first time in December, 2007. During the interviews, three participants told me that they were planning to register in a study abroad program the following year, which meant that I might not be able to observe or interview them in the later stages of the study. Thus, from the remaining 11 participants, I randomly selected 10 as focal students, who were then randomly assigned to two groups of five during the instructional treatment in May 2008. Table 1 presents information about the ten focal participants and one of the four remaining “candidates,” Junko, who substituted for one of the focal participants, Hana, when she was absent from school on one of the instructional treatment days. Table 1 also provides information about the participating teachers. The names of all participants have been changed to protect their anonymity.
### Table 1

**Ten Focal Participants and Participating Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in Group A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiko</td>
<td>Aiko was selected for a case study (Chapter 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Hana missed one of the instructional treatment days (Day 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td>Keiko lived in the U.S. for four years and came back to Japan when she was 13 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junko</td>
<td>Junko substituted for Hana on Day 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Group B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>Mika was selected for a case study (Chapter 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tami</td>
<td>Tami lived in Australia for 3 years and came back to Japan when she was 12 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Matsuda</td>
<td>Mr. Matsuda was the homeroom teacher of the participants and an English teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Honda</td>
<td>Mr. Honda was the chair of the English department. He participated in this study as a substitute teacher for Ms. Johnson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnson</td>
<td>Ms. Johnson had been in charge of the participants prior to the instructional treatment. However, she was not assigned to the participants’ class when the instructional treatment was conducted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3. Materials

#### 3.3.1. Overview of the Material Development

I observed the English class eight times in December 2007 in order to examine the types of activities used in the participant’s English classes. The classroom observations were necessary to develop instructional intervention materials that were appropriate and familiar to both participating teachers and students. During the
observations, I stood or sat in the back of the classroom and kept a record of activities, using Part A of the COLT scheme (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995) that was revised for this study (Appendix A). Through the observations, I noticed that the most common types of activities involved pair or group work, writing tasks, reading aloud, and oral presentations at the end of the class. Thus, I decided to develop materials that consisted of writing tasks and oral presentations, all of which would be completed within small groups of four or five students.

The materials for the instructional treatment were based on the participant’s textbook and type of activities that they engaged in during their regular English classes. Four grammatical forms were selected from the regular course textbook to serve as target features for the instructional treatment. I then developed two different sets of instructional activities with the target features, piloted them, and revised them based on feedback from students who participated in the pilot study. More details regarding the development of the instructional materials is provided in the following sections.

3.3.2. Target Grammar and Topic Selection

As indicated above, the target forms were selected from the textbook used in the English class – “Crown: English Series II” (Shimozaki, 2007). Based on the discussions with the participating teachers, the grammar sections of Lessons 1 and 2 of the textbook were specifically used as the basis for the instructional treatment. Each lesson consisted of approximately six pages of reading and three pages of grammar explanation and exercises. The grammar section targeted several grammar forms in each lesson. According to the homeroom teacher, Mr. Matsuda, it usually took two weeks to finish one lesson (e.g., eight days for reading and two for grammar exercises). Table 2 shows the topics and the target grammar forms for Lessons 1 and 2. As shown in Table 2, the topic of Lesson 1 was English idioms, and its target features were nonrestrictive relative clauses and passives with auxiliary verbs. The topic of Lesson 2 was Australian Aborigines with the target features of negative/passive participial constructions and the formal object it.
Since there was a grammar section at the end of each lesson, I decided to use this time for the instructional treatment. First, I tried targeting the grammar forms that were the focus of the lesson as shown in Table 2. However, I found it difficult to develop instructional materials for oral communication activities based on some of the grammatical forms, such as nonrestrictive relative clauses and negative/passive participial constructions. For example, it is difficult to differentiate between nonrestrictive (e.g., “NP, which”) and restrictive relative clauses (e.g., “NP which”) when they are used during oral communication. Although a pause can indicate the difference between them (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1983), I have observed that many high school learners tend to pause frequently between words or phrases. Therefore, I was concerned that this could result in less reliable oral production data. Regarding the other feature, “negative/passive participial constructions,” it is rarely used in oral communication (Thompson, 1983) and seemed to be too advanced for my participants. Thus, I decided not to use these two grammatical forms as target features in my instructional treatment sessions. Instead I chose two target features from Lesson 1 and Lesson 2. This included passives and comparatives (Lesson 1) and formal object it and conditionals (Lesson 2).
Regarding the content for the instructional materials, I selected either topics that were covered in the textbook, or those that were related to the participants’ school trip to Australia, which took place two months before the instructional treatment. For example, the topic of Lesson 1 was English idioms. However, because it was difficult to develop communicative activities related to idioms that used the target forms, comparatives and passives, I created alternative materials based on the school trip to Australia. This included content about an imaginary friend from Australia who the participants had met during the school trip to Australia and a Japanese student’s home-stay experience in Australia. In the students’ textbook, Lesson 2 was about Australian Aborigines and their concept of dreamtime. Thus, I developed communicative activities that were about relationships between Australia and Japan and the participants’ future dreams.

In preparing the instructional materials, I noticed that the passive structure, the target form in Lesson 1, actually occurred more frequently in Lesson 2. In addition, the conditional structure selected for Lesson 2 was more frequently used in Lesson 1. After consulting with the participating teachers about changing the order of the grammatical features, it was agreed that this would not be a problem since all target features had been covered in the students’ previous instruction. Thus, the final order of the target features appearing in the communicative activities was: comparatives (Lesson 1), conditionals (Lesson 1), passives (Lesson 2), and formal object it (Lesson 2).

The participating teachers and I also agreed on a schedule that included two instructional treatment sessions per lesson and these were provided on two consecutive days. Hereafter these will be referred to as “Lesson 1 – Day 1 and Day 2” and “Lesson 2 – Day 3 and Day 4.” Each Day consisted of: a 5-minute warm-up activity, a 5-minute review of the target form, the first 15-minute communicative activity, the second 15-minute communicative activity, and a 10-minute group presentation. The warm-up activity was completed as individual or group work. The review of the target structure was provided by the participating teachers, Mr. Matsuda and Mr. Honda, to the whole class, where the teachers briefly explained the grammar rules together. The two 15-minute communicative activities, the main focus of the study, were completed within groups of five students. Finally, the group presentation was given to the whole class.
More detailed information about operationalizing the instructional treatments is provided below.

After finalizing the schedule, the target forms, topics for the treatment lessons, and procedures for the instructional treatment lessons, I consulted several published ESL textbooks and online ESL websites with the goal of finding already existing communicative activities that focused on the selected target grammar forms (i.e., comparatives, conditionals, passives, and formal object *it*) and modifying them to suit the selected topics for the study. I also looked for warm-up activities for each treatment lesson focused on the target grammar forms. A warm-up crossword puzzle activity for Day 1 was adapted from Pennington’s (1995) *New Ways in Teaching Grammar*, and two 15-minute communication activities were adapted from Larsen-Freeman, Badalamenti, and Stanchina’s (1997) *Grammar Dimensions 1*. All of the activities for Day 2 were adapted from the Internet, *Dave’s ESL Café (n.d.*) and *Koukou Ryugaku Net (n.d.*)*. It was difficult finding communicative activities requiring learners to use passives that could be modified to the Australian topic for Day 3. Therefore, I developed all the materials for Day 3, and piloted them with a group of comparable students. It was also difficult to find communicative activities focusing on the formal object *it* for Day 4. Based on my experience as a language learner and teacher of English, I was also concerned that this particular feature required more advanced knowledge than the other target forms. Thus, apart from one 5-minute warm-up activity that I found from Larsen-Freeman, Frodesen, and Erying’s (1997) *Grammar Dimensions 4*, I developed the communicative activities for Day 4 by adapting sentences that were provided in the grammar section of the participants’ textbook (Shimozaki, 2007, pp. 24-26). After developing the materials, I piloted them with Japanese ESL students in Toronto, which I describe in the next section.

### 3.3.3. Piloting and Finalizing the Materials

The instructional treatment materials were piloted with five participants in Toronto, Canada. First, I tried recruiting participants from a similar population in Toronto: senior high school students from Japan. I contacted a Japanese library in Toronto which provided me with information about a *supplementary school* in Toronto. This school offers classes on Saturdays for children who would like to maintain their
Japanese proficiency and to study subjects that follow the Japanese school curriculum (Kanno, 2003). However, it was not possible to conduct a study there due to their limited time for finishing the whole curriculum only on Saturdays.

In the end, I recruited participants from a university-based ESL program in Toronto. Five students agreed to participate in the pilot study. All of them had recently arrived in Toronto from Japan and had started the ESL program together. Four of them were university students in Japan and one of them had graduated from a university in Japan a few years ago. Their ages ranged from 19 – 25.

After I obtained their consent forms, I piloted the materials with them over two days consisting of two 2-hour sessions. The main purpose of the pilot was to make sure of the time required to complete the materials and the oral interaction tasks in English. After piloting the materials, the participants met with me in a focus group and gave me feedback and opinions about how to revise the materials in order to elicit interaction in English. For example, they proposed more interesting/relevant topics for high school students in Japan, pointed out unfamiliar vocabulary words in the materials, recommended clearer procedures for the activities, and suggested how to modify graphical displays for a clearer presentation.

After piloting the materials and revising them based on the feedback from the pilot study participants, I finalized the materials as presented in Table 3. Table 3 presents the topics and target grammar forms of the final version of the materials.

### Table 3

**Contents of Instructional Treatment Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Target Grammar</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Comparatives</td>
<td>5-minute warm-up activity</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Crossword Puzzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Comparing Tokyo and Takano-City</td>
<td>Students compared Tokyo and Takano-City and wrote their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 As Kanno (2003) describes, most students at this type of supplementary school come to Canada from Japan because of their parents’ jobs and may go back to Japan for further education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Target Grammar</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Conditionals</td>
<td>5-minute warm-up activity</td>
<td>Song, “If I had a million dollars,” by Barenaked Ladies.</td>
<td>Students listened to the song and filled the blanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Communication with a home stay family</td>
<td>Students wrote advice on how to communicate with a home stay family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Foods at a home stay family</td>
<td>Student wrote advice on how to request foods at a home stay family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Relationship between Australia and Japan</td>
<td>Students responded to questions about the relationship between Australia and Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Relationship between Australia and Japan</td>
<td>Students looked for information in posters and wrote answers about the relationship between Australia and Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Target Grammar</td>
<td>Type of Activity</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Formal Object</td>
<td>5-minute warm-up activity</td>
<td>“What do you think?”</td>
<td>Students answered what they thought for each given situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>it</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 1: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Future Dreams</td>
<td>Students asked each other about their dreams and wrote them down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2: 15-minute communicative activity</td>
<td>Future Jobs</td>
<td>Students read explanation about different jobs and wrote down what they found interesting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following section, details regarding the operationalization of the instructional treatments are provided.

### 3.4. Instructional Treatment

The instructional treatment consisted of four 50-minute sessions that took place during the participants’ regular English class periods in May, 2008. These sessions consisted of communicative activities that were implemented in different ways. They were either exclusively focused on meaning or combined a focus on meaning and form. The former are referred to as MF activities and the latter as FF activities. Each lesson consisted of a warm-up activity, a review of the target grammar, two 15-minute communicative group activities, and a group presentation. Table 4 shows how the instructional treatment sessions unfolded, using Day 1 as an example.

As Table 4 shows, all students received the same instruction about grammar rules associated with the target features at the beginning of the class, completed two 15-minute communicative tasks during the 30-minute instructional treatment period, and participated in the group presentation at the end of the class. The students were divided into two instructional groups during the 30-minute treatment period. That is, one group
completed a 15-minute FF activity, followed by a 15-minute MF activity. The other group completed the activities in the opposite order: a 15-minute MF activity, followed by a 15-minute FF activity. All of the FF and MF activities were completed by groups of five students. As described in Section 3.2., there were ten focal participants in my study. Therefore, they were divided into two groups of five participants: Group A and Group B (see Table 1 in Section 3.2.). The assignment of the focal students to treatment groups was random except for two participants who had lived in an English-speaking country. One of them was assigned to each group.

Table 4

*Instructional Treatment on Day 1 (50 minutes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Group/Whole Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Warm-up activity: Crossword puzzle</td>
<td>Groups of five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Review/explanation of the target grammar: Comparatives</td>
<td>Whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Activity 1: Communicative Activity</td>
<td>Groups of five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Comparing Tokyo and Takano-City”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A: FF activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B: MF activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Activity 2: Communicative Activity</td>
<td>Groups of five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Making a commercial about Takano-City”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A: MF activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group B: FF activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Group Presentation:</td>
<td>Group presentation to the whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of each group’s commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows how the FF and MF communicative activities differed, using the instructional materials from Day 1 with *comparatives* as the target feature (see Appendix B for all FF/MF activity handouts). As this illustrates, when the group of students were engaged in the FF activity, they were required to use the target grammar in their interactions and pay close attention to it in order to complete the communicative activity. On the other hand, when the group of students were engaged in the MF activity, they were not asked to pay attention to the target form but were asked simply to complete the communicative activity. As shown in Table 4, Group A completed the FF version of
Activity 1 and the MF version of Activity 2 on Day 1, while Group B completed the MF version of Activity 1 and the FF version of Activity 2 on that day.

Activity 1
(First 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period)

Dear Lucy,
Thank you very much for your letter. I am very happy that you are interested in studying in Japan as an exchange student. I would like to answer your questions about Takano and Tokyo. **Use as many comparatives as possible (出来るだけ比較級を使いなさい).**

Environment:
____________________________________________________

Life style:
____________________________________________________

Public transportation:
____________________________________________________

House:
____________________________________________________

Food:
____________________________________________________

People:
____________________________________________________

Activity 2
(Second 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period)

You would like Lucy to study as an exchange student in Takano rather than in Tokyo. You asked your classmates to make a collection of commercials to advertise Takano and send it to Lucy. Work in a group and make a 30-second commercial so that Lucy will choose Takano rather than Tokyo. Create a commercial script. **Use as many comparatives as possible (出来るだけ比較級を使いなさい).**

Environment:
____________________________________________________

Life style:
____________________________________________________

Public transportation:
____________________________________________________

House:
____________________________________________________

Food:
____________________________________________________

People:
____________________________________________________

_**Figure 1.** Samples of FF (left) and MF (right) Activities: Activity 1 and Activity 2 on Day 1._
The two teachers worked with both groups over the four instructional treatment lessons (see Table 5). When teaching the FF group, the teacher provided feedback on content and form, such as meta-linguistic corrective feedback and explicit correction. When teaching the MF group, the teacher provided feedback only on content. It is important to emphasize that learners in both groups completed both types of activities (i.e., FF and MF activities) for all four treatment lessons (see Table 5).

Table 5
Procedures of Instructional Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Topics of two activities on each day</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Mr. Matsuda</th>
<th>Mr. Honda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comparatives</td>
<td>Tokyo and Takano: Comparison</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tokyo and Takano: Commercial</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conditionals</td>
<td>Home stay: Communication</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Home stay: Foods</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Passives</td>
<td>Australia and Japan: Knowledge</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia and Japan: Getting information</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Formal object it</td>
<td>Future: Dreams</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future: Jobs</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Day 1 and Day 2 were on Lesson 1 of the participants’ textbook, while Day 3 and Day 4 were on Lesson 2. These two days on each Lesson were consecutive school days.

The order of the FF and MF activities was counterbalanced, that is, learners who completed the communicative activities in the order of FF and MF on Day 1 completed them in the MF and FF order on Day 2. Care was also taken to ensure that the order of
MF and FF activities were counterbalanced between Lesson 1, which was taught on the two consecutive days of Day 1 and Day 2, and Lesson 2, which was taught in on the other two consecutive days of Day 3 and Day 4. For example, learners who had started Lesson 1 with a FF activity started Lesson 2 with a MF activity. This was done to avoid a potential order effect of FF and MF activities. In sum, the effects of target grammar forms, topics, teachers, and orders of FF/MF activities were counterbalanced.

As indicated above, the content of both sets of activities was the same – the only difference was whether students were asked to use the target form during their interactions and pay attention to it (i.e., FF activities) or not (i.e., MF activities) (see Figure 1). The activities mainly consisted of group discussion and group writing, followed by an oral presentation to the whole class. Table 5 presents the complete schedule of the instructional treatment lessons.

### 3.5. Data Collection Instruments/Tools

Data were collected through diaries, observations, questionnaires, stimulated recalls, and interviews. The data collection schedule is shown in Table 6. Although all student participants were asked to complete questionnaires, I only analyzed data from the participants with parent consent. Similarly, although all students kept diaries, only the 10 focal participants and 4 focal candidates (see Table 1) were asked to share their diaries with the researcher. In addition, the 10 focal students and one of the focal candidates, who agreed to substitute for the absent focal participant on Day 3, were videotaped during the instructional treatment lessons for the post hoc observations, and completed the stimulated recalls and interviews. The following sections describe each data collection tool and how it was used.

---

10 As presented in Table 1, one of the participants, Hana, missed Day 3, and Junko joined Group A for Hana on Day 3. She acted as a focal participant on Day 3, being videotaped during the treatment on Day 3 and completing stimulated recalls on Day 3.
### Table 6

**Data Collection Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Interviews with the 10 focal and 4 focal candidate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students kept weekly diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>January-May</td>
<td>Students kept weekly diaries from January to May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students kept daily diaries during the school trip in March 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 13 (Tue)</td>
<td>Questionnaire (2:20-2:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Started diary collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 15 (Thu)</td>
<td>Instructional Treatment : Day 1 (2:20-3:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recall and Emotional Temperature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group A and Group B (20 minutes each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 16 (Fri)</td>
<td>Instructional Treatment Day 2 (8:50-9:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recall and Emotional Temperature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group A and Group B (20 minutes each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 20, 21, and 22</td>
<td>10-Minute Follow-up Interview on Stimulated Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 23 (Fri)</td>
<td>Instructional Treatment : Day 3 (8:50-9:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recall and Emotional Temperature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group A and Group B (20 minutes each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 26 (Mon)</td>
<td>Instructional Treatment Day 4 (11:50-12:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recall and Emotional Temperature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group A and Group B  20 minutes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 27, 28, and 29</td>
<td>10-Minute Follow-up Interview on Stimulated Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June-December</td>
<td>Student kept weekly diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>December-January</td>
<td>Classroom Observation (December 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diary Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5.1. Questionnaires

All participants were asked to complete a questionnaire written in Japanese (see Appendix C for translated samples of questionnaire items and Appendix D for a complete questionnaire of the original Japanese version). This questionnaire consisted of five
sections: background information about English learning experiences, motivation to learn English, attitude toward the international community, L2 communication confidence, and willingness to communicate in English. This questionnaire developed by Yashima (2002) has been already validated and used in other research projects in Japan (e.g., Yashima, 2010; Yashima & Zenuk-Nishide, 2008; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004). Most of the items are based on other questionnaires measuring motivation (e.g., Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972), anxiety (e.g., Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986), and willingness to communicate (e.g., MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; McCroskey, 1992) and were modified, where necessary, to reflect EFL contexts in Japan (see Yashima, 2002, for further information). Although the questionnaires alone might not fully capture learners’ contradictory attitudes toward L2 communication, it was useful to examine whether these learners could be categorized as motivated or unmotivated to learn English, as anxious or not anxious about learning English, and willing or not willing to learn English at the outset.

3.5.2. Diaries

The 10 focal participants and 4 focal candidate participants were asked to keep weekly diaries for 13 months (i.e., from December 2007 to December 2008) and to share them with the researcher. They were also asked to share the diaries that they had kept for half a year before this study started (i.e., from April 2007 to November 2007). Thus, the diary entries that were collected spanned a period of 21 months starting in April 2007 and ending in December 2008. The purpose of using diaries was to investigate the students’ use of English and their feelings toward the use of English both inside and outside of the classroom. Keeping diaries had been part of their regular classroom activities. That is, students were required to write about a topic provided by the teacher once a week as homework, and their English teachers provided them with feedback mainly on content. In order to explore when they actually used or communicated in English and what made them feel comfortable or uncomfortable communicating in English, I asked the participating homeroom teacher, Mr. Matsuda, to include two questions related to the use of English, as follows:
(1) How much did you use English outside the classroom this week? In what situation did you use English? With whom did you speak/use in English? Did you feel comfortable or uncomfortable when using English? Why did you feel like this?

(2) How much did you speak English in English class this week? In what situation did you speak English in the class? With whom did you speak English? Did you feel comfortable or uncomfortable when speaking English in the class? Why did you feel like this?

The first question was about their use of English outside the classroom. With limited opportunities to communicate in English outside the classroom in the Japanese EFL context (Wada, 2002), I asked them about their use of English, instead of specifying communication. The use of English may include communication, exchanging emails, sending/receiving cellphone text-messages, singing songs, and reading books. The second question was more specific with a focus on their speaking in English in English classes.

In addition to their regular weekly diaries, I asked the 10 focal participants and 4 focal candidate participants to share the entries from their school trip diaries. They had been required to keep diaries every day during the school trip to Australia. This provided additional information about when they used English, with whom they communicated in English, and how they felt when communicating in English in Australia.

3.5.3. Observations: Instructional intervention

In this section, I will focus on the classroom observations that took place during the instructional treatment lessons as well as classroom observations of the learner behavior and classroom environment afterwards.

3.5.3.1. Observations of Communication Patterns during the Instructional Treatment

I audio and videotaped one class prior to the instructional treatment. Because audio and video taping can affect learner performance and behavior (Mackey & Gass, 2005), the purpose of this initial recording was to familiarize the participants with the
existence of the audio and video equipment. I discarded the data obtained from this initial recording.

Following the initial recording, I audio and video taped the five focal participants in both groups during the four instructional treatment lessons. To do this, an audiotape recorder was placed in the center of each group, and a video camera was directed to each group. In addition, I placed a “fake” audiotape recorder in the center of a randomly chosen group\textsuperscript{11} and a “fake” video camera in the center of the classroom throughout the four treatment lessons. The fake audiotape recorder was a broken one, while the fake video camera had no tape in it. I placed these fake recorders so that students would not notice who I was videotaping at particular points in time\textsuperscript{12}.

Based on the videotaped interactions, I completed the COLT Part B observation scheme (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995) that had been modified for this study. It focuses on individual learner communication behaviors with categories that record the existence/absence of each student’s utterances, L1/L2 usage and communication patterns (e.g., confirmation check and clarification request). I added several items under communication patterns (e.g., reading aloud) and created a few categories such as length of an utterance and indication of a full sentence based on Potowski (2007) (see Appendix E). I also created another template for keeping a record of vocabulary used in order to determine the size and richness of learners’ vocabulary. Detailed procedures of the transcription and analysis of these data are described in the next chapter.

3.5.3.2. Observations of Learner Behavior and Classroom Environment

In December 2008, six months after the instructional treatment, I took field notes of learner behaviors during English classes. The main purpose of these observations was to see whether there was any pattern in the oral communication among the participants. For example, I was interested in who initiated communication in English, in what situations students communicated in English, and what verbal and non-verbal reaction hindered/facilitated further communication during the English classes. I used an A4 size

\textsuperscript{11}In addition to Groups A and B consisting of the focal participants, there were five groups of non-focal participants and the students without parental consent.

\textsuperscript{12}There were students who did not provide their parent consent. Thus, I did not analyze any of their data.
notebook to draw the communication behaviors of participants using pictures, arrows, and written descriptions.

During the observations, I also kept field notes of the classroom environment in order to examine the use of English other than communication, such as posters and scribbles. I sketched everything posted in the participants’ classroom, such as posters, daily schedules, test announcements, and scribbles.

### 3.5.4. Written Stimulated Recalls, Emotional Temperature, and Follow-Up Interview

The ten focal students participated in stimulated recalls in Japanese. After each instructional treatment lesson, the focal students came to a meeting room in the high school building after school to participate in 20-minute stimulated recall sessions. The videotaped interactions during the FF/MF activities were used to stimulate recalls. Prior to the stimulated recall session, I watched the videotape and selected about three segments from the FF activities and three segments from the MF activities that illustrated the participant’s active participation in L2 communication as well as their reluctance to communicate in L2. The selected segments were approximately ten minutes in total (i.e. play back time) for each stimulated recall session with approximately five minutes from FF and five minutes from MF activities.

Several researchers have indicated that it is desirable to conduct stimulated recalls immediately after the event in order to obtain as accurate data as possible (Ericsson & Simon, 1993; Gass & Mackey, 2000). Unfortunately, it was impossible to transfer the data to a computer, review two 40-minutes videos, and select segments for recalls in such a short time in order to conduct the stimulated recall sessions immediately after the treatment. Furthermore, after the instructional treatment lesson, students had only a 10-minute break and were required to attend other classes until early evening. Thus, I conducted the stimulated recalls after school but on the same day as the treatment lesson.

---

13 As explained earlier, one of the focal candidate participants joined Group A for Hana only on Day 3, meaning that the total number of the focal students was eleven, including her.
Originally, I had planned to use a computer lab at the high school to conduct oral stimulated recalls, where students would watch a video clip on their computer screens and verbalize their recalls into a microphone individually. However, due to circumstances at the school beyond my control, I was not able to use the computer lab. Thus, I decided to conduct written stimulated recalls in one of the regular meeting rooms, instead of oral stimulated recalls. As Table 6 shows, each group of five participants (i.e., Group A and Group B) came to the room, listened to my instructions, watched the video together, and individually wrote down what they had been thinking or feeling at the time of the event.

In L2 research stimulated recalls have been mainly used to explore learners’ cognitive processes or awareness in relation to oral interaction (e.g., DeKeyser, 2010; Dornyei & Kormos, 1998; Fujii & Mackey, 2009; Mackey, 2002; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000), listening (Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010), speaking (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993), writing (Adams, 2003; Bosher, 1998; Zhao, 2010), vocabulary (Paribakht & Wesche, 1999), and metalinguistic knowledge (Roehr, 2006). In addition, stimulated recalls have been found to reveal participants’ emotional feelings at each moment of learning (see DiPardo, 1994; Tyler, 1995 for empirical studies). The main purpose of employing stimulated recalls in these studies was to investigate learners’ thoughts and feelings (e.g., being offended, worried, comfortable, and uncomfortable) in different communication contexts.

It has been argued that it is problematic to ask learners to explain the reasons for their recalled thoughts and feelings because these explanations may be given based on their current thoughts at the time of the stimulated recall session, rather than their thoughts at the time of the selected event (Ericsson & Simon, 1993; Gass & Mackey, 2000). What is more, learners tend to provide the explanation that they think the researcher expects from them (Gass & Mackey, 2000). This tendency may affect their later recalls providing the “desired” response, rather than verbalizing their actual thoughts and feelings at the time of the event. Therefore, learners were asked only to verbalize the thoughts and feelings that they had had in specific contexts/events, and I asked further questions about what they had written during the recall session at the follow-up interview, which will be discussed later.
At the end of the stimulated recall session, the participants were asked to rate the emotions that they had experienced during the FF and MF activities. For this task, I used Imai’s (2007) emotional temperature list (see Appendix F for the English version and the original Japanese version), which he developed based on Pekrun’s (1992) emotional taxonomy. The purpose of using the emotional temperature list in this study was to help learners reflect on and describe their emotions and feelings during the follow-up interviews. The list consists of 21 emotions: enjoyment, boredom, hope, anxiety, joy (anticipatory), hopelessness, relief, joy (outcome-related), sadness, pride, disappointment, shame, gratitude, anger, empathy, jealousy, admiration, contempt, sympathy, antipathy, and excitement. The participants were asked to choose the degree of emotions and feelings that they had experienced during FF and MF activities on 5-point Likert type scales from 1 (did not feel so at all) to 5 (strongly felt so). I did not analyze emotional temperature in this study. The purpose of using the emotional temperature scale was to help learners describe their emotions and feelings during interviews, not to directly measure their emotions.

After completing two consecutive instructional treatment sessions followed by a stimulated recall session for each treatment session, each student came to a meeting room and completed a 10-minute follow-up interview on the written stimulated recalls individually (see Table 6). The follow-up interview was conducted in Japanese. The main purpose of this follow-up interview was to clarify what they had written during the stimulated recall session and to ask why they had such feelings, emotions, and thoughts during the FF and MF activities. Students were shown their written product during the FF and MF activities, their written stimulated recalls, and their emotional temperatures to help them remember why they had such feelings and emotions. When students had difficulty explaining their feelings, emotions, and thoughts, I showed them their own emotional temperature list to elicit their comments.

Table 7 presents an example of the entire process of a stimulated recall session, including the use of the emotional temperature list. This example is from the stimulated recall session with Group A on Day 1. It is important to note that the follow-up interview is not included in Table 7 and that it was conducted after two consecutive treatment sessions (i.e., after Day 2 and after Day 4). After the last follow-up interview (i.e., after
Day 4), the students participated in the main interview, which I describe in the next section.

Table 7

*Stimulated Recall Session: Group A on Day 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity on Day 1</th>
<th>Watching Segments and Written Stimulated Recalls</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the 20-minute FF Activity on Day 1</td>
<td>Watching Segment (SG) 1 from FF</td>
<td>1-2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recalls on SG 1</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watching SG 2 from FF</td>
<td>1-2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recalls on SG 2</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watching SG 3 from FF</td>
<td>1-2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recalls on SG 3</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing Emotional Temperatures on FF</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the 20-minute MF Activity on Day 1</td>
<td>Watching SG 4 from MF</td>
<td>1-2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recalls on SG 4</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watching SG 5 from MF</td>
<td>1-2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recalls on SG 5</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watching SG 6 from MF</td>
<td>1-2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Stimulated Recalls on SG 6</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completing Emotional Temperatures on MF</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.5. **Interviews**

A twenty-minute semi-structured interview was conducted in Japanese with the 10 focal participants and four focal candidate participants three times: at the beginning of the study in December 2007, after the instructional treatment in June 2008, and at the end of the study in December 2008 and January 2009. It is important to note that the interview after the instructional treatment is different from the follow-up interview after the stimulated recalls. The former was a longer and more detailed interview, while the latter was for clarification of what the students had written during the stimulated recalls as discussed above. Throughout the interview sessions, several questions were asked to elicit information about learner investment.

The purpose of the initial interview was to obtain the student’s historical information about their English learning. The second interview was conducted to ask learners to further explain the reasons for their thoughts and feelings that they provided during the stimulated recall sessions and follow-up interviews (e.g., “Why did you think so?” “What made you feel so?”). It was also a time during which participants were asked
to further explain what they had written in their diaries. The main purpose of the last interview was to clarify and let participants explain the content of their diaries, as well as to ask them about their behaviors (e.g., silence or active participation) that I noticed during the classroom observations. I also asked them why they rarely spoke English during the class. Two of the four focal candidate participants were not able to come to the final interviews conducted in December 2008, because they had been in the U.S. from August 2008 for a study abroad program. Thus, instead of the face-to-face interviews, I interviewed them through email exchanges.

3.6. Transcribing Interview Data

All of the audio recorded data were transferred to the computer. I first listened to the initial interview data and the follow-up interview data on the stimulated recalls, while taking notes. It was necessary to do this in order to formulate questions for the following interviews: the interview after the instructional treatment sessions (June 2008) and the exit interview (December 2008 - January 2009). Overall, approximately 1440 minutes of interviews and follow-up interviews were transcribed: approximately 300 minutes from the initial interviews (December 2007), 100 minutes from the first follow-up interviews (May 2008), 110 minutes from the second follow-up interviews (May 2008), 420 minutes from the second interview after the treatment sessions (June 2008), and 510 minutes from the last interview (December 2008). I transcribed the main ideas expressed using sentences or phrases close to the original utterances. However, I did not transcribe backchannels in Japanese, such as “un” (uh-huh in English) and “so” (right in English), or fillers in Japanese, such as “eto” (um in English) and “nanka” (like in English).

A timeline of the data collection schedule is presented in Table 8. In the next chapter, the data analyses and results of the quantitative data are reported.

---

14 Backchannels are listeners’ short utterances that indicate their interest in the speaker’s story and encourage the speaker to continue their talk (Maynard, 1987; Ward & Tsukahara, 2000). Fillers are used by a speaker to indicate that the speaker is thinking and planning the next utterance (Bada, 2010; Kitano, 1999; Mizukami & Yamashita, 2007).
### Table 8

**Overall Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Consent Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews and Classroom Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>January-April</td>
<td>Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(School Trip to Australia in March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Instructional Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulated Recalls &amp; Follow-Up Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting Diaries and School Trip Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July-November</td>
<td>Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Interviews and Classroom Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting Diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collecting Diaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Quantitative Analyses and Results

This chapter presents the quantitative analyses and results. First, I present the descriptive statistics of the questionnaire responses. Second, I show the analyses and results of the student’s verbal interactions, such as L1/L2 use, patterns of communication in L2, length of turns, and word/sentence types. These analyses are based on descriptive statistics and frequencies and comparisons are made between the FF and MF activities.

4.1. Questionnaire

4.1.1. Questionnaire Analysis

As indicated in the methodology chapter, the participants completed a questionnaire developed by Yashima (2002) before receiving the instructional treatment. The purpose of utilizing the questionnaire was to capture the participants’ background information regarding English learning experiences and their general attitudes toward, anxiety about, and motivation to learn English. The questionnaire consisted of five sections: background information, motivation, attitude toward the international community, L2 communication confidence, and willingness to communicate. Part of the questionnaire translated into English and the complete questionnaire of the original Japanese version are provided in Appendix C and Appendix D, respectively. The participants were asked to complete the Japanese version.

Although 24 students submitted both student and parent consent forms at the beginning of the study (December 2007), three of them did not complete the questionnaire either because they were absent from school on that day or they had been transferred to a different program when I administered the questionnaire (May 2008). Therefore, I analyzed the questionnaire responses from the 21 participants who submitted both student and parent consent forms and completed the questionnaire: 10 focal participants, four focal candidate participants, and the remaining seven. For the analysis of the background information section, I counted frequencies for each category. The remaining four sections (i.e., motivation, attitude, confidence, and willingness to communicate) were analyzed using both Excel and SPSS programs to calculate means, standard deviations, minimum values and maximum values for each. The following
sections present the results of the five questionnaire sections: (1) background information, (2) motivation, (3) attitudes towards the international community, (4) L2 communication confidence, and (5) willingness to communicate.

4.1.2. Questionnaire Results

4.1.2.1. Background Information

The first section of the questionnaire probed the participants’ experiences of traveling or living abroad and their English learning experiences before entering the high school (Yashima, 2002). The first question concerned length of traveling or staying abroad, and the participants were asked to circle one of the five multiple choice items: (a) never, (b) for two weeks or less, (c) between two weeks and three months, (d) between three months and six months, and (e) longer than six months. Since all of the participants had been on a school trip to Australia a few months prior to the administration of the questionnaire, I specifically asked them not to include this travel experience in their responses. The results are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Length of traveling or staying abroad.
As shown in this figure, approximately 60% of the participants (n = 13) had never been abroad and the remaining 40% had spent some time abroad. The counties they had visited included Australia, Canada, China, England, Korea, New Zealand, and U.S.A. Two participants had lived in the U.S. and Australia for about three years. The second background question asked about the number of years students had experienced learning English at school or outside school during their elementary school years. Two students wrote number of months because it was less than one year. I combined these into a category, “less than one year.” The results are shown in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Number of years studying English during the elementary school period.](image)

Almost half of the participants (n = 11) did not answer this question, but the other 10 students reported that they had learned English when they were elementary school students. Those who did not answer the question might not have learned English at that time. These results indicate that about half of the participants (48%) had learned English when they were elementary school students.

The third question asked about the learners’ experience learning English outside school when they were at the junior high school level. Again, the participants were asked
to report on the number of years they had studied English outside school during this period. The results are shown in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. Number of years learning English outside school during the junior high school period.](image)

One of the participants wrote one and a half years, which I included in the category of “less than two years” as shown in Figure 4. Six participants did not answer the question. They might not have learned English at all outside the school. As this figure shows, at least 15 participants or 63% of them had learned English outside junior high school either in afterschool private cram schools or in private English conversation schools.

4.1.2.2. Motivation

The second section of the questionnaire was about motivation (Yashima, 2002). The motivation questionnaire consisted of two concepts: motivation intensity and desire to learn English. Six items to measure each concept are presented on a Likert scale of 1-7 with 1 meaning absolutely disagree and 7 meaning absolutely agree. Examples of the motivation intensity items are: “I think I spend fairly long hours studying English” and “I often think about the words and ideas which I learn about in my English classes.”
Examples of the desire to learn English items are: “I would like the number of English classes at school increased” and “I would read English newspapers or magazines outside my English course work.”

The mean score of the six items for each concept was calculated for each participant. Thus, each participant had their own mean scores for each of the two concepts: motivation intensity and desire to learn English. All participants’ mean scores were subsequently added and divided by the number of participants (n = 21) to compute the mean scores of motivation intensity and desire to learn English. Table 9 shows the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values for motivation intensity and desire to learn English. The results showed the participants’ overall tendency to have relatively high motivation to study English.

| Table 9 |
| Results of the Motivation Questionnaire |
| | N | M | SD | Min. | Max. |
| Motivation Intensity | 21 | 4.80 | 1.08 | 3.17 | 6.67 |
| Desire to Learn English | 21 | 5.13 | 0.87 | 3.33 | 6.33 |

*Note.* On a 1-7 scale (1 = absolutely disagree, 7 = absolutely agree).

### 4.1.2.3. Attitudes toward the International Community

The third section of the questionnaire was on attitudes toward the international community, which consisted of four concepts: intercultural friendship orientation, intergroup approach-avoidance tendency, interest in foreign affairs, and interest in international occupation or activities (Yashima, 2002). Intercultural friendship orientation was composed of 4 items, such as “I am studying English because I would like to make friends with foreigners.” Intergroup approach-avoidance tendency was measured with seven items including, for example, “I would talk to an international student if there is one at school.” Interest in foreign affairs comprised 4 items, such as, “I often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with my family and/or friends.” Interest in international occupation or activities consisted of six items, including “I don’t think what is happening overseas has much to do with my daily life.” The scoring of negatively
worded items such as these was reversed before starting the analysis (Dörnyei, 2003). Following the same procedure for the analysis of the motivation section of the questionnaire, I calculated the means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores for each of the concept as can be seen in Table 10.

### Table 10

Results of Attitude toward the International Community Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Friendship Orientation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup Approach-Avoidance Tendency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in international Occupation or Activities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. On a 1-7 scale (1 = absolutely disagree, 7 = absolutely agree).*

As can be seen in Table 10, the participants had positive attitudes toward the international community. Among these four concepts, intercultural friendship was the highest, while the lowest was for participants’ interest in foreign affairs.

**4.1.2.4. Communication Confidence in L2**

The fourth section of the questionnaire was on communication confidence in the L2, which consisted of two concepts: communication anxiety and perceived communication competence in L2 (Yashima, 2002). Each concept was composed of 12 items. To measure communication anxiety, the participants were asked to indicate the percentage of time they would feel nervous in a variety of situations (e.g. speaking in public, speaking in pairs) with different speakers (e.g. strangers or friends). Zero indicated “I would never feel nervous” and 100 indicated “I would always feel nervous” (Yashima, 2002).

To measure perceived communicative competence in the L2, the participants were asked to rate themselves in different situations with different speakers with zero being “completely incompetent” and 100 “completely competent.” The items for different situations and speakers were the same ones used for the communication anxiety items.
Following the same procedures, I calculated the means, standard deviations, minimum, and maximum mean scores for each concept as in Table 11.

**Table 11**

*Results of Communication Confidence in L2 Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Anxiety</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.28</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Communicative Competence in L2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43.45</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>88.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* On a 0-100 scale (0 = “never” or “completely incompetent,” 100 = “always” or “completely competent”).

As Table 11 shows, the participants were likely to feel nervous almost half of the time when communicating in English. Similarly, they assessed their competence in L2 (i.e., English) communication relatively low with $M = 43.45$, $SD = 22.35$. As this standard deviation shows, the range of their self-assessment was wide with some assessing themselves to be completely incompetent and others assessing themselves to be highly competent.

**4.1.2.5. Willingness to Communicate**

The last section on the questionnaire concerned learners’ willingness to communicate (Yashima, 2002). There were 12 items asking the participants to indicate “the percentage of time they would choose to communicate in different situations when completely free to do so, using a figure between 0 and 100” (Yashima, 2002, p. 86). Again, the items for different situations and speakers were the same ones used above (e.g. speaking in pairs or in public with friends or strangers). Following the same procedures, I calculated the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum mean scores for willingness to communicate as shown in Table 12.
### Table 12

**Results of Willingness to Communicate Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Communicate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>90.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* On a 0-100 scale (0 = never, 100 = always).

Overall, as Table 12 presents, the participants had neither high nor low willingness to communicate in English. However, individual participants varied, as the large standard deviation and the wide range of minimum and maximum scores demonstrate. In the following sections, I describe the procedures for the analysis of the learner interaction data.

### 4.2. Learner Interaction

#### 4.2.1. Learner Interaction Analyses

In this section, I describe how I analyzed the learner interaction data, including data transcription and quantitative analyses of the verbal interaction among learners.

##### 4.2.1.1. Data Transcription: Audio and video recorded data

All of the audio and video recorded learner interaction data were transferred to the computer. I first watched the video and transcribed as much as possible. At this stage, I focused on transcribing sentences as accurately as possible with little attention to speakers. Next, I listened to the audio recorded data to verify that I had transcribed everything. I added to and revised my transcriptions because there were some utterances that I had not noticed or had not been able to hear well when watching the video. Then, I watched the video again to make sure who was speaking by matching voices to faces. In total, I transcribed approximately 320 minutes of verbal interaction among learners: 160 minutes from Group A and 160 minutes from Group B. It took five months to complete the interaction transcriptions because matching the voices and speakers during group discussions was very challenging.
4.2.1.2. Coding Learner Interactions: L1/L2 Use, Communication Patterns, and Length of Turns.

A turn was used as a unit of analysis for the learner interaction data. According to Ellis (1994), a unit of turn ends when the interlocutor stops talking or is interrupted by other interlocutors. Using the transcriptions of the learner interaction, I coded each turn using the coding template adapted from COLT Part B scheme by Spada and Fröhlich (1995) (see Appendix E). I coded each turn in terms of verbal exchanges (i.e., on or off task), use of L1 (i.e., Japanese) or L2 (i.e., English), interaction characteristics (i.e., initiation, correction, repetition, paraphrase, comment, expansion, clarification request, spelling, ask for translation, and reading aloud), length (i.e., 1 word, 2-3 words, or 4 or more words) and interlocutors (i.e., teacher or peer). I provide the definition and example of each category based on Potowski (2007) and Spada and Frohlich (1995) in Table 13.

Table 13
Coding Notes/Definitions and Examples (adapted from Potowski, 2007; Spada & Fröhlich, 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Exchanges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Task</td>
<td>Related to the content of the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Task</td>
<td>Not related to the content of the lesson in any way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Target Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Use of the native language (i.e., Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Use of the second/target language (i.e., English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Self-initiated turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>Any linguistic correction of a previous utterance or indication of incorrectness. <em>Example:</em> We don’t say “he go;” we say “he goes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Full or partial repetition of previous utterance/s. <em>Example:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student: I went to the movie last weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher: Hm, to the movies. (partial repetition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>Reformulation of previous utterance/s (including translation) <em>Example:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student: I saw movie Sunday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher: Oh, you saw a movie on Sunday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Positive or negative response (not correction) to previous utterance/s, or answers/responses to the interlocutor’s utterances. Comments can either be message-related or form-related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Example: Message-related comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: I think the rich should give money to the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Now that’s an interesting idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Example: Form-related comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Give me the past tense of “to be.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: I was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>Extension of the content of the preceding utterance/s or the addition of information that is related to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Example:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: What's the capital of Canada?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Ottawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Right, and Ottawa is in the province of Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request (Clar.Req)</td>
<td>Requests which indicate that the preceding utterance was not clearly understood and a repetition or reformulation is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Example:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: I helped my Dad to build a …(inaudible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Sorry, what did you help your Dad with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration Request (Elab. Req)</td>
<td>Requests for further information related to the subject matter of the preceding utterance/s. Included are also requests for explanations (not requests for clarification).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Example:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: I had a swim-meet last weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Did you do well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: I did OK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: How often do you train during the week?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S: Five times, two hours each time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Spelling out a word/words (e.g., “b-o-o-k”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for Translation</td>
<td>Asking translation either into English or Japanese (e.g., “Kore Eigo de nannte iuno?”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Aloud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 word</td>
<td>There is one English word in a turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 words</td>
<td>There are two or three English words in a turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>There are 4 or more English words in a turn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to determine the amount and type of interaction patterns, I first coded the use of L1 and L2. This included turns that were entirely in English as well as turns that included both L1 and L2 as in “I went to gakko,” where the Japanese word, gakko, is school in English. When a turn included both L1 and L2 (e.g., “I went to gakko”), it was coded for both L1 and L2 categories. There were also turns entirely in Japanese. After coding all of the turns, I tallied the frequencies of each category (i.e., L1 and L2) using Excel for both individual focal participants and for Group A and Group B during FF and MF activities. Second, the patterns of communications in the L2 were also coded, following the definitions by Potowski (2007) and Spada and Fröhlich (1995) provided in Table 13. As for the patterns of communication, I only coded L2 turns (e.g., “I went to school” and “I went to gakko”) and I did not code any turn entirely in Japanese. Third, as seen in Appendix E, I also coded the length of each turn: one word, two or three words, and three or more words. I only counted the English words in a turn and counted any English word as one word, including backchannels (e.g., “okay”) or fillers (“um”).

I coded lengths of turns, which is a low-inference feature, on my own. The high-inference feature of communication patterns was coded by two raters. That is, I asked another researcher who is bilingual in Japanese and English to code 25% of the learner interaction database for inter-rater agreement. A portion of this (25%) was used for practice and we coded the remainder for the purpose of establishing inter-rater agreement. In addition, there were a few words that were difficult to code as either L1 or L2, such as commercial (komasharu in Japanese) and announcer (anaunsa in Japanese). In these cases, I asked a second rater to code L1/L2 use as well. The overall inter-coder agreement for L1/L2 use was 0.99, and the overall agreement for the communication patterns was 0.94. Although most of the disagreements were resolved through discussion, there was one unresolved item about L1/L2 use and four unresolved items about the

15 Different from the interview transcripts, I transcribed all utterances produced by the participants during the instructional treatment, including backchannels and fillers.
communication patterns. Since there was only one unsolved item about L1/L2 use, I was confident that I could continue coding L1/L2 use consistently. Regarding the unresolved items about communication patterns, I went back to the audio data and confirmed the codes based on the contextual situations and tone of voice.\(^\text{16}\)

**4.2.1.3. Counting Types and Tokens**

The number of word types and tokens were also counted during FF and MF activities for Group A and Group B. Word types are defined as “different words that are used in one data set” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 369), while tokens are “the number of repetitions of those words” (p. 369). Similarly, I counted the number of sentence types and the number of sentence tokens for each group during each communicative activity on each day (e.g., Group A during FF on Day 1) for each group. A sentence consists of at least a subject and verb, and it can be a simple sentence or a complex sentence with a subordinate clause.

The type-token ratio is often used to measure sentence complexity or “lexical richness” (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005, p. 155). In addition, the comparison of types and tokens may permit us to investigate how much new information was provided during FF and MF activities. The latter (i.e., new information) is the purpose of the type-token analysis in this study.

**4.2.2. Learner Interaction Results**

In this section, I report the results of learner speech production in the classroom interactions, focusing on turns in English. As discussed above, a unit of turn ends when the interlocutor stops talking or is interrupted by other interlocutors (Ellis, 1994). The classroom interaction data are from the two groups of five focal participants.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{16}\) The other researcher coded based on the written transcripts and did not have access to the audio data.

\(^{17}\) It is important to remember that one of the four focal candidate participants joined the treatment group, Group A, on the third instructional treatment day because one of the focal participants was absent on that day. In order to compare the amount of speech produced during the interactions, I decided to ask the candidate participant to join Group A on Day 3 so that both groups would have the same number of group members.
I first present the results of L1 (i.e., Japanese) and L2 (i.e., English) use during the instructional treatment sessions, and I examine whether there were any differences between the FF and MF activities. Second, communication patterns are compared, which is followed by a comparison of the length of turns during the FF and MF activities. The purpose of these comparisons is to explore whether type of instructional activities (i.e., FF and MF activities) influenced the pattern of L2 communication and length of L2 communication. Third, the number of word types, sentence types, and sentence tokens during FF and MF activities are presented to examine whether the amount of new information provided in these verbal interaction was different between the FF and MF activities.

4.2.2.1. L1 and L2 Use

The participants in this study did not use L2 English as frequently as I had expected based on the results of the pilot study. Furthermore, as discussed in the methods chapter, the participants often mixed the L1 and L2 in the same turn. Thus, I coded all utterances with at least one English word as a turn in the L2. Similarly, I coded all utterances with at least one Japanese word as a turn with L1. Therefore, one turn could be and was in fact coded both as an L1 and L2 turn.

The results of the number of turns in L1 and L2 are presented in Table 14. It is important to recall that Group A and Group B experienced both FF and MF activities on each treatment lesson day. For example, Group A completed the FF activity for the first 15 minutes on Day 1, while Group B completed the MF activity for the first 15 minutes on Day 1. Then, Group A completed the MF activity for the next 15 minutes on Day 1, while Group B completed the FF activity for the next 15 minutes. Thus, every communicative activity (i.e., FF and MF activities) was completed by learners in both Group A and Group B. This was an important aspect of the study design permitting an examination of instructional treatment effects by counterbalancing the effects of materials, group characteristics, and teachers. As shown in Table 14, there were more turns in the L1 (i.e., Japanese) than in the L2 (i.e., English) in both FF and MF activities. In other words, students tended to speak in Japanese regardless of the type of instruction. However, as Table 14 shows, there was a slight difference in the amount of L2 use during
FF and MF activities. That is, the participants tended to speak slightly more English during MF activities (n=421) than during FF activities (n=396), but the difference is small.

Table 14

*Number of Turns in L1 and in L2 during FF and MF Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>L1 Japanese</th>
<th></th>
<th>L2 English</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical significance of the difference in the number of turns was not tested due to the small number of participants and the variation in the number of turns within both FF and MF activities across the four days. Furthermore, as shown in Table 15, there was also variation in the number of turns produced by each individual participant regardless of the type of instruction. The following sections focus on the turns and communication patterns in English during FF and MF activities.
### Table 15

**Number of Turns Produced by Each Participant in L2 during FF and MF Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>MF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiko</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chika</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sato</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tami</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Hana was absent on Day 3, and Junko substituted for her on Day 3.

#### 4.2.2.2. Patterns of Communication in L2 English

As indicated in Chapter 3, each turn was coded in terms of the following communication types: initiation, correction, repetition, paraphrase, comment, expansion, clarification request, elaboration request, singing, reading aloud, spelling, and translation request (see the coding note in Table 13 for the definition of each communication pattern). While most of the turns were coded as representing one of the communication types, some of the turns were coded as multiple types because one turn sometimes consisted of multiple communication patterns.

The results of the patterns of communication in L2 English are presented in Table 16 (see Appendix G for complete results).
Table 16

Patterns of Communication in L2 English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Clar. Request</th>
<th>Elab. Request</th>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Reading Aloud</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Transl. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 16, there were some differences in the communication patterns between FF and MF activities, although they are not great. For example, initiation, expansion, and clarification requests were observed more frequently during FF activities than MF activities. On the other hand, the following communication patterns happened more frequently during MF activities than FF activities: repetition, paraphrase, comment, elaboration request, reading aloud, and translation request. There were also some communication patterns that happened almost equally in both FF and MF activities, such as correction, singing, and spelling.

4.2.2.3. Lengths of L2 Turns

The length of each L2 turn was coded as one word, two or three words, and four or more words, following Potowski (2007). Some of the turns included both Japanese and English. In such cases, I only counted the number of English words in a turn. The results are presented in Table 17 (see Appendix H for complete results).

Table 17

Lengths of L2 Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 word</th>
<th>2 or 3 words</th>
<th>4 or more words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 17 shows, there was almost the same number of turns of different lengths during the FF activities with an average of about 132 turns each. On the other hand, there were different numbers of turns with different lengths in the MF activities, ranging from 117 to 170. Overall, longer turns (i.e., 2 or 3 words and 4 or more words) were produced more during the MF activities, and shorter turns (i.e., 1 word) were produced more during the FF activities. These findings were not consistent with my expectations that longer turns would be more frequently observed during the FF activities. In the following section, I will present the results of number of word types, sentence types, and sentence tokens to examine how much new information was exchanged during FF and MF activities.

4.2.2.4. Word Types, Sentence Types, and Sentence Tokens

In this section, I present the number of word types, sentence types, and sentence tokens produced by participants in English during the FF and MF activities. As described above, I adopted Mackey and Gass’ (2005) definitions of word type and token. When examining the word tokens, I realized that most of the words were repeated. Therefore, the number of word tokens is not presented here. The results of the number of word types, sentence types and sentence tokens are presented in Table 18 (see Appendix I for the complete results).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Word Types</th>
<th>Number of Sentence Types</th>
<th>Number of Sentence Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFI</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 18, there was little difference in the number of word types, sentence types, and sentence tokens produced by the learners in the FF and MF activities. Almost an equal number of word types was observed and even though there were more sentence types produced during the FF activities, it is a small difference. There were more repetitions during MF activities than FF activities; about 25% [= (98-73)/98] of the
sentences were repetitions in FF activities, while as much as 60% \(= \frac{(108-65)}{108}\) of the sentences were repetitions in MF activities.

4.3. Summary of the Quantitative Results

The questionnaire results indicated that almost half of the participants had traveled abroad and had started learning English before entering junior high school. Furthermore, more than half of the participants studied English after school when they were in junior high school. The results of the questionnaire indicated their relatively high levels of motivation to study English and their positive attitudes toward the international community. At the same time, the participants indicated that they felt nervous almost half of the time they spoke English and would not feel confident speaking English most of the time. Nonetheless, they were willing to communicate in English about half of the time when they had a chance to do so. The large standard deviations for these results suggest great variation among individuals.

The results of the analysis of turns during FF and MF activities showed that the participants used more Japanese than English, regardless of type of instructional activities (i.e., FF and MF activities). It was also revealed that the participants spoke more during MF activities than during FF activities, regardless of whether it was in Japanese or English. The results of length of turn analysis demonstrated that longer turns were produced more frequently during MF activities, which was also contrary to hypothesis. The number of word types, sentence types and sentence tokens revealed that the participants exchanged new information by producing a greater variety of sentences during FF activities than MF activities although they used almost the same number of word types in the FF and MF activities.

In the following two chapters a case-study approach is taken in the analysis of two participants in this study. A case study approach permits a closer and more in-depth examination of participants and learning contexts/situations from multiple perspectives (Duff, 2008). I have focused on two focal participants, Mika and Aiko who have been selected from the two focal groups: Group A and Group B. In these case studies, I utilized both quantitative and qualitative analyses in the analysis of their interactional
behaviours and in relation to their self-report data, including diaries, written stimulated recalls and interviews.
Chapter 5: Analyses and Results of Case Study of Mika

In this chapter, I describe the analyses and present the results of the first case study. I selected Mika for this case study because she often mentioned the connection between grammar and communication during the stimulated recalls and interviews. I will first introduce Mika’s background based on the interview, diary, and classroom observation data. This is followed by the results of the questionnaire and the analysis of turns Mia produced during the form and meaning-based activities. Finally, I present the results of her interviews and stimulated recalls in relation to her interactional behaviours, which are analyzed in terms of discursive practices (Young, 2008, 2009), during the FF and MF activities.

5.1. Mika\(^{18}\)

Mika was one of the students who entered this high school from a town outside Takano City.\(^{19}\) She was from Midori town, which is famous for Mt. Midori, a well-known mountain throughout the world. She commuted between Midori town and the high school using trains and buses, which took at least one and a half hours each way. Thus, every morning, she left home at 5:00am in order to attend morning classes at 7:30am. She usually arrived at home around 9:00pm after attending an after-school cram school. Then, she spent another two hours to finish her homework at home. Both in her interviews and in her diaries, she stated that she had wanted to major in English at this high school because of its good reputation.

Although she successfully passed the entrance examination for the English program, Mika started losing her confidence in English. She had been one of the best students in English at a junior high school in Midori town, but she found that everybody was good at English at this high school. In addition, Mika expressed concern that she sometimes fell asleep during the class because of the constant lack of sleep due to her schedule. Once during my observation, she did not wake up even after the teacher had called her name several times and tapped her on the shoulder to wake her up. Most of the time, however, she was serious during the class, taking detailed notes and checking vocabulary words with her electronic dictionary. During my

\(^{18}\) As indicated in the previous chapters, all of the participants’ names are pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

\(^{19}\) Similarly, the names of cities, towns, and mountains are pseudonyms to protect the anonymity of the high school.
observations of the English classes, Mika did not speak up in English unless she was called upon. Although she was verbally quiet, she was engaged in conversations with other students and the teacher through facial expressions (e.g., smile) and gestures (e.g., turning up her thumb).

In spite of such a physically hard daily-schedule, Mika was active during recess and lunch time, chatting, laughing, and sometimes running around with her classmates. According to one of her diary entries, her classmates described her as a cheerful and jolly girl. The teachers seemed to have a similar impression about her. For example, as written in her diaries, when the class went on a school trip to Australia, the instructor, Tom, wrote an example sentence on the blackboard, “Mika and Tom are small but dynamic.” By interviewing her and reading her diaries, I discovered that she was not only a cheerful girl but also a caring person. For instance, when the assigned topics for the diaries were place, time, and money, she wrote that she wanted to go to skies where there were no wars, back to the time when the atomic bomb was dropped to give suffering people water, and to spend money on her parents.

According to her interviews and diaries, she wanted to be an English teacher in the future because she liked English and children. She became interested in English when she was a junior high school student because her English teacher’s pronunciation was good, which seemed to be very “cool” to her. During the interviews, she often used the expression, “cool,” when she discussed English-related topics, such as her classmates who were good at speaking English, English teachers, and people living in English-speaking countries. Although she expressed her desire to become a fluent English speaker, she had difficulty speaking English. She frequently told me that she was not good at speaking English and wanted to improve it. When I asked her why she had such a strong desire to speak English fluently, she responded that she could be a different person with a more positive outlook and attitude by speaking English. To her, speaking English would always require courage. Therefore, she thought that her classmates who spoke English well were courageous and had a positive outlook. I further asked her why she thought speaking English was cool. She answered that speaking English and having a good pronunciation were “Sugoi, mou, kakkoii! ‘Wah’ te kanji!” (Great and so cool! It is like ‘Wow!’),” while having grammar knowledge would simply show that you had studied English. She clarified this

---

20 Tom is a pseudonym for the instructor at a language school in Australia.
21 The assigned questions were “If you could fly, where would you go?” “If you could travel in time, where would you go?” and “How would you spend one million yen?” respectively.
22 Mika provided this comment during the interview in December 2008.
comment by adding that everybody could learn grammar by studying, while not everybody could improve pronunciation by studying. She stated that speaking and pronunciation represent the speakers’ experiences, such as their familiarity with the English-speaking culture and their experiences of living in the English-speaking countries.

This background information indicates that Mika had a strong desire to study English and to speak English well, although she did not think she was good at speaking English yet. In the following section, I will present the results of Mika’s questionnaire about motivation and willingness to communicate.

5.2. Mika’s Questionnaire Results

As indicated in Chapter 3, the questionnaire developed by Yashima (2002) consisted of five sections: background information, motivation, attitude toward the international community, L2 communication confidence, and willingness to communicate. The results of the first section, background information, showed that Mika had never been abroad prior to the school trip to Australia. She learned English for a month before entering junior high school and continued learning English outside junior high school for a year and a half.

Table 19 presents the results of Mika’s responses to the questionnaire items. Table 19 also presents the mean scores of all participants’ (n = 21) responses (see Tables 9-12 in Chapter 4 for the complete results). As described in Chapter 4, the motivation and attitude sections were presented on a Likert scale of 1-7 with 1 meaning absolutely disagree and 7 meaning absolutely agree. The communicative confidence section consists of two constructs: communication anxiety and perceived communication competence. This section required participants to indicate the percentage of time they would feel nervous/incompetent in a variety of situations in English and to rate their communicative anxiety/competence in the L2 in different situations. Zero indicated “never feel nervous” and “completely incompetent” respectively, while 100 indicated “always feel nervous” and “completely competent” respectively. Similarly, the willingness to communicate section asked the participants to indicate “the percentage of time they would choose to communicate” in English (Yashima, 2002, p. 86).

As Table 19 shows, Mika had slightly higher levels of motivation and a stronger desire to study English than the class mean, but slightly less positive attitudes toward the international community. In addition, although she rated her L2 communicative competence higher than the
class average, she had higher levels of anxiety and was less willing to communicate in the L2 when compared with the mean of her peers. These results suggest that while she was interested in learning English and felt confident about her ability in English, she was nervous about engaging in English conversation and was reluctant to communicate in English very much. In the next section, I will present the results of the verbal interaction analyses to examine how much and how she communicated in English during the form and meaning-based activities.

Table 19

Results of Mika’s Responses to Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Mika Mean (n= 21)</th>
<th>Class Mean (n= 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Motivation Intensity</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to Learn English</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward the International Community Questionnaire</td>
<td>Intercultural Friendship Orientation</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergroup Approach-Avoidance Tendency</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest in Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest in International Occupation or Activities</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Confidence in L2</td>
<td>Communication Anxiety</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>44.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Communicative Competence in L2</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>43.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Communicate</td>
<td>Willingness to Communicate</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>46.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. On a 1-7 scale for the motivation and attitude sections (1 = absolutely disagree, 7 = absolutely agree). On a 0-100 scale for the confidence section (0 = “never” or “completely incompetent,” 1 = “always” or “completely competent.” On a 0-100 scale for the willingness section (0 = never, 1= always).

5.3. Mika’s Classroom Interactions: Results of Turn Analyses

Mika was assigned to Group B with four other focal participants. This group produced a total of 427 turns that included at least one English word over the four treatment lessons (i.e.,
four FF activities and four MF activities). Table 20 shows the number of turns produced by each participant over these four treatment lesson days.

**Table 20**

*Number of Turns Produced by Each Participant*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mika</th>
<th>Nao</th>
<th>Sato</th>
<th>Tami</th>
<th>Waka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was surprising to see that Mika spoke English the least overall when compared with her interlocutors because she seemed to be quite engaged in the activities when I observed the treatment lessons. This appears to be due to her active non-verbal behaviours, such as gestures and facial expressions, which I will discuss in an upcoming section which examines Mika’s behaviour from a discursive practice analysis perspective. Another possibility for her small number of utterances might be due to her lack of participation on Day 3, when she did not participate much because of sleepiness. When we compare the number of L2 turns Mika produced in the FF activities and MF activities, Figure 5 shows that she produced 15 turns during the FF activities and 12 turns during the MF activities. She only produced one L2 turn on Day 3, which according to her stimulated recalls and interviews, was a day that she was too sleepy to participate in the activity.
Table 21 presents information about the type of utterances Mika produced during the FF and MF activities. Apart from more repetitions produced during FF activities than MF activities, there were no other differences.

Table 21

Mika’s Patterns of Communication in L2 English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Clar. Request</th>
<th>Elab. Request</th>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Reading Aloud</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Translation Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2³</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The two turns coded as clarification request and elaboration request in MF were also coded as reading aloud.
In the following sections, using Young’s (2008, 2009) discursive practice framework, I will examine Mika’s investment in L2 communication by analyzing her interactional behaviours during FF activities and MF activities in relation to her self-report comments provided during stimulated recalls and interviews. I will also examine Mika’s investment in L2 communication through exploring her views on learning English, studying English grammar, and speaking in English.

5.4. Discursive Practice Analysis

In this section, I examine the discursive practices during FF activities and MF activities, focusing on what linguistic, identity, and interactional resources were available for Mike to use when interacting with her group members: Nao, Sato, Tami, and Waka. Although Mika is the focus of this analysis, I also examine her group members’ utterances and behaviours when necessary because discursive practices are not created by a single person. Rather, they are mutually created through the use of identity, linguistic and interactional resources (Young, 2008, 2009). The goal of analyzing discursive practices in this study is to investigate Mika’s investment in L2 communication in two instructional contexts: FF activities and MF activities. A discursive practice analysis should help us understand how Mika invested in L2 communication during FF activities and MF activities by providing information about (a) what linguistic resources were available for Mika, (b) how these linguistic resources were used by Mika to pool identity and interactional resources, and (c) how these identity and interactional resources were distributed through the use of linguistic resources among Mika and her peers during FF activities and MF activities. In the following sections, I present the procedures used to carry out the discursive practice analysis and describe how the discursive practices compared in the FF activities and MF activities.

5.4.1. The focused characteristics of discursive practices in this study

As discussed in Chapter 2, discursive practices consist of identity, linguistic, and interactional resources (Young, 2008, 2009). Although Young provides detailed characteristics of each resource, some of them some of them did not appear in my data. Therefore, only those characteristics which appeared frequently in my data are discussed in the following sections.
For identity resources, I decided to focus on animator, author, official hearer and ratified participants. Principal was excluded because I was not able to find a person whose political view had a strong impact on the participants’ interactions during FF activities and MF activities. For linguistic resources, there was almost no variety in modes of meaning because the interactional data in this study derived from classroom activities (i.e., FF activities and MF activities). In other words, most of the utterances were textual in meaning, regardless of whether they occurred in FF or MF activities. Thus, I decided to focus only on register for linguistic resources, such as pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. For interactional resources, I decided to focus only on repair and non-linguistic characteristics (e.g., gestures and eye contact) because there was almost no variation in speech acts, turn-taking, and boundaries. In other words, most of the speech acts were making a request or describing thoughts, while the majority of the turn-taking patterns were self-selected, regardless of the type of instruction. In addition, both FF and MF activities had similar boundaries; both of them usually started and ended by the teachers’ utterances, such as, “Okay, you have 15 minutes to complete this” and “Okay, stop.” Table 22 summarizes the characteristics of the identity, linguistic, and interactional resources focused on in this case study.

Table 22

*Focused Characteristics of Discursive Practice Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Practice Resources</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Identity Resources</td>
<td>Participation roles (e.g., animator, author, official hearer, and ratified participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Linguistic Resources</td>
<td>Register: (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, pauses, overlapping, and speed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interactional Resources</td>
<td>Repair (e.g., self-repair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-linguistic features (e.g., eye contact, body movement, and gesture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young’s (2008, 2009) definitions for resources were followed closely except for the definition of author in identity resources. I extended its definition to include a person whose utterances were repeated in other participants’ utterances. Since there were many repetitions
among my participants, it seemed important to identify whose utterances were adopted and repeated as an “author” in later utterances.

In the following sections, I will present the results of these three resources (i.e., identity, linguistic, and interactional) of discursive practices that Mika exhibited during FF activities and MF activities. Before doing so, it is important to explain how I selected the audio- and video-recorded interactional data for the analysis and what proportion of the database is included in the analysis of this case study.

5.4.2. Classroom Interactional Data for Mika’s Case Study

Most of the classroom interactional data analyzed were the audio and video-recorded segments selected for stimulated recalls. Figure 6 shows the processes of selecting the classroom interactional data for the analysis in Mika’s case study.
Figure 6. Data selection processes for the case study.
First, I watched the videos for all the classroom interactions and selected some of the interactional episodes for the stimulated recalls. I chose the episodes based on two categories: ordinal interactions and unique interactions. Ordinal interactions were what I considered the participants’ typical behaviours during the class, such as chatting in Japanese with some English words or writing down something in their notebooks. Unique interactions included the interactions that were faster and/or louder than their regular interactions, as well as communication breakdowns and silence. During the stimulated recall sessions, Mika provided many comments on some of the episodes and few on others. At the follow-up and main interviews, she further commented on some of the episodes that she had recalled. Thus, for further analysis, I selected the interactional segments: (a) that I had chosen for the stimulated recalls, (b) that Mika had provided many comments on during the stimulated recall sessions, and (c) that Mika further commented on during the follow-up and main interviews.

Although most of the data were selected based on the above process, I also analyzed some interactional data that had not been selected for stimulated recalls (see Figure 6). That is, after collecting and transcribing the classroom interactional data, I noticed that there were some occasions, where Mika interacted in English to a greater extent than usual during the instructional treatment lessons. In addition, while transcribing and examining her interview data, I noticed that Mika commented on specific interactions during the interviews. Unfortunately, some of these interactional episodes had not been selected for stimulated recalls. Therefore, I added those interactional episodes for further analysis. Table 23 shows the total number of turns that Mika and her group members produced during the instructional treatment lessons and the approximate total number of their turns selected for the stimulated recall sessions.

---

23 I did not focus only on Mika at the time of data collection. Rather, I focused on overall communication behaviors among the participants.
24 This represents an approximation of the total number of turns selected for the stimulated recall sessions because it was almost impossible for me to manually play-back the video at the exact onset time of each episode.
Table 23

**Number of Turns during Lessons and Number of Turns for Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FF Activities</th>
<th>MF Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>SR + (Added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>55 + (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38 + (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>168 + (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Each turn was uttered either only in English, only in Japanese, or both in English and Japanese.

*b SR + (Added) means the number of turns selected for stimulated recalls and the number of turns that were not selected for stimulated recalls but were added at later stages for further analysis. For example, 55 +(21) means 55 turns were selected for stimulated recalls and 21 turns were added later for analysis.

As Table 23 shows, a total of 822 turns was produced by Mika and her group members during the treatment lessons. Approximately half of the data (393/822 = 0.478) were selected for stimulated recalls or for further analysis at later stages, and they were closely examined. The data presented in the following sections consist of a total number of 85 turns: 34 from FF activities and 51 from MF activities. Although this represents only 10 percent of the entire database (85/822), is the most representative with similar interactions frequently observed in other parts of the data.

5.5. Results of Discursive Practices of FF and MF Activities

In this section, I present the results of the discursive practice analyses in relation to Mika’s self-report data included in the diaries, stimulated recalls, and interviews.

5.5.1. Grammar as a navigator of L2 communication

“I can see the direction of the story based on the given grammar form.”

(Mika, December, 2008)

“I am afraid that I may talk about things that are totally irrelevant.”

(Mika, June, 2008)
The above excerpts were taken from Mika’s self-report data. The first excerpt is from her interview response about FF activities, and the second is her interview response about MF activities. Below is an example from a FF activity on Day 1. In presenting the interactional data, I am following Ten Have’s (2007) conversation analysis transcription conventions (see Appendix J for details of these transcription conventions). Utterances in italics represent speech produced in Japanese.

Example 1: FF Activity on Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tami</td>
<td>You should go <em>would be fine</em>. ((Tami nods and looks at Waka’s paper.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sato</td>
<td>Next, you should (.) should see? ((Sato smiles and looks at members’ faces. Sato moves her arms to make a circle from her eyes, to the front, and to the sides.)) <em>Is this okay because we are talking about Mt. Midori?</em> ((Sato makes eye contact with Mika.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td><em>I agree that we can see things from Mt. Midori, but how about climb?</em> ((Tami, Sato, and Nao look at Mika.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sato</td>
<td><em>I see. Climb?</em> (Sato looks at Waka’s paper, and Sato looks confused.) <em>Does climb mean climb?</em> ((Sato looks at Mika. Mika and Nao nods.)) <em>Is that tiring?</em> ((Sato points at Waka’s paper, smiles and looks at Mika and Waka. Nao moves her head back, moves her hands forward and laughs. The others laugh, too.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Nao</td>
<td><em>Isn’t it too tiring?</em> ((Nao smiles.)) <em>How about in the opposite order?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td><em>Yeah, then we can both climb the mountain and have a nice view from there.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number next to the participants’ names represents the number of the turn in the entire exchange of the FF activity on Day 1. In Example 1, Mika was an animator at turns 82 and 85. Even though it was one word, *climb*, it was uttered in English at turn 82, and Sato referred to it three times in turn 83 (“Climb? Does climb mean climb? Is that tiring?”). Thus, at turn 83, Mika was an “author” of the word, climb. Mika was also an official hearer at turn 83 when Sato asked Mika a question. At the other turns, she was a ratified participant.
In terms of the linguistic resources, the word, “climb” or its Japanese translation, “climb,” as shown in Italics was frequently uttered in Example 1. Both Japanese and English were used in the interactions in this example. Different from my observation experiences of their regular English lessons, their English was pronounced without inserting a vowel after a consonant, which is different from the Japanese pronunciation system (Jenkins, 2007; Tamura, 2010). For example, Tami, who had lived in the U.S., said “You should go” smoothly at turn 80. Then, at turn 81, Sato pronounced “should (/ʃʊd/)” without a vowel at the end. However, from Mika’s turn at 82, English words were pronounced with a vowel after each consonant, following the Japanese pronunciation system.

In terms of interactional resources, at turn 82, Mika initiated a repair of Sato’s use of “see” by using another verb, “climb.” Then, at turn 83, Sato initiated a repair of Mika’s use of “climb,” followed by Nao’s repair of the order of the use of “see” and “climb.” Thus, there were two repair episodes in Example 1. As described in Example 1, there was also a great deal of eye contact among the participants. For example, when Sato spoke, she looked at others. Also, after Mika’s turn, the other members looked at Mika. Gestures, body movements (e.g., nodding) and laughter were also frequently observed during this interaction.

As the descriptions of identity, linguistic, and interactional resources of the discursive practices show, Mika and her group members seemed to create a supportive and pleasant learning environment by providing each other with feedback and making eye contact. That is, Mika and her group members seemed to invest in communication utilizing the resources collaboratively. This investment is clearly reflected in Mika’s excitement reported in her stimulated recalls about the FF activity on Day 1:

Excerpt 1:

We got many ideas about the stories, and I was excited, too.26

(Mika, Stimulated Recall, FF Activity on Day 1)

---

25 The absence or presence of a vowel is not shown in the transcripts because they are not phonetic transcripts. For example, the participants often pronounced “should,” inserting a vowel after each consonant (e.g., /ʃʊdo/).
26 All of the interviews, stimulated recalls, and follow-up interviews were conducted in Japanese. I transcribed them and translated them into English.
Mika’s investment in communication during this supportive context is also evident in Mika’s follow-up interview on this stimulated recall:

Excerpt 2:

It was fun to think about the story. I was thinking that I could think of more stories and I was not worried about expressing opinions.

(Mika, Follow-up, FF Activity on Day 1)

Since Mika had often told me that she did not want to speak English in front of her Japanese peers, which I will discuss later, I asked her why she had so many ideas and why she was not afraid of expressing her opinions in English on that day. She answered:

Excerpt 3:

If I am told to use a certain grammar form, I usually find it easy to make story lines. I can see the direction of the story based on the given grammar form.

(Mika, Interview, June, 2008)

This excerpt suggests that Mika seemed to feel secure and more invested in communication because grammar navigated her in the right direction (e.g., discussing relevant topics).

Example 2 is from a MF activity on Day 1. In this example, both Japanese and English translations are presented to show the overlap, which did not occur in Example 1. The overlapping turns are indicated by square brackets [ ]. The utterances written in italics were said in Japanese and translated into English. In addition, the original utterances in Japanese are in boldface type.

Example 2: MF Activity on Day 1

24 Sato Than in Takano. Life style? ((Sato looks at Waka’s paper with a smile. Waka writes. Mika, Nao, and Tami look at Waka’s paper. Everybody leans forward over the desk toward Waka’s paper.))

25 Nao I am not sure. ((Mika, Nao, Sato, and Tami look at Waka’s paper.))

Douka[na].

26 Waka I don’t think there is any difference in life style. ((Sato glances at Waka.))

<[Anmari] [kawaranainjanai]>.
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27 Tami  *I wonder if there is any difference.*

[Chigaunokana].

28 Nao  [Life style.] ((Tami looks at Nao. Sato looks at Waka’s paper.))

29 Waka  *It should be the same.*

<[Onaji.]>

30 Tami  *I guess there is no difference in life style.* ((Sato glances at Mika and looks at Waka’s paper.))

<[Anmari] kawanai kanji.>

Mika did not speak at all in this MF activity until the 49th turn, when she said, “ah,” in Japanese. Compared with Example 1 (i.e., a FF activity on Day 1), she was a ratified participant in the interactions in Example 2. That is, she did not become an animator or official hearer because she did not speak or was not directly spoken to. Not providing a turn at all, she was not an author either.

The linguistic resources in Example 2 include the use of English and Japanese, as well as a phrase, “life style.” The participants pronounced English words with Japanese pronunciation by inserting a vowel every after a consonant. In this example, there were many overlapped turns, many of which were uttered quickly as shown with the symbol, < > (Ten Have, 2007). Here, it is important to keep it in mind that Mika did not produce any language; all interactions were completed by the other members of her group.

The characteristics of the interactional resources in Example 2 of the MF activity differ from those in Example 1 of the FF activity. In Example 2, the participants mainly looked at Waka’s paper and rarely made eye contact or smiled at each other.27 They did not use gestures, move their arms, or change their body positions. There was also no repair in Example 2. Mika did not seem to find a way to invest in communication during this MF activity and described this during the follow-up interview.

---

27 Due to the angle of the camera during Example 2, I was not able to see Waka or Mika’s faces. I could sometimes see Waka’s forehead and guessed whether she was looking down or up.
Excerpt 4:

I could not tell my opinion. I could not even say a word. Everybody was exchanging their opinions so quickly that I could not interrupt them. It was very frustrating that I could not join the conversation. I think it takes longer for me to make a sentence in English than others. I am not good at making sentences in English.

(Mika, Follow-up Interview, May 2008)

Although she explained her silence in terms of her lack of English proficiency, this seems to be only one of the reasons for not speaking in English with her Japanese peers. She also repeatedly expressed in the interview that she was worried what others would think of her, and that she was afraid of getting a puzzled look and reactions from others, such as “what is she talking about?”:

Excerpt 5:

I am always worried what people would think of me. If I say something in English as if I am a good English speaker and if this actually sounds funny, it will be very embarrassing.

(Mika, Interview, December 2007)

Excerpt 6:

I want to speak in English, but I cannot. I am worried that my friends might wonder, “What is she talking about?” Then, I cannot speak. […] Anyway, I do not lead or initiate conversation. I will first make sure that I am in the right direction. Otherwise, I am afraid that I may talk about things that are totally irrelevant.

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

Interestingly, she had these worries only when she had to speak English with her Japanese peers. When she lived with her home stay family during her school trip to Australia, she did not worry what they would think of her when she spoke in English. In addition, she did not feel frustrated even when she could not join the conversation with her host family members. During the interview, she said,
Excerpt 7:

Mika: I talked a lot with my host family mother in English. But when there were some other people, I sometimes could not join their conversation.

Yasuyo: Can you tell me whether it is the same or different than the situations where you find it difficult to join the conversations during English classes here in Japan?

Mika: It is different. When I am with Japanese classmates and cannot join their conversation in English, I feel very frustrated because we are at the same level. If I cannot join their conversation, I will get worried that I may be inferior to them. I want to speak, I want to say something, and I want to win! But in Australia, they are native speakers, and it is obvious that I am inferior to them. I do not feel frustrated because I am not even at the level that I can compare myself to them.

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

Thus, she was often less willing to speak in English when she was with Japanese peers as illustrated in Example 2, particularly in the MF activity. However, when she was given a target grammar form to use in communicative practice as in Example 1 (FF activity), she seemed more willing to invest in L2 communication by utilizing identity, linguistic, and interactional resources provided in the discursive practices during FF activities.

5.5.2. Grammar as a Stimulus for L2 Communication

“I can think of many stories when I am told to use a certain grammar form.”

(Mika, Follow-up Interview, FF Activity on Day 2)

“My mind went blank.”

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

Below is an example of how grammar instruction stimulated Mika to communicate in English. Utterances in italics were in Japanese, and translated into English. At turn 34, the original Japanese utterance is in boldface type to show the overlapping of turns 33 and 34.
Example 3: FF Activity on Day 2

32 Waka If you have ((Waka writes.))
33 Sato [Answer]
34 Waka Do you mean “If you have some difficulty”? ((Nao looks at Waka’s paper, glances at Mika, and looks at Waka’s paper again.))

[Moshi] gimonga attara toiukoto?
35 Sato Do you mean “If you have a question”? ((Nao leans back and disappeared from the camera.))
36 Mika How about “If you have something that you want to talk about”?((Mika crosses her arms. Waka looks at Sato.))
37 Sato Sounds good. “If you want to talk,” right? ((Waka looks at Sato and looks at her own paper. Sato moves her arms forward and opens her palm with the rhythm of her speech.))
38 Mika Something (. ) [if you::]
39 Sato [If you want] to
40 Mika From you. ((Mika moves her arms forward and flips her hand.))
41 Sato Right. ((Waka writes.))
42 Waka Like, “You should.” ((Sato points at Waka with her pen.))
43 Sato Speak. ((Mika stretch her left arm, grabs her electric dictionary and opens it. Tami glances at Mika and stands up to see Waka’s paper.))

In Example 3, Mika was an animator (at turns 36, 38, and 40), official hearer (at turns 37, 39, 41) and a ratified participant at the other turns. She also became an author at turn 37, where Sato adapted what Mika had said at turn 36, as well as at turn 38, where Mika animated her own utterance at turn 36 by translating it to English. Thus, similar to the previous example of the FF activity on Day 1 (Example 1), Mika exhibited various identity roles during the discursive practices of the FF activity on Day 2.

Regarding the linguistic resources in Example 3, “if” and its translation into Japanese were most frequently uttered. “If” is part of the conditional structure, which was the target grammar form of Day 2. Similar to other examples, the participants used both English and Japanese and pronounced English by inserting a vowel every after consonant. Turns 33 and 34
overlapped. The other overlapping turns 38 (“if you::”) and 39 (“If you want to”) seem to complement each other’s sentences.

With regard to interactional resources, there were two repairs in Example 3. The first was about Sato’s use of “answer” at turn 33. At turn 34, Waka initiated a repair and Mika repaired it by proposing an alternative idea. The second repair was about Mika’s alternative idea. Sato initiated a repair at turn 37, followed by Mika’s self-repair by translating what Sato proposed in Japanese into English. Although Waka looked at Sato at turn 37, it was difficult to examine eye contact in Example 3 due to the angle of the camera; I could not see Sato or Mika’s faces. However, I saw many body movements and gestures in Example 3. For example, Mika crossed her arms at turn 36, Sato moved her arms and opened her palm with the rhythm of her speech at turn 37, and Mika moved her arms forward and flipped her hand. At the end of the interactions in Example 3, there were larger body movements; Tami stood up to see Waka’s paper, following Mika’s stretching her arm to grab her electric dictionary.

Similar to the first example of the FF activity on Day 1 (Example 1), Mika and her group members seemed to be engaged in the interactions while using the target structure forms both in English and their Japanese translations. In addition, in Example 3, the target structure (i.e., conditionals) appears to help Mika and her members to invest in communication, utilizing identity, linguistic, and interactional resources. During the stimulated recall session, Mika commented on these interactions as follows:

Excerpt 8:

I thought I could think about stories easily when I heard that we had to use conditionals.

But the sentence structure might be difficult.

(Mika, Stimulated Recalls, FF Activity on Day 2)

She further explained this comment in the follow-up interview:

---

28 I could not see Nao’s face after she leaned back and disappeared from the camera at turn 35.
Excerpt 9:

If I am told to use conditionals and make sentences, I can make many sentences. I can think of many stories when I am told to use a certain grammar form, especially when the given grammar and stories match well.

(Mika, Follow-up, FF Activity on Day 2)

One might argue that only one turn in English (i.e., Example 3, Turn 38) is not a strong indicator of Mika’s investment in L2 communication. However, when I examined each turn produced by Mika over the four treatment lesson days, a pattern emerged. That is, during the FF activity, Mika tended to provide new information in English (e.g., Example 1, Turn 82) or provide new information in Japanese and then translate it into English (e.g., Example 3, Turns 36 and 38). During the MF activity on Day 2, however, Mika also provided new information, thus contradicting my hypothesis that FF activities led to greater participation on Mika’s part. However, a closer examination of each of her utterances during this MF activity on Day 2 revealed that Mika had actually noticed the target form at the beginning of the lesson as shown in Example 4. Again, sentences in italics were uttered in Japanese.

Example 4: MF Activity on Day 2

33 Mika *Are we supposed to use conditionals here?* ((Mika closes her dictionary and turns her face to Waka without making eye contact with her. Tami looks at Mika.))

34 Sato *Maybe. It is difficult.* ((Sato looks at the paper and taps the paper with her pen. She also bites her lips.))

35 Waka *Let’s try.*

36 Mika *Well (.) if we can use conditionals, how about asking her what she would do if she was a host mother?* ((Mika smiles, taps her left arm with her right hand and looks at Sato. Waka nods, and Tami looks at Sato.))

As indicated above, Mika noticed that the target form of the activity was the conditional structure. Therefore, she responded to this intended MF activity as a FF activity, and thus her interactional behaviour was similar to how she behaved during FF activities. In other words,
Mika and her group members mutually created FF discursive practices during the MF activity on Day 2. Although I tried to develop the MF materials so that participants would not notice the target grammar, Mika’s previous experience with the FF activity (e.g., Example 3) right before the MF activity (Examples 4 and 5) seems to have had an impact on her performance on Day 2, as shown in Examples 4 and 5. On the other instructional treatment days, she did not seem to notice the target form during MF activities because she did not mention it at all. Hereafter, I will treat Example 5, which was intended to be a MF activity, as a FF example.

Example 5: MF activity (but unfolded as FF activity for Mika) on Day 2

46  Waka  How about using what Mika said?  (Sato looks at Waka. Sato and Nao lean forward over the desk.)

47  Sato  What did you say?  (Sato looks at Mika, and everybody looks at Mika.)

48  Mika  If I were your host mother... your host mother(.( (Tami, Nao, and Sato look at Mika. Sato nods, and Nao looks serious.)

49  Sato  Before this, we can also ask her whether she is fine or not.  (Sato smiles, points at Waka’s paper with her pen, and looks at Waka. Tami looks at Sato.)

50  Waka  Are you [okay?]  

51  Sato  [Okay?] (3.0)  (Sato looks at Waka and then looks at Waka’s paper.) Then, I think we can move to the next topic. (1.0)  (Sato leans back against the chair.) And then, we can say what Mika has just said.  (Sato and Nao look at Waka’s paper.)

52  Waka  Sure.

53  Mika  If I were you (. ) (Mika grabs her eraser and starts flipping it on her desk.)

54  Sato  If I were (. ) (Tami looks at Sato.)

55  Mika  Your mother (2.0)  (Sato looks at Mika and nods at her.)

56  Waka  How about host mother?

In terms of identity resources in Example 5, Mika was an animator at turns 48, 53, and 55, which seemed to lead her to become an official hearer. In other words, after each turn that Mika
produced, the next speaker (i.e., Sato at turns 49 and 54 and Waka at turn 56) responded to what Mika had said. Also, Mika was a ratified participant at turn 50, where Waka was directly talking to Sato. The most noticeable feature of this interaction was Mika’s role as an author. She became an author two times at turns 46 and 51. At turn 46, Waka suggested using Mika’s idea, and Sato also suggested using Mika’s idea at turn 51. Therefore, similar to the other FF examples, Mika exhibited various identity roles during this “unintended” FF activity.

As can be seen in Example 5, the if-structure and its translation in Japanese (as shown in Italics) appeared frequently as linguistic resources. This is likely due to the fact that Mika had noticed the target grammar form (i.e., conditionals) at the beginning of this activity (see Example 4). Similar to other FF and MF examples, Mika and her group members inserted a vowel every after a consonant, following the Japanese pronunciation system. Furthermore, the /ð/ sound in “mother,” which does not exist in the Japanese pronunciation system, was replaced with /za/, which exists in Japanese. There was one instance of overlapped speech at turns 50 and 51.

The interaction resources were very similar to the other FFI examples (Examples 1 and 3). There were two sets of repair interactions in Example 5. At turn 49, Sato initiated repair about Mika’s idea expressed at turn 48, and Waka repaired it in English. The second set of repair interactions started at turn 55, where Mika self-initiated a repair of her own utterance at turn 53. Two seconds later, Waka repaired it by replacing Mika’s “your mother” (turn 55) with “host mother” (turn 56). Regarding non-linguistic interactional resources, Mika and her group members frequently made eye contact with each other. For example, members were likely to make eye contact after an animator (i.e., a speaker) completed her turn, by looking at the animator (at turns 46, 48, 49, 54, and 55). Also, there was some body movement, such as nodding at the animator, Mika (at turns 48 and 55), Mika’s flipping an eraser while talking, and Sato’s pointing at the paper (at turn 49).

During the MF activities, on the other hand, Mika kept quiet for a long time (e.g., Example 2) or repeated what others said, unless she was called upon. Example 6 shows how Mika repeated others’ utterances during the MF activity.
Example 6: MF Activity on Day 1

117  Nao  *The rent is high.* ((Nao looks at Waka. Tami looks up words in her electric dictionary.))

118  Sato  Many (.) many bill. ((Sato smiles, looks at Waka and leans forward over the desk. Tami looks up words in her electric dictionary.))

119  Waka  Many bill. Many [high-] ((Waka looks at Sato. Tami looks up words in her electric dictionary. Mika starts looking up words in her electric dictionary. Sato glanced at Mika.))

120  Sato  [Many high] (.) high ((Sato smiles and looks at Waka. Tami looks at Waka’s paper and looks up words in her dictionary. Mika also looks up words in her dictionary. ))

121  Waka  *How about* tall? [Tall-] ((Mika and Tami look up words in their electric dictionaries. ))

122  Nao  [Many tall]. ((Nao looks at Waka’s paper. Mika and Tami look up words in their electric dictionaries. ))

123  Sato  Tall bill. ((Sato looks at Waka’s paper. Mika and Tami look up words in their electric dictionaries.))

124  Waka  *<Tall, right?>* ((Sato nods.))

125  Sato  Bill? *Is* bill okay? ((Sato looks at Waka. Tami puts her arms on her lap and looks at her dictionary. ))

126  Waka  *<Building.>* ((Sato and Nao look at Waka’s paper.))

127  Mika  *<High building>* ((Sato looks at Waka’s paper. ))

128  Waka  *<High?>*

129  Mika  *<High (.) high building>* ((Tami looks up words in her dictionary. Mika shows her electric dictionary to Waka.))

130  Sato  *But, you know, we also have to write about Takano City, right?* ((Sato looks at Waka’s paper and points it at with her pen.))

In Example 6, Mika was an animator at turns 127 (“high building”) and 129 (“high (. ) high building”). However, both of her turns were the repetitions of what Waka had said at turns 119 (“high”) and 126 (“building”). Therefore, Waka was an original author of Mika’s utterances.
Mika became an official hearer only one time when Waka seemed to directly ask Mika “High?” immediately after Mika’s turn at 127. In the other turns, Mika remained silent and played a role as a ratified participant without speaking or being talked to.

Similar to the linguistic resources available in other FF and MF examples (Examples 2, 3, and 5), Mika and her group members constantly spoke English using Japanese pronunciation by inserting a vowel after every consonant. Different from the FF examples, vocabulary words, such as “many,” “high/tall,” and “bill/building”29 were frequently used during this MF activity. The frequent use of the same words and repetition indicates that the participants were focused on meaning and tried to select appropriate words to express meaning. In addition, there were two overlapped turns; the first was at turns 119 and 120, and the second was at turns 121 and 122. Finally, after Waka’s rapid utterance, indicate by < > (see Appendix J for transcription conventions), the participants speeded up their utterances from turn 126 to turn 129.

In terms of interactional resources, there were two repair episodes. At turn 121, Waka initiated repair of Sato’s use of “high” to describe a building height and repaired it by replacing “high” with “tall.” The second repair episode was at turn 125, where Sato self-initiated her own use of “bill” at turn 123. Then, Waka repaired it by providing an appropriate word, “building” at turn 126. Regarding non-linguistic interactional resources, Mika did not receive any eye contact with anybody, except for Sato’s glance at her when Mika started looking up words in her electric dictionary again at turn 119. Even after Mika’s turn at 127, nobody looked at her, which might have motivated her to be physically noticeable by showing her dictionary to Waka at turn 129. However, it seems that she failed to be an official hearer because Sato changed the topic at the next turn (i.e., turn 130). Interestingly, the use of dictionaries frequently happened during this MF activity. Both Tami and Mika devoted most of their time to looking up words in their electronic dictionaries during this activity—another indicator of the participants’ focus on meaning.

As the description of the discursive practices during this MF activity shows, Mika was likely to remain silent or repeat what others had said. In other words, different from the FF activities, where Mika had many creative ideas about story lines based on the target grammar

---

29 In Japanese, “building” is pronounced as /bi:ru/. In Example 6, I spelled it as “bill” because it sounds a little like the English word, “bill.”
form, she did not express new, creative ideas in this MF activity in Example 6. During one of the interviews, she commented on this aspect of her behaviour in MF activities:

Excerpt 10:

When I was not provided with any particular grammar form, my mind went blank. I could not say anything.

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

In sum, the results indicate that grammar was not only a communication navigator for Mika but also a stimulus to invest in communication. In other words, grammar provided her with opportunities to obtain and express creative ideas for the topic of the communication activity. Thus, this role of grammar as a communication stimulus seemed to give Mika access to becoming an animator, author, and official hearer during communication. Evidently, these roles also allowed Mika to make eye contact with others and confirm their engagement with the interaction through their body movement (e.g., nodding).

In the next section, I present another role of grammar that influenced Mika’s investment in L2 communication.

5.5.3. Grammar as Feedback Provider in L2

“I felt my opinions were accepted more when we were told to use certain grammar than when we were not told to do so.”

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

“We can understand each other in Japanese.”

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

Example 7 shows how most of Mika’s utterances in English received responses or feedback in English from her interlocutors.

Example 7: FF Activity on Day 4

60  Mika  That? Is this fine? That I need to.
61  Waka  That
Mika was an animator at turns 60, 63, and 65. Following Mika’s first turn, Waka and Nao repeated what Mika had said at turn 60. Therefore, it is possible that Mika was an author for Waka and Nao when they repeated Mika’s words at turns 61 and 62. In Example 7, the interactions were mostly between Mika and Waka. Therefore, Mika was an official hearer when Waka repeated Mika’s words at turns 61 and 64 and when Waka directly asked Mika a question at turn 66. In other words, Mika always became an official hearer after she completed her turn as an animator. Therefore, similar to other FF examples (i.e., Examples 1, 3, and 5), Mika experienced a variety of identity roles during this FF activity.

Regarding the linguistic resources in Example 7, “that” was used frequently by Mika and her interlocutors at the beginning of the interactions. “That” was a part of the “it-that” structure, which was the target form of the lesson. There were no overlapped turns in Example 7. Similar to other FF and MF examples (Examples 2, 3, 5, and 6), Mika and her interlocutors constantly used the Japanese pronunciation systems when they spoke in English, by inserting a vowel after every consonant. In addition, Mika and Waka replaced /v/ and /r/ phonemes in “several” with Japanese phonemes of /b/ and /ɻ/, respectively.

Unfortunately, during this interaction episode, I could only see Nao’s face, Sato’s hands, Mika’s hands and arms, and Waka’s hands and arms due to the angle of my camera. With very limited information about Mika’s non-linguistic interactional resources, I was only able to see Mika’s body movement, such as showing her card to Waka and pointing at the card with her left hand. Nao glanced at Mika at turns 62 and 65, but it was impossible to confirm whether Nao made eye contact with her or to examine whether Mika made eye contact with others. Although
it was difficult to describe non-linguistic interactional resources, I was able to search for repairs. There was one repair at turn 60, where Mika self-initiated a repair by completing the phrase, “that I need to.” One of the noticeable features in this example is that Mika’s utterances in English received feedback or responses also in English from her interlocutors (e.g., turns 61, 62, and 64). Regarding her general impression about FF activities, she said,

Excerpt 11:
I felt my opinions were accepted more when we were told to use certain grammar than when we were not told to do so.  
(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

On the other hand, during MF activities, Mika rarely received responses not only in English but also in Japanese, as shown in Example 8.

Example 8: MF Activity on Day 4

62 Tami (Reading aloud a text) <What is your dream? What do you want to be in the [future]?> (Sato looks at Tami and writes. Nao looks at Tami, Mika, and Sato’s paper.)

63 Mika [My dream] is English teacher. Can I tell my dream? (Nao looks at Waka.)

64 Sato Nao, could you ask Mika the next question? (Sato looks at the paper and points at the paper. Nao leans forward over the desk, holding her towel.)

65 Nao (Reading aloud a text) <What do you find (. . .) attractive about <your dream>? (Nao looks at Mika and Sato’s paper.)

66 Mika I (. . .) I like children. (Nao glanced at Mika and then looks at Sato’s paper.)

67 Nao Sato, may I use your dictionary? (Nao puts her towel on her laps, stretches her arm to Sato’s electric dictionary and opens it.)

68 Sato Sure. Waka, could you read the next question? (Sato shows the paper to Waka and points at a sentence. Nao switches on the electric dictionary and starts typing.)

69 Waka (Reading aloud a text) What do you think important to make the dream come true? (Nao looks up words in the electric dictionary.)
Sato: What do you have to do to make your dream come true? ((Sato looks at Mika. Nao looks up words in the electric dictionary.))

Mika: Study English very hard. Right? ((Sato writes. Nao looks up words in the electric dictionary.))

Waka: Well... ((Sato writes. Nao looks up words in the electric dictionary.))

Tami: Super easy. ((Sato writes. Nao looks up words in the electric dictionary.))

Waka: All of my answers were “nothing” and “I don’t know.” You know, I am a girl of the new generation. ((Sato writes. Nao looks up words in the electric dictionary.))

In Example 8, Mika was an official hearer when she was asked questions by Tami at turn 62, by Nao at turn 65, Waka at turn 69 and Sato at turn 70. Thus, when she answered the questions, she was an animator at turns 63, 66, and 71. In this MF activity, Mika produced more language than in other FF or MF activities due to the characteristics of the question-answer task. Interestingly, however, she never became an official hearer after her turn. Instead, she seemed to be positioned as a ratified participant. For example, following Mika’s utterance at turn 63 (“My dream is English teacher”), Sato requested Nao to ask the next question at turn 64 without responding to Mika’s utterance. Similarly, after Mika’s next utterance at turn 66 (“I like children”), there was silence for about 5 seconds and Nao asked Sato if she could use Sato’s electric dictionary at turn 67. Again, Mika did not receive any feedback or response to what she had said. Finally, after Mika said “Study English very hard” at turn 71, Waka and Tami talked to each other at turns 72 and 73, while Sato and Nao focused on other things—writing sentences and looking up words in the dictionary, respectively. Without any response or reference to what Mika had said, she failed to become an official hearer or an author. Therefore, after her status as an animator, she was positioned to be a ratified participant in this MF activity.

Similar to other MF examples (i.e., Examples 2 and 6), this MF example presented frequent use of vocabulary words, such as “dream,” “English”, as well as “what” in the question sentences, which were read aloud from a text. The use of these suggests that Mika and her group members were focused more on meaning rather than form. There was one overlap at

---

30 One of the teachers, Mr. Matsuda, showed Mika and her group members how to complete the task, and they completed the question and answer task following his instructions.
turns 62 and 63 and seven pauses ranging from 2 to 6 seconds. Regarding speed of utterances and pronunciation, this example started with Tami’s question sentences, which were read aloud in English fluently. Following Tami’s turn, Mika and the other participants spoke English relatively faster without inserting a vowel after every consonant. The same phenomenon was observed in Example 1 (a FF activity on Day 1). I will discuss this later.

In terms of the interactional resources, there was no repair in Example 8. Again, due to the angle of the camera, I could only see Sato and Nao’s faces during the interactions in this example. Although Nao and Sato looked at Mika when they asked her questions, Mika rarely received any eye contact from them when she was speaking or completed her turn, except for Nao’s quick glance at Mika at turn 66. Instead, after Mika’s turn, her group members started either talking to another member other than Mika (e.g., turns 64, 67, and 72), looking at the paper (e.g., turns 64 and 66), looking up words in a dictionary (e.g., turns 71 and 72), or writing sentences (e.g., turns 71 and 72). Therefore, Mika did not receive verbal feedback (regardless of L1 or L2) or non-linguistic interactional feedback (e.g., eye contact) from others during this MF activity. Even though she did not receive responses or feedback to her utterances in Example 8, Mika did not seem to be disappointed about it as expressed in her stimulated recalls on this interaction:

Excerpt 12:

I was able to answer the questions smoothly.

(Mika, Stimulated Recalls, MF Activity on Day 4)

In fact, as her interview comment below indicates, Mika did not seem to expect any response or feedback from others when she said something in English because she knew that English was not the main language for communication among her peers:

Excerpt 13:

We can understand each other in Japanese. So, I do not feel like trying hard to communicate in English with my Japanese classmates. I usually give up communicating in English when I cannot make myself understood.

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)
In summary, the above three sections showed that (a) grammar was a navigator for Mika to join conversations in English, (b) grammar stimulated Mika to create stories and provide new information to peers, and (c) grammar provided Mika with opportunities to receive responses or feedback in English from her peers. With these three characteristics of grammar, Mika created discursive practices, using identity, linguistic and interactional resources during FF activities. In other words, by utilizing such resources, Mika seemed to invest in L2 communication during FF activities, where grammar, as well as meaning, was the focus during communication. I will discuss these results after presenting Mika’s views on grammar and communication in the next section.

5.5.4. Mika’s Views on Grammar and Communication

This section describes the reasons why Mika spoke little English overall, by referring to her views on grammar and communication obtained during the interviews. At the end of Example 8 (a meaning focused activity on Day 4), one of the members of Mika’s group (i.e. Waka) said,

All of my answers were “nothing” and “I don’t know.” You know, I am a girl of the new generation.

(see Example 8, Turn 74)

This was uttered after Mika described her dream in English: “My dream is English teacher” (see Example 8, Turn 63) and “Study English hard” (see Example 8, Turn 71). Mika expressed her feelings about this interaction during the follow-up interview saying:

Excerpt 14:

I am jealous of Waka because she pretends to be an unmotivated student but she is actually smart. I have a dream, and I am trying very hard. But I cannot do things well. So, I am jealous of her. She says that she is not trying hard because she does not have a dream. But actually, she can do things very well.

(Mika, Follow-up, May 2008)
During this follow-up interview, Mika was referring to the interactions between Waka and other group members shown in Example 9 below.

Example 9: MF Activity on Day 4

49  Sato  ((Reading aloud a text)) What (1.0) is (.) your (.) dream? ((Sato and Nao look at Waka’s paper. Sato and Nao crossed their arms on their desks.))

50  Waka  Nothing. (1.0)

51  Sato  Nothing? ((Sato looks confused and half-smiles.))

52  Waka  Nothing. (2.0)

53  Sato  (Reading aloud a text) What do you= ((Sato looks at Waka’s paper.))

54  Waka  = I don’t know.=((Waka giggles.))

55  Sato  =((Reading aloud a text)) want to be:: (5.0) Nao, <can you ask her the next question> ? ((Sato moves her face up.))

56  Nao  ((Reading aloud a text)) What do you (. ) find (. ) attractive (. ) about your dream? ((Nao glanced at Waka.))

57  Waka  I don’t know. (1.0) I don’t know. (7.0)

As shown in Example 9, Waka’s answers were mainly “nothing” and “I don’t know.” When I asked Mika why she felt jealous of a person who pretended to be unmotivated and was actually smart. Mika’s answer was as follows:

Excerpt 15:

Waka always says that she does not like studying, but she always gets the highest mark on the test. She is the best student. The other day, when she was relaxing, I approached her, saying, “I don’t understand this question.” Then, she answered the question very easily. She is amazing. I think she is very cool because she does not show that she is trying hard. Similarly, if a person does not speak English at all but actually can speak it very fluently, the person is so cool.

(Mika, Interview, December 2008)
Although this comment is not directly related to the FF or MF activities, this may help to explain why Mika rarely spoke in English during the treatment lessons or other English lessons that I observed; she thought it “cool” that a person did not show his/her ability to others. This image of hiding one’s ability appeared to be related to another cool image of English speakers. She often used the expression, “cool,” during interviews to describe the image of English speakers: native speakers of English, her classmates who speak English fluently, and English teachers whose pronunciation was like native speakers. In one of the interviews, she told me how much she admired Fumi, one of her classmates who had lived in the U.S. for a year. Fumi looked like a different person to Mika when Fumi was speaking in Japanese with Mika and when Fumi was speaking in English during the class. Mika described her feeling with the following sentence, “Then, I often wonder which is true Fumi.” During the interview, Mika said that she could tell that Fumi had learned English not only by studying, but also by living in the U.S. Mika added that she could feel “American stuff” when listening to Fumi’s English. In the same interview, Mika contrasted speaking/pronunciation with grammar as follows:

Excerpt 16:

I have never thought grammar is cool. Everybody learns grammar, and I am learning grammar, too. I know that I will be able to use grammar if I study it hard. But pronunciation...I would be happy if someone told me that my pronunciation got better. Grammar and pronunciation are different. If you can use grammar, that is good. It is fine. But grammar is not as cool as pronunciation. Pronunciation shows that you are familiar with English environment. [...] Everybody can use grammar if they think hard and study hard. If you know grammar well, I will just think “Oh, you are studying hard.” But if you have good pronunciation, I will think you are very cool. [...] Being able to speak English fluently and having good pronunciation can show how much you are familiar (with English and English culture).

(Mika, Interview, December 2008)

Thus, Mika seemed to think it was “cool” to have a gap between how a person behaved (e.g., pretending to be unmotivated and hiding skills) and his or her actual ability (e.g. being the
best student or having fluent English skills because of living abroad). At the same time, however, Mika did not want to behave like a fluent English speaker herself saying that: “I am always worried what people would think of me. If I say something in English as if I am a good English speaker and this actually sounds funny, it will be very embarrassing” Therefore, she used grammar, which was unrelated to a “cool image” as a tool for communication. In other words, she invested in L2 communication for the sake of learning grammar rather than for the purpose of communication practice to sound like or become a fluent English speaker. In the brief discussion section below, I will discuss how Mika’s view on grammar and her behaviours during FF and MF activities explain Mika’s investment in L2 communication and learning, in relation to different types of resources available during FF activities and MF activities.

5.5.5. Summary of Discursive Practices during FF and MF Activities: Mika’s Case

As shown in the previous section, there were identity, linguistic and interactional resources available for Mika in the discursive practices of FF activities and MF activities. Table 24 presents a summary of these resources for each example. An examination of the similarities and differences in the discursive practices between FF and MF activities will be discussed in the following sections.

---

31 Examples 4 and 9 were not included in this table because I did not present these two examples to show the characteristics of discursive practices during FF or MF activities. Rather, I showed Example 4 to present Mika’s noticing the form during the MF activity, while I showed Example 9 to present Mika’s views on learning grammar.
Table 24

*Mika’s Identity, Linguistic and Interactional Resources in FF and MF Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. 1</td>
<td>Ex. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animator</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official hearer</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratified participant</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary words</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese pronunciation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Japanese</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>∆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body movement</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Only Mika’s identity resources were presented.
b. This activity was intended to be MF. However, Mika noticed the target form at the beginning of the activity. Therefore, this activity is considered to be form-focused in this study.
c. Eye contact with Mika is presented by √, while eye contact among others is presented by ∆.

5.5.5.1. Identity Resources

As Table 24 shows, Mika exhibited a variety of identities during the FF activities, while she did not always experience the roles of animator or official hearer and remained as a ratified
participant during the MF activities. The most noticeable difference in identity resources between FF and MF activities might be that Mika did not become an author at all in the MF examples, whereas she became an author in all FF examples. The reasons why Mika became an author during FF activities and did not become an author during MF activities appears to be related to linguistic resources available in FF activities and MF activities.

5.5.5.2. Linguistic Resources

As shown in Table 24, there were some similarities in the linguistic resources between FF and MF activities. For example, Mika and her peers frequently used Japanese in both FF and MF activities. Furthermore, regardless of instructional type, they constantly pronounced English words using Japanese pronunciation by inserting a vowel after a consonant and replacing English phonemes with Japanese ones (e.g., replacing /v/ with /b/), except for two occasions shown in Examples 1 (a FF activity on Day 1) and 8 (a MF activity on Day 4). In these examples, Mika and her peers sometimes spoke English without Japanese pronunciation. A close examination of these examples showed that these utterances in English immediately followed Tami’s turns. As described in the Methods chapter, Tami had lived in Australia for three years when she was an elementary school student, and she was a fluent English speaker. It seems possible that Tami’s fluent speech influenced the speech of Mika and her peers. In fact, Mika commented on how she was influenced by how others spoke:

Excerpt 17:

When I was in Australia (on a school trip), I was a different person. You might wonder, “Who are you?” I responded with big reactions there.

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

Excerpt 18:

I easily get influenced by others. [...] Because I thought their reactions were really big in Australia, I started reacting a lot, too.

---

32 When I piloted the materials with EAP students at a Canadian university, they almost never interacted in Japanese during the treatment lessons. Thus, I was surprised when I found that Mika and her classmates frequently spoke in Japanese during the treatment sessions.
There were also some differences in linguistic resources between FF and MF activities. As Table 24 shows, grammatical structures were the main resources in FF activities, while vocabulary words were the main resources in MF activities. Also, there seemed to be more overlapping turns and faster interactions during MF activities than FF activities, as shown in Table 24. Mika commented on her difficulty joining rapid and exciting interactions:

Excerpt 19:
I cannot interrupt conversations when everybody is speaking fast.

(Mika, Interview, December 2007)

Excerpt 20:
I cannot join a conversation where everybody is excited.

(Mika, Interview, June 2008)

The overlapped and rapid interactions during MF activities might not have provided opportunities for Mika to become an animator or an official hearer, resulting in her role as a ratified participant. Linguistic resources in FF activities, on the other hand, seemed to have helped Mika to invest in L2 communication. In the next section, I will describe how linguistic and identity resources affected the characteristics of interactional resources during FF and MF activities.

5.5.5.3. Interactional Resources

As Table 24 shows, the similarities in interactional resources between FF and MF activities are body movements and eye contact. That is, similar types of body movement and a great deal of eye contact were observed during both FF and MF activities. It seemed that Mika and her peers nodded, pointed at the handout, leaned forward over the desk or leaned back against the chair in both FF and MF activities. Similarly, they were likely to make eye contact or cast a glance at others during FF and MF activities. However, a close examination of eye contact showed a slight difference in timing between FF and MF activities. I explored when Mika received eye contact from others, specifically focusing on two time points: during her turn and
immediately after her turn. It turned out that Mika was likely to receive eye contact or a glance from others during or immediately after her turn in FF activities (e.g., Examples 1, 5, and 7), while she rarely received eye contact during or after her turn in MF activities. She only received a quick glance from Nao during the MF activity in Example 8. Receiving eye contact or a glance from others during and after her turn in FF activities might support what Mika said during the interview: “I felt my opinions were accepted more when we were told to use certain grammar than when we were not told to do so” (see Excerpt 11).

In addition to the difference in the timing of eye contact, there were differences in repair, gesture, laughter, and the use of dictionaries between FF and MF activities as shown in Table 24. While repair happened in all FF examples, it only happened in one of the MF examples (i.e., Example 6). Further examination of repair showed more differences in characteristics of the repair between FF and MF activities. The repairs in MF activities (i.e., Example 6) were about choice of vocabulary words, such as high or tall to describe a building. On the other hand, repairs in FF activities were mostly about topic-related ideas of the activities (i.e., Examples 1, 3, and 5), except for one repair about grammar in Example 7. Through negotiating and repairing topic-related ideas, Mika and her peers used target grammar forms either in English or its translation in Japanese (see Examples 3 and 5). As Mika expressed in her interview, grammar might have given her and her peers opportunities to be creative and to exchange various ideas among them.

Another difference in interactional resources was the use of gestures; gestures were used only during FF activities (i.e., Examples 1 and 3). These gestures seemed to be used to add visual images for a verb, such as “see” in Example 1 and for directions, such as “from” in Example 3. Gestures were also used to give rhythm to speech. For example, Sato rhythmically moved her hand to her speech in Example 3. Also, laughter occurred only in one of the FF examples, Example 1, and it did not occur in the MF examples.

One of the interactional resources frequently observed only in the MF examples was the use of dictionaries. In Example 6 (a MF activity on Day 1), Mika and Tami devoted most of their time to looking up words in their electronic dictionaries and rarely joined the conversation or looked at other peers. Similarly, in Example 8 (a MF activity on Day 4), Nao did not speak or look at her peers after she started looking up words in the electronic dictionary, even when Mika, who was sitting right in front of her, was speaking. The use of dictionaries during MF activities is an indication that the participants were focused on the meanings of the words. It is important
to remember that the participants were likely to use vocabulary words as their linguistic resources during MF activities and also were likely to repair vocabulary words rather than grammar or content during MF activities. In the next section, I will discuss how these differences in discursive practices between FF and MF activities may explain Mika’s investment in L2 communication.

5.5.5.4. Mika’s Investment in L2 Communication and Discursive Practices of FF and MF Activities

As reported above, Mika seemed to exhibit different discursive practices during FF and MF activities. That is, different identity, linguistic, and interactional resources were available to Mika during FF and MF activities. The discursive practices of FF activities with these three resources for Mika are presented in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Mika’s Discursive Practices in FF Activities

As shown in Figure 7, when Mika was instructed to focus on grammar during communication (i.e., FF activities), Mika found that grammar navigated her to talk about
relevant topics. She also felt that grammar stimulated her to be creative and to get many ideas about the relevant topics. For example, as she said during the interview, when she was told to use conditionals, she could think of many story lines using the conditional structures. She then shared these ideas with her peers as an animator, which would allow Mika to receive both linguistic and non-linguistic interactional feedback from others: repair and eye contact, respectively. Receiving such feedback, Mika had opportunities to become an official hearer and sometimes even an author. Furthermore, repair was mostly on topic-related content, which was often expressed with the target grammar forms. Again, grammar would navigate and stimulate communication, which would then provide Mika with more opportunities to receive feedback. The use of gesture might be an indicator of her and her peers’ engagement with the interactions, where these three resources were meaningfully interrelated. Therefore, along with her peers, Mika invested in L2 communication using linguistic, identity and interactional resources. For Mika, grammar was the key to effectively utilize these three resources for her investment.

The discursive practices of MF activities for Mika are presented in Figure 8. As Figure 8 shows, vocabulary items were part of the linguistic resources in the MF activities. However, they did not seem to navigate Mika to become an animator or to stimulate her to think of a variety of story lines, as grammar did. Instead, the focus on vocabulary was likely to result in frequent use of dictionaries to search for words and word meanings. The use of dictionaries was not likely to encourage Mika and her peers to make eye contact with each other, to use gestures to visualize utterances, or to provide feedback to each other. Therefore, Mika tended to remain silent, accepting the role of ratified participant. This role as a ratified participant seemed to be related to the other linguistic resources of MF activities: overlapping of speech and speed. Commenting on the difficulty of interrupting rapid and overlapping speech, Mika participated less and remained as a ratified participant during MF activities.

Although Mika tended to be a ratified participant mainly during MF activities, she did sometimes communicate during MF activities. As discussed above and presented in Figure 8, however, the role of animator did not lead to eye contact or to repair in the MF examples. Thus, instead of becoming an official hearer or author after her turn, Mika tended to be placed as a ratified participant during MF activities. This combination of linguistic, identity, and interactional resources did not seem to help Mika to invest in L2 communication during MF activities.
A comparison of the discursive practices in the FF and MF activities (see Figures 7 and 8) highlights the role of grammar as a navigator, stimulus, and feedback provider. In other words, grammar seemed to bridge linguistic, identity, and interactional resources during FF activities and encouraged Mika to invest in L2 communication by using these three resources. Without grammar, on the other hand, these three resources (i.e., linguistic, identity, and interactional resources) were likely to be less connected, leaving Mika to remain as a ratified participant. One of the reasons that grammar played a key role in Mika’s investment in L2 communication might be that Mika did not think grammar was “cool” and did not have to worry about what others would think of her when she tried to use grammar in communication. As discussed in the previous section, Mika did not want to look “cool” by speaking fluent English because it would be embarrassing for her to pretend to be a fluent English speaker.
5.6. Summary of Mika’s Case Study

Mika had a strong desire to learn English and to become a fluent English speaker based on the information provided in her diaries, interviews, and questionnaires. However, she did not want to sound like a fluent speaker in front of her Japanese peers. Therefore, she rarely communicated in English during the instructional treatment sessions and during my classroom observations. A close examination of discursive practices of FF and MF activities and her self-report data revealed that grammar served as a navigator, a stimulus, and a feedback provider for Mika. In other words, when she was told to use a certain grammatical form, she felt more secure about the topic she would discuss in English, become more creative in thinking about different story lines, and was able to receive feedback from her peers. Thus, grammar appears to have served as the bridge, connecting linguistic, identity, and interactional resources of discursive practices and helped Mika to further invest in L2 communication during FF activities. Therefore, even though she did not want to communicate in English solely for the purpose of communication practice with Japanese peers in order to become a fluent English speaker, she invested in L2 communication using grammar as a tool to participate more comfortably in the conversation.
Chapter 6: Analyses and Results of Case Study of Aiko

In this chapter, I present the analyses and results of the second case study. I chose Aiko because she appeared to be very different from Mika, the first case study. For example, while Mika talked the least in English during the instructional treatment lessons and frequently talked about the relationship between grammar and communication during the interview, Aiko spoke in English the most and rarely mentioned the relationship between grammar and communication. In this second case study I examine whether the different patterns of discursive practices during FF and MF activities that Mika and her group members mutually created are applicable to Aiko, who presented different personality and interactional behaviours from Mika. In the following sections, I first present Aiko’s background information, followed by the results of her motivation questionnaire responses, interaction analysis, and discursive practice analysis during FF and MF activities.

6.1. Aiko

Aiko is from one of the largest junior high schools in Takano City. Compared to Tokyo or Osaka, Takano City is a smaller city and sometimes regarded as the countryside. However, within Takano City, the junior high school is located near a downtown area and students from the junior high school are more like city girls or boys. At the high school, where I conducted this study, Aiko also looked like a “city girl” and always hung out with girls who shared similar characteristics, such as being confident, fashionable, and humorous, as well as engaged in smooth, rhythmical, loud and fast conversations with constant laughter. As she told me during the interview, she enjoyed being friends with the “gals” rather than with quiet girls. Whenever I visited her classroom during recess, she was always surrounded by five or six girls, forming the biggest and loudest group in the classroom. It was not hard to find Aiko and her friends because they all had beautifully taken care of long and wavy or straight hair and had many colourful accessories (e.g., small-bags for the Bible, pen cases, hair pins, and unique stationeries). Even

---

33 As indicated in the previous chapters, all of the participants’ names are pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.
34 Similarly, as indicated in the previous chapters, the name of the city, where this study was conducted, was a pseudonym to protect the anonymity of the high school.
35 “Gals” in Japanese means “girls in their early teens who act out and wear flashy clothes” (Iwamura & Smillie, n.d.).
from the small glass window on the entrance door to the classroom, I was able to recognize them easily.

Aiko was very popular among her classmates, always making jokes and making others laugh. She told me during the interview that she had taken pictures, called “purikura,”36 with almost all of her classmates and had exchanged cellphone email addresses with all of her classmates, both of which were symbols of friendship among her peers. Having many friends, she usually sat in the center of her friends during the recess and led conversations, making jokes, clapping hands, and laughing. Her active talk and humorous jokes continued even during class. For example, at the written stimulated recall sessions on the treatment lessons, three out of four group work members commented on Aiko’s utterances and behaviours, such as “Aiko is so funny!” (Keiko’s stimulated recall on Day 1) and “You are so funny, Aiko (laugh)” (Emi’s stimulated recall on Day 4). She was also well known among her peers and teachers as a person who loved eating. While most of her classmates brought extremely small lunch boxes, sometimes only with cherry tomatoes and rice, she would eat extra large curry and rice at a school cafeteria.

She was not only popular among her peers, but also among her teachers and her host family members in Australia. As far as I could determine, she was the only student who was called by her nickname by teachers. The teachers also made jokes with Aiko during the class, which often activated the classroom atmosphere with a cheerful laugh. Aiko also seemed to have a good time with her host family in Australia, while some of her peers expressed difficulty talking with their host families. As she said during the interview and wrote in her diary, she experienced “real English study”37 (Aiko’s diary entry on March 3, 2008) by talking with her host father. Her host father taught Aiko Australian English pronunciation and checked her writing every day during her stay in Australia. Among nine participants who showed me the diaries of the school trip to Australia, only Aiko’s diary had spelling and grammar corrections made by a host family member. In addition, when Aiko wrote in her diary that she had learned English from her host father, her host father wrote “Yeah!!” in the margin, which seems to show that he also acted humorously around Aiko.

36 Purikura, “print club (purinto kurabu in Japanese),” is a sticker sheet of small photos, which was popular among teenagers at the time of the data collection in Japan. Almost all of my participants put many purikura stickers on their cellphones, notebooks, and pen cases.
37 In her diary, it was originally written as “real study English.”
It was not surprising when I heard that Aiko wanted to be a TV announcer in the future because, as she expressed in her interviews and diary entries, she liked talking and standing out. She believed English was essential for an announcer to be promoted, as she said in the interview:

Excerpt 21:
Announcers are easily promoted if they can speak English. Even if you are not beautiful, you will get promoted to interview Hollywood stars if you can speak English. I know an announcer who is not smart or a graduate from a famous university, but she interviewed Brad Pitt only after two years of her career. You know, that’s how people get promoted if they can speak English.\(^{38}\)

(Aiko, Interview June, 2008)

With this dream to become a TV announcer who can speak English, she was very happy when she was accepted to the English program at this high school. Her strong motivation to study English and to improve her English speaking skills was evident in her diaries. For example, she frequently wrote that she should study English hard, she wanted to speak English fluently like native English speakers, and she wanted to pronounce English words like native English speakers. She also mentioned during the interview that being able to speak English was cool. Interestingly, she observed that people were likely to consider a person to be smart if the person could speak English, even if he or she was not good at studying other subjects. Throughout the interviews, she frequently used the expressions, such as “cool,” “smart,” and “promotion” in relation to speaking English, and she showed a great interest in learning English.

In spite of her motivation to study and to become a fluent speaker of English, she often said during the interview that she did not want to speak English in front of her Japanese classmates. According to her interview responses, she thought that people in Japan would be impressed by a perfect and fluent English speaker. At the same time, she also thought that people might wonder, “What is she talking about?” when they heard someone speaking English, which was not perfect. She further expressed her ambiguous feelings about speaking English as follows:

\(^{38}\) All of the interviews, stimulated recalls, and follow-up interviews were conducted in Japanese. I transcribed them in and translated them into English.
Excerpt 22:

I try to speak as little English as possible in class. […] Of course, I want to speak English fluently and want to pronounce English like a native English speaker. But it is embarrassing if I speak English as if I were a native speaker but I am actually making mistakes and pronouncing wrongly. Then, speaking katakana English is safer.

(Aiko, Interview, December 2008)

Once I asked her when she practiced speaking English if she did not want to speak English in front of her peers. Her answer was, “I practice English pronunciation at home secretly.” This made me wonder whether it would ever be possible to create an atmosphere among Japanese high school students, where they could practice speaking English with less embarrassment. Based on my teaching experience at Japanese high schools, I wondered if FF instruction would help to create a ‘safer’ context for students to speak English more comfortably. As with the first case study, the specific questions I explored with Aiko were: (a) how many English turns did she produce during FF activities and MF activities, (b) what did she think about FF and MF activities in terms of L2 communication, and (c) how did she invest in L2 communication during FF and MF activities. In the following sections, I present the results of Aiko’s motivation questionnaire, her classroom interaction patterns during FF and MF activities, and her discursive practices during FF and MF activities.

6.2. Aiko’s Questionnaire Results

As indicated in Chapter 3, the questionnaire was developed by Yashima (2002), consisting of five sections: background information, motivation, attitude toward the international community, L2 communication confidence, and willingness to communicate. The results of the background information showed that Aiko had never been abroad except for her school trip to Australia, had studied English for three years when she was an elementary school student, and had studied English for three years outside the school when she was a junior high school student.

39 Katakana English is Japanese English, which usually has a vowel after each consonant (Jenkins, 2007; Tamura, 2010).
Table 25 shows the results of Aiko’s responses to the questionnaire, along with the mean scores of all participants (n=21, including Aiko). As described in Chapter 4 the motivation and attitude sections were measured on a 7-point Likert scale with 1 meaning absolutely disagree and 7 meaning absolutely agree. The communicative confidence section, which consists of the two constructs of communication anxiety and perceived communication competence, was measured on a percentage scale. Zero indicated “never feel nervous” and “completely incompetent” respectively, while 100 indicated “always feel nervous” and “completely competent” respectively. In the willingness to communicate section, the participants were also asked to indicate their tendency to communicate in English on a 0-100 percentage scale.

Table 25  
**Results of Aiko’s Responses to Questionnaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Aiko</th>
<th>Class Mean (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Learn English</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward the International Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Friendship Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup Approach-Avoidance Tendency</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in International Occupation or Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication Confidence in L2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>44.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Communicative Competence in L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>43.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to Communicate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>46.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* On a 1-7 scale for the motivation and attitude sections (1 = absolutely disagree, 7 = absolutely agree). On a 0-100 scale for the confidence section (0 = “never” or “completely incompetent,” 1 = “always” or “completely competent.” On a 0-100 scale for the willingness section (0 = never, 1 = always).

As shown in Table 25, Aiko was not as motivated to study English as other students, but she had a greater desire to learn English than the average. Also, she had more positive attitudes
toward the international community than the class mean. Interestingly, she seldom felt anxious about communicating in English but did not feel like communicating in English very often nor did she feel competent in the L2. In the next section, I present the results of the number of turns and types of interactional patterns that Aiko produced in English during FF and MF activities.

6.3. Aiko’s Classroom Interactions: Results of Turn Analysis

I randomly assigned Aiko to Group A along with four other focal participants: Chika, Emi, Hana, and Keiko. As noted in Chapter 3, Hana could not attend Day 3, and Junko joined Group A for Hana on Day 3. Therefore, Junko’s utterances were included in the analysis as part of Group A. Over the four treatment lesson days (i.e., four FF activities and four MF activities), Group A produced a total of 999 turns which were uttered in English, in Japanese, or in a mixture of English and Japanese. Out of these 999 turns, 388 included at least one English word. Table 26 presents the number of turns produced by each participant over the four treatment lesson days.

Table 26
Number of Turns Produced by Each Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aiko</th>
<th>Chika</th>
<th>Emi</th>
<th>Hana (and Junko)</th>
<th>Keiko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>116 (and 32)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Hana was absent from school on Day 3, and Junko joined Aiko’s group for Hana on that day.

As Table 26 shows, Aiko produced the most English turns among the group members, although Hana might have produced the most if she had attended all treatment lessons. The fact that Aiko spoke in English the most was rather surprising, considering her responses in the interview indicating that she tried not to speak English in front of her peers. It is possible that her definition of “speaking English” might include more than simply uttering English words. I will return to this in the discussion chapter.

Figure 9 presents the number of L2 turns (i.e., turns that included at least one English word) produced by Aiko in FF and MF activities. As this figure shows, even though Aiko produced many L2 turns during the FF activity on Day 1, this was not consistent for the other days. Overall, there was little difference in the number of L2 turns in FF and MF activities.
Table 27 shows the types of utterances Aiko produced in her turns during FF and MF activities. As presented in Table 27, there was little difference in Aiko’s patterns of L2 communication between FF and MF activities, except for three categories: initiation, clarification request, and translation request. In other words, Aiko initiated more utterances and requested clarification during FF activities than during MF activities. In addition, she asked for translation more frequently during MF activities than during FF activities, indicating more of a focus on meaning than grammatical forms.

Table 27

Aiko’s Patterns of Communication in L2 English: FF and MF Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Ch. Request</th>
<th>Elab. Request</th>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Reading Aloud</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Translation Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FF</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MF</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following sections, I present the results of the discursive practice analysis. This includes Aiko’s linguistic and non-linguistic behaviours, which are examined in relation to her self-report data derived from interviews, diaries, and stimulated recalls.

6.4. Discursive Practice Analysis

Following the same procedures used in Mika’s case study, I analyzed Aiko’s discursive practices during FF and MF activities. The purpose of this analysis was to investigate how she mutually created discursive practices with her four other group members (i.e., Chika, Emi, Hana, and Keiko) and how she used the discursive practice resources (i.e. identity, linguistic and interactional resources) to invest in L2 communication during FF and MF activities. As discussed in Chapter 2, discursive practice provides information about (a) the linguistic resources available for Aiko during FF and MF activities, (b) the way Aiko used the linguistic resources to obtain identity and interactional resources in these two activities, and (c) the distribution of identity and interactional resources among Aiko and her group members through their use of linguistic resources in the two instructional contexts.

Following the same procedures used in Mika’s case study (see Table 22 in Chapter 5), I coded characteristics of each resource type and narrowed down the number of characteristics of the resources by excluding those characteristics from further analysis if they did not appear in Aiko’s interactions. Thus, similar to Mika’s case study, I focused on (a) participation roles as animator, official hearer, and ratified participants for identity resources, (b) register, including vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, overlapping, and speed for linguistic resources, and (c) repairs and non-linguistic features, such as eye contact, body movement, and gestures, for interactional resources (see Chapter 2 for the definitions of the terms).

As described in Mika’s case study procedures, I extended Young’s (2008, 2009) original definition of “author,” one of the participation roles of identity resources, to include a person whose utterances were repeated by others. I found it was particularly necessary to do so in the analysis of Aiko’s discursive practices because there were many repetitions in Aiko’s interactions and those of her peers. It seemed important to clarify whose utterances were repeated. In addition, when analysing Aiko’s discursive practices, I created a new category for

---

40 As mentioned previously, Hana was absent from school on Day 3. Thus, Junko joined Aiko’s group on Day 3 for Hana.
identity resources: “ratified +” participant. When coding Aiko’s participation roles, I noticed that Aiko often played a hearer’s role which was neither official hearer nor ratified participant. In other words, her peers often talked about, responded to, and commented on Aiko’s utterances in front of her without looking at her or directly talking to her. They did so as if they wanted Aiko to listen to their responses or comments and wanted to include Aiko as a main interlocutor. In such cases, I coded Aiko’s role as a “ratified +” participant to indicate her hearer’s role, which is more than being a ratified participant but not necessarily an official hearer.

6.4.1. Classroom Interactional Data for Aiko’s Case Study

The classroom interactional data were selected from audio and video recorded interactions among Aiko and her peers (i.e., Group A) over the four treatment lesson days, consisting of four FF activities and four MF activities. I selected the data for this chapter, following the same procedures used in Mika’s case study. These data were selected because (a) the interactional segments were selected for discussion in the stimulated recalls, (b) the participants used more English during the segments than usual, or (c) the interactional patterns matched what Aiko reported during interviews or stimulated recalls. The details of this procedure are described in Mika’s case study chapter (see Figure 6 in Chapter 5). Table 28 shows the total number of turns that Aiko and her peers produced during the instructional treatment lessons and the approximate total number of their turns selected for the stimulated recall session.41

41 This is an approximation of the total number of turns selected for the stimulated recall session because it was almost impossible for me to manually play-back the video at the exact onset time of each episode.
Table 28

Number of Turns during Lessons and Number of Turns for Analysis: Aiko’s Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FF Activities</th>
<th>MF Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>SR + (Added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>42 + (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24 + (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23 + (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42 + (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>131 + (58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Each turn was uttered either only in English, only in Japanese, or both in English and Japanese.
b SR + (Added) means the number of turns selected for stimulated recalls and the number of turns that were not selected for stimulated recalls but were added at later stages for further analysis. For example, 42 + (44) means 42 turns were selected for stimulated recalls and 44 turns were added later for analysis.

As Table 28 shows, a total of 999 turns was produced by Aiko and her peers during the treatment lessons. Approximately 40% of the data (365/999 = 0.365) were selected for stimulated recalls or for further analysis at later stages. The data presented in the following sections consist of a total number of 114 turns: 53 from FF activities and 61 from MF activities. Although this represents only slightly more than 10 percent of the entire database (114/999), it is representative of the interactions frequently observed in other parts of the database.

6.5. Results of Discursive Practices of FF and MF Activities

In this section, I present the results of discursive practices during FF and MF activities in relation to Aiko’s self-reported data.

6.5.1. Grammar learning and L2 communication: Discursive practices as a learner of English

“When Japanese people hear perfect English, they would be like, ‘Wow!’ But if it is just sloppy English, they would say like, ‘Huh? What is she talking about?’”

(Aiko, June, 2008)

The above excerpt was from Aiko’s interview responses to my question about her hesitation to speak English in front of her Japanese friends. I asked her this question because she frequently told me during the interviews that she did not want to speak in English in front of her
Japanese peers. I further asked her what she meant by “perfect English” as in the above excerpt, and her answer was “fluent and speedy English with correct pronunciation and accurate grammar” (Aiko’s Interview, June, 2008). In spite of her hesitation, however, she also expressed her strong desire to become a “great speaker” of English with “especially great pronunciation” (Aiko’s Diary, November, 2007) both in the interviews and diary entries. Therefore, her attitudes toward English communication were ambiguous and contradictory. Based on her observations of people’s positive reaction to “perfect” English and negative reaction to “sloppy” English as expressed in the above interview excerpt and her desire to become a great English speaker, it seemed that Aiko did not want to speak English in front of her friends because she knew she would not get the “wow!” reaction from others. In fact one might hypothesize that Aiko might not hesitate to speak English even with her Japanese friends if she was in a situation, where she was acknowledged as a learner and was not expected to impress others by speaking perfect English.

Before presenting Aiko’s interactional behaviors, it is important to note three characteristics of the situations in which Aiko spoke more English than in others as a “road map” for the following sections. When looking at Aiko’s interactions with the four other members of her group, I noticed that Aiko was likely to speak in English (a) when she succeeded in establishing her identity as an English learner, (b) when she was able to share her English learning experience with her peers, or (c) when she tried to construct/formulate English sentences collaboratively with her peers. In the following sections, based on these three themes, I present Aiko’s interactional data from the four instructional treatment days: four FF activities and four MF activities.

6.5.1.1. Talking about grammar: Establishing identity as a learner

Example 10 is from a FF activity on Day 1. This example shows how Aiko used grammar to establish her identity as a learner of English, while producing utterances in English. As with Mika’s case study, I am following Ten Have’s (2007) conversation analysis transcription conventions (see Appendix J) Utterances written in italics represents utterances originally produced in Japanese and translated into English. The number next to the speaker’s name is the number of the turn in the entire interaction of the FF activity on Day 1.
Example 10: FF Activity on Day 1

48 Aiko And beautiful ((Emi glances at Aiko)) more [Tokyo]. ((Aiko puts her head on her right arm and covers her mouth with her right hand. She looks at Emi.))

49 Keiko [Is]

50 Hana Is

51 Aiko It’s more beautiful. ((Aiko looks at Emi. Emi looks at Aiko.))

52 Keiko More.

53 Aiko More beautiful. ((Chika looks at Aiko. Aiko looks at Emi.))

54 Keiko Then, Takano-City has.

55 Hana Water.

56 Aiko Right. Well, ((Emi smiles at Aiko and then laughs)) never mind. When there are three, we have to use more, right? Beautiful, interesting ((Aiko raises her three fingers as pronouncing each syllable)).

57 Emi Important ((Emi nods. Aiko scratches her head)).

In Example 10, Aiko was an animator at turns 48, 51, 42, and 56, all of which included at least one English word. She was also an author because part of her utterance (i.e., “more”) was repeated by herself and Keiko. Due to the angle of the camera, it was impossible to see Hana’s and Keiko’s faces. Thus, it was not clear who they were directly talking to by examining the direction of their faces or eyes. At turn 57, Aiko was an official hearer because Emi was nodding to Aiko’s explanation of a grammar rule at turn 56 and provided another three-syllable word, important.

Regarding linguistic resources, the word “more,” part of the comparative form, was a focus of their interactions and it appeared frequently in Example 10. Most of the interactions were uttered in English, except for Aiko’s explanation of a grammar rule at turn 56.

There were a variety of interactional resources in Example 10. At turn 51, Aiko self-initiated the repair and self-corrected her own grammar mistake of “beautiful more” that she made at turn 48. There was frequent eye contact between Aiko and Emi and Chika. Aiko used gestures to count syllables, and Emi smiled at her, laughed, and nodded in response to Aiko’s utterances. As can be seen, there were many repetitions throughout Example 10.
In Example 10, Aiko established her identity as a learner by making a grammar mistake at turn 48, self-repairing the mistake at turn 51, and explaining the rule at turn 56. It is remarkable that most of the interactions were uttered in English in Example 10. The following two examples also show how she established her identity as a learner and how she led conversations in English.

Example 11: FF Activity on Day 1

65 Keiko Than, cleaner than. *Is cleaner comparative?* ((Aiko yawns, covers her mouth with her right hand, and scratches her head. Keiko looks at Aiko and giggles, covering her mouth with her left hand.))

66 Emi Clear? (Emi looks at Keiko’s paper.)

67 Aiko Clean? *Can we use this?* ((Aiko looks at Keiko, scratching her head. Chika looks at Aiko and Keiko.))

68 Hana *Don’t worry. We can make mistakes.* ((Hana looks at Keiko’s paper.))

69 Aiko *It’s not a test.* ((Aiko looks at Keiko’s paper.))

70 Emi Mistake is okay. ((Emi looks at Keiko’s paper.))

71 Aiko Are you okay, right!

72 Hana ARE YOU OKAY? ((Hana laughs, looking at Aiko. Everybody laughs.))

73 Keiko Are you okay?

74 Aiko You are okay? ((Aiko laughs, touches her hair, and looks at Emi.))

75 Emi Don’t worry mistake. ((Aiko and Keiko nod.))

76 Aiko Ah:::::

In Example 11, Aiko was an animator at turns 67, 69, 71, 74, and 76, as well as an author at turn 71 of “Are you okay,” which was repeated by others. Aiko was an official hearer at turn 72, where Hana looked at her and repeated what Aiko said. At turn 68, 70, and 75, Aiko was a “ratified +” participant because others were responding to Aiko’s utterances although they did not make eye contact with Aiko.

In terms of the linguistic resources, the target grammar, comparatives, was again the focus of their interactions. This provided Aiko with opportunities to repair, one of the characteristics of interactional resources. At turn 66, Emi initiated repair, followed by Aiko’s
repair at turn 67, although her repair was not correct. Then, there was a big, cheerful laugh among the group members when Aiko mistakenly said “Are you okay” instead of “You are okay.” There were repetitions of “Are you okay,” during which Aiko and others made eye contact, laughed, and nodded.

Example 11 also shows a rare situation, where the participants used English for communication purposes, such as Emi’s “Mistake is okay” at turn 70 and “Don’t worry mistake” at turn 75, as well as Aiko’s “Are you okay,” which she meant “You are okay” at turn 71. They seemed to communicate in English for the purpose of communication, rather than for the purpose of English learning. It is important to note that these unique interactions happened after Aiko and others established their identity as learners by displaying their questions about grammar at turns 65, 66, and 67.

Example 12 also presents another example of establishing identities as learners and then communicating in English.

Example 12: FF Activity on Day 1

108 Hana Convenient. ((Chika and Emi look at Keiko’s writing. Aiko also looks at Keiko’s writing, scratching her head.))

109 Aiko Con[venience.] ((Aiko looks at Keiko, still scratching her head.))

110 Hana [Convenience] ((Hana looks at Keiko’s writing.))

111 Keiko Convenient? ((Keiko looks at her own writing.))

112 Aiko Do you say, conveniencer? ((Aiko looks at Keiko and smiles, touching her hair. Keiko and Emi look at Aiko. Everybody laughs.))

113 Emi Convenient. ((Emi laughs and looks at Keiko’s writing.))

114 Aiko Okay. ((Aiko looks at Emi.))

115 Emi Is that why we say convenience store? A convenient score. ((Emi looks at Keiko and Hana.))

116 Aiko Like a convenient store. A convenient store. ((Emi nods, looks at Aiko, smiles at her, and giggles. Chika looks at Aiko.))

117 Chika A convenient store. ((Chika smiles. Aiko and Emi look at Chika.))
Aiko  I have to study harder. ((Aiko looks at Keiko’s writing.))

Hana  Hey, does anybody have an electronic dictionary? ((Hana looks at Aiko, Emi, and Chika. Aiko stretches her arm, grabs her electronic dictionary, and puts it in front of her.)) How do you spell convenience? ((Hana looks at Mr. Matsuda.))

Mr. Matsuda  Convenience?

Hana  Yeah. ((Hana looks at Mr. Matsuda. Aiko, Emi, and Chika are chatting, but inaudible.))

Mr. Matsuda  Con-v-e-n-i-e-n-c-e.

Hana  Thank you. ((Hana looks at Keiko’s writing.))

In terms of identity resources, Aiko was an animator at turns 109, 112, 114, 116, and 118, as well as an author at turn 19 (“convenience”), which was repeated by Hana at turns 110 and 119 and by Emi at turn 115. Aiko was an official hearer at turn 119, when Hana asked for a dictionary, and she was a “ratified +” participant at turns 110, 111, 113, 115, and 117, where her members were talking about Aiko’s utterance, “convenience” at turn 109. She was a ratified participant when Hana was talking directly to Mr. Matsuda.

Again, in this example, the grammatical form, a comparative form, was the main focus of the interactions among Aiko and her peers. Similar to Example 11, their focus on grammar seemed to trigger interactional resources, such as repairs, eye contact and repetitions. At turns 111 and 113, Keiko repaired the use of the adjective, “convenient.” When Aiko said, “convenienter,” at turn 112, everybody cheerfully laughed, followed by a great deal of eye contact among participants with smiles. There were also some body movements, such as Emi’s nodding and Aiko’s grabbing her electronic dictionary. As can be seen in Example 12, there were many repetitions of “convenient” and its nominalised form, “convenience.”

Similar to Example 11, their discussion about grammar questions seemed to lead a participant, Hana, to speak in English for the purpose of communication, rather than for practicing English. That is, after Aiko and her peers established their identities as English learners through posing and discussing questions about comparative forms, Hana asked a question in English and interacted with Mr. Matsuda in English. Even though her interlocutor
was a teacher, communicating in English for communication purposes rarely occurred during my observations.

Interestingly, during these interactions in Examples 11 and 12, where participants communicated in English for the purpose of communication, Aiko was thinking about grammar, rather than communication. The following are Aiko’s stimulated recalls on Examples 11 and 12, respectively.

Excerpt 23:

I was thinking that I should have studied English comparatives because I did not understand them.

(Aiko, Stimulated Recall on Example 11, FF Activity on Day 1)

Excerpt 24:

“Convenience” and “store.” I was thinking about word formation.

(Aiko, Stimulated Recall on Example 12, FF Activity on Day 1)

Thus, Aiko was thinking about grammar during Example 11 and the lexical formation of “convenience store” during Example 12. Her thoughts about lexical formation seemed to be triggered by the discussion of how to make a comparative form of “convenient” as shown in Example 12. It is worth emphasizing that Aiko was thinking about grammar or vocabulary while Aiko and her peers were interacting in English for the purpose of communication rather than for practicing English as in Examples 11 and 12. It seems that Aiko and her peers established their identities as English learners by asking questions about grammar and discussing grammar problems together, which was likely to give them a sense of solidarity as learners. With this solidarity, Aiko and her peers seemed to assume that they would not produce perfect English or they would not expect the “wow” reaction from each other. Because of their negotiated identity as “English learners,” they might have little pressure to impress others by speaking perfect English. Therefore, they might have invested in L2 communication as in Example 11 and 12 with greater security.
The above examples (Examples 10, 11, and 12) were from a FF activity on Day 1, where they were able to establish their identities as English learners and to invest in L2 communication. Did Aiko show similar communication patterns during MF activities, where she was not asked to focus on grammar? The following is an example of a MF activity on Day 1. As explained before, the utterances in italics were originally uttered in Japanese and were translated into English. In Example 13, Aiko and her group members were making a 30-second commercial.

Example 13: MF Activity on Day 1

90 Aiko \textit{This is Takano-City.} ((Aiko puts her head on her left arm and covers her mouth with her left hand. She glances at Keiko and looks at her writing. Emi looks at Aiko.))

91 Emi Where [are we?] ((Emi looks at Keiko’s writing.))

92 Aiko [And then,] and then. ((Emi looks at Aiko, and Aiko looks at Hana.))

93 Hana \textit{Like, “What are you talking about?” What are you saying? What are you saying?} ((Aiko, Emi, and Hana look at Keiko’s writing.))

94 Emi Oh. ((Aiko and Emi look at Keiko’s writing.))

95 Hana \textit{Sounds good.} ((Aiko, Emi, and Hana look at Keiko’s writing.))

96 Aiko \textit{Sounds good, sounds good.} ((Aiko smiles and looks at Keiko’s writing, putting her head on her left arm. Emi smiles and looks at Keiko’s writing.))

97 Hana What are you saying? ((Aiko looks at Hana.))

98 Aiko \textit{So, the person C cannot say anything here. The other two cannot say anything, either.} ((Aiko points at the paper with her left hand and glances at Keiko. The others look at Keiko’s writing.))

99 Emi \textit{That’s funny.} ((Aiko looks at Emi. Emi looks at Aiko, waves her hand, and points at the paper.))

100 Hana \textit{Like, “Tell me.”} ((Aiko, Emi, Chika, and Hana put their heads on their arms and look at Keiko’s writing. Then, Emi puts her arms on the desk, followed by Chika and Aiko.))

101 Aiko \textit{Then, the person C wonders where he is.} ((Aiko, Emi, Chika and Hana
look at Keiko’s writing.))

In Example 13, Aiko was an animator only in Japanese; all of her utterances were in Japanese. She was an official hearer at turn 99, where Emi looked at Aiko and talked to her. At other turns, she was a ratified participant because her peers did not directly talk to Aiko or talk about Aiko’s utterances. In terms of linguistic resources, Aiko’s utterances were all in Japanese, and she did not speak English at all in Example 13. Hana was the only person who spoke in English, most of which consisted of repetitions of her own utterance, “What are you saying?” Regarding interactional resources, there was no repair, no gesture, and no laughter. However, there was a little eye contact and a few body movements, such as pointing at paper. Although they did not make eye contact very often and kept looking at Keiko’s writing most of the time, one of them (i.e., Emi) sometimes smiled when she listened to Aiko at turn 96 and Hana at turn 100. Except for Hana’s repetition of her own utterance at turn 97, there were no repetitions in Example 13.

Aiko’s stimulated recall on Example 13 is provided in Excerpt 25.

Excerpt 25:

I was thinking about what we could advertise about Takano-City.

(Aiko, Stimulated Recall on Example 13, MF Activity on Day 1)

Different from Excerpts 23 and 24 of Aiko’s stimulated recalls on the FF activity, she was focusing on meaning or content of the activity during the MF activity (Example 13), as shown in Excerpt 25. In addition, different from her interactional patterns during the FF activity (Examples 10, 11, and 12), Aiko spoke only Japanese in the example of a MF activity (Example 13). Of course, there were occasions where Aiko spoke English during MF activities. The close examination of such occasions provided me with further information about the relationship between grammar and investment in L2 communication as an English learner, which I present in the following two sections below.
6.5.1.2. Learning grammar: Shared experience as an English learner42

Example 14 is from a MF activity on Day 4. This example shows how Aiko and her peers used English to talk about English grammar, which they all had experienced difficulty with. Although the MF material did not ask the participants to use or to focus on a grammatical structure, one of the participants, Hana, initiated a discussion on grammar as an off-task chat, as shown in Example 14.

Example 14: MF Activity on Day 4

52 Hana At the entrance examination, I was thinking hard if it was “difficult for me” or “to me.” [Then, I wrote “difficult to me.”] ((Keiko looks at Hana and nods.))

53 Emi [Difficult for me.] ((Keiko looks at Hana and nods.))

Which is correct?

54 Aiko Difficult for. ((Keiko looks at Hana and nods.))

55 Keiko For. (Keiko looks at Hana and nods.))

56 Hana I remember that I wrote “to.” ((Hana nods. Keiko nods and looks at her own paper.))

57 Keiko You know, there are phrases like “going by” and “going to.” ((Keiko raises her right hand and shakes her head.))

58 Hana I guess those are something like “wa” or “ni” in Japanese. Like “ue.”43

((Keiko laughs, looks at Hana, and nods.))

In Example 14, I was only able to see Keiko’s face and others’ upper bodies due to the angle of the camera. Although visual information (e.g., facial expressions and eye contact) was limited, I still analyzed the data based on the audio information (e.g., verbal interactions). Regarding identity resources of Aiko in Example 14, Aiko was an animator at turn 54. Although it was impossible to analyze eye contact between Aiko and the others, Aiko seemed to be a

42 The titles for this section may bring to mind the theoretical framework of Communities of Practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). While I use their terms “shared experience” and “mutual engagement,” I am not using them in the same way. I use these terms simply to refer to experiences that are shared among my participants and their collaborative engagement.

43 “Wa” and “ni” are Japanese particles. There is no particle of “ue.”
 ratified participant at turns 52, 57 and 58, where Hana and Keiko seemed to be talking directly to each other. At turn 55, Aiko seems to be in the role of “ratified +” because Keiko was responding to Aiko’s utterance at turn 54 and nodding.

In terms of linguistic resources, a grammatical question about prepositions (i.e., to and for) was the main focus of the interactions in Example 14. When Hana raised the topic of prepositions at turn 52, Emi jumped in the conversation and overlapped with Hana’s utterance. It is noteworthy that four out of five participants produced their turns in English in this example. Similar to other FF examples (Examples 10, 11, and 12), their discussion about grammar appeared to lead to repair, one of the characteristics of interactional resources. At turn 53, Emi initiated repair, asking others which preposition they should use. At turn 54, Aiko repaired Hana’s use of the preposition, “to,” and repaired it. The phrase, “difficult for,” or part of it was repeated by Emi, Aiko and Keiko. Although an examination of Aiko’s facial expressions, eye contact, and body movements was not possible, Keiko made eye contact with Hana, laughed, and nodded.

Example 14 was from a MF activity, but Hana initiated a discussion on grammar, which led to active interactions about the use of English prepositions. As mentioned above, most participants produced their turns in English in this example. It seems they wanted to share their experiences of taking an entrance examination to this high school, as well as their experiences of facing difficulty when learning English grammar, specifically the choice of the appropriate English prepositions in this example. As a result, they might have actively interacted using English to talk about English grammar in Example 14.

It is important to remember that this active discussion on grammar happened during a MF activity on Day 4. The close examination of their interactions on Day 4 revealed that these interactions in Example 14 occurred immediately after their conversation about not knowing what to say to complete the activity. For example, Keiko said “I don’t know what to write,” which was followed by Emi’s utterance, “I don’t know. I want write something, but…” Then, Hana initiated this conversation on grammar (Example 14) as an off-task chat. It seems the participants’ shared experience of learning grammar helped them invest in L2 communication.
6.5.1.3. Working on grammar: Mutual engagement as a learner

Example 15 is from a MF activity on Day 3. This example presents how Aiko and her peers interacted in English to collaboratively create English sentences or phrases using their knowledge about English grammar. As stated before, one of Aiko’s group members, Hana, was absent from the school on Day 3 and did not participate in the FF or MF activities on Day 3. Instead, Junko joined Aiko’s group for Hana.

Example 15: MF Activity on Day 3

15 Keiko What languages are studied in Australia? ((Keiko looks at Junko’s writing. Keiko and Chika put their heads on their right arms.))

16 Emi Huh? Just general English. A little bit accented English, right? ((Keiko and Chika look at Junko’s paper, putting their heads on their right arms.))

17 Aiko Australian native English. Today (/tudai/).=

18 Emi =Today (/tudai/). ((Keiko and Chika look at Emi.))

19 Junko What is it called?

20 Emi Isn’t it just English?

21 Aiko English but have.

22 Emi Well, how do you say “accent” in English?

23 Junko But, native, acce[nt].

24 Aiko [Accent]? ((Emi nods, looking at Junko’s writing.))

25 Emi Dictionary. ((Junko writes.))

26 Aiko There’s a dictionary over there. Just write that. ((Chika looks at Aiko and smiles.))

27 Junko English but. ((Junko writes.))

28 Aiko But have, can’t we use have? ((Keiko and Chika look at their desks.))

29 Emi Have an accent.

30 Junko How can we say that in English?

In Example 15, Aiko was an animator at turns 17, 21, 24, 26, and 28. She was also an author at turn 21 because part of her utterance in turn 21 was repeated by Junko and Emi. It was impossible to see Aiko’s, Emi’s and Junko’s faces due to the angle of the camera. Thus, it was
impossible to examine who they made eye contact with, and it was not clear whether Aiko was an official hearer, ratified participant, or “ratified +” participant from the video-recorded data. Therefore, the focus of this analysis is linguistic behaviour among the participants. As can be seen in Example 15, they were struggling with creating a phrase or sentence, such as “English with an Australian accent” or “English in Australia has an Australian accent.” While they were trying to find an English word for “accent” at turns 22, 23, and 24, they were also collaboratively trying to figure out English structures of phrases or sentences from turn 19 to turn 30. Aiko’s stimulated recall shows her focus on vocabulary and grammatical forms as in Excerpt 26:

Excerpt 26:
I was thinking about the meaning of accent.\(^44\) I was thinking about grammar.

(Aiko, Stimulated Recall on Example 15, MF Activity on Day 3)

Although I was not able to examine Aiko, Emi, or Junko’s interactional resources (e.g., eye contact and smile) due to the angle of the camera, I was able to examine those of Keiko and Chika. Different from my impression of active interactional behaviours in English in Example 15, both Keiko and Chika kept looking at Junko’s writing or at their own desks most of the time. Therefore, it remains unclear whether only Aiko, Emi, and Junko were active in terms of both verbal and interactional behaviours. The data show that Aiko, Emi, and Junko were at least verbally active when working on the grammatical and vocabulary forms, and they showed a mutual engagement to make a sentence or phrase, exercising their knowledge about grammar.

As the above six examples show, Aiko and her peers tended to communicate in English when they had opportunities (a) to establish their identities as English learners though discussing grammar (Examples 10, 11, and 12), (b) to share their experiences of grammar learning (Example 13), and (c) to mutually engage in creating phrases/sentences using their knowledge about grammar (Example 15). Overall, they seemed to communicate in English as English learners, rather than English speakers. As Example 15 shows, not only discussions about grammar but also discussions about vocabulary seemed to help learners establish their identity as English learners, which I describe further in the next section.

\(^{44}\) In the written stimulated recall, she wrote “accent” in English.
6.5.2. Vocabulary learning as a learner

Example 16 is from a FF activity on Day 4. This example shows how Aiko and her peers interacted in English to choose an appropriate vocabulary item.

Example 16: FF Activity on Day 4

110  Mr. Honda What is your dream? ((Hana looks at Aiko and then looks at Keiko’s paper. Mr. Honda points at Emi.))
111  Emi Fashion advisor? Buyer? ((Keiko looks at Emi.))
112  Keiko Advisor? ((Keiko looks at Emi. Hana looks at Keiko.))
113  Emi Buyer? ((Keiko looks at Emi.))
114  Aiko Buyer? Do you mean a person who buys stuff? ((Keiko and Hana look at Aiko.))
115  Emi Buyer? Going to buy stuff. ((Emi nods and smiles.))
116  Hana Sounds like a person who does trading. ((Emi looks at and smiles at Keiko.))
117  Mr. Honda In English. Try to use English. ((Emi giggles.))
118  Hana Import. Import. What is that? ((Hana looks down, opening and closing her pen case.))
119  Aiko To other countries? ((Hana and Emi look at Aiko.))
120  Emi To other countries. ((Emi looks at and smiles at Aiko. Emi also nods.))
121  Aiko (inaudible) Forget that. ((Emi giggles. Hana glanced at Aiko.))
122  Hana Import cross. Export and import. ((Hana looks at Keiko’s writing, while opening and closing her pen case.))
123  Aiko It says buyer. ((Keiko writes. Chika looks at Keiko’s writing.))
124  Emi Buyer?

In Example 16, Aiko was an animator at turns 114, 119, 121, and 123. She was an official hearer at turns 115 and 120, where Emi answered Aiko’s questions. She was a “ratified +” participant at turn 116, where Hana added information to Aiko’s utterance. At the other turns (i.e., turns 111, 112, 123, 118, and 122), Aiko was a ratified participant because her peers did not
directly talk to her or they did not talk about Aiko’s utterances. Regarding linguistic resources, their main topic was the choice of an appropriate vocabulary item, advisor or buyer. They used Japanese to understand what Emi was trying to express in English. In Example 16, four out of the five participants produced their turns in English.

In terms of interactional resources, Emi self-initiated repair by adding “buyer” at turn 111 and self-repaired her own mistake at turn 113 by repeating “buyer.” As can be seen in Example 16, there were many repetitions of the words, “buyer” and “import,” during the interactions. When Aiko and others repeated the word, there was a great deal of eye contact among Aiko and her peers. In addition, there were body movements (e.g., nodding), smiles and giggles in Example 16. For example, Emi smiled and nodded when she answered Aiko’s question at turn 115. Also, she giggled, smiled, and nodded when Hana added some information to Emi’s comment at turn 116. Excerpt 27 is from Aiko’s stimulated recalls on Example 16 and shows that Aiko was thinking about vocabulary words.

Excerpt 27:
I was talking about vocabulary words related to importing and exporting.

(Aiko, Stimulated Recall on Example 16, FF Activity on Day 4)

Similar to the other stimulated recalls shown in Excerpt 23, 24, and 26, Aiko was thinking about the correct vocabulary to use rather than communicating in English. The next example, Example 17, is from a MF activity on Day 4 and also shows how vocabulary-related talk led to interactions using English. In this example, Aiko and one of her peers, Chika, interacted in English to talk about Aiko’s vocabulary mistake, which activated the group with a cheerful laugh. It should be emphasized that Chika produced only three turns using English over the four instructional treatment days (i.e., throughout four FF activities and four MF activities) as shown in Table 26. Therefore, Example 17 presents one of the rare episodes, where Aiko interacted with Chika in English.

Example 17: MF Activity on Day 4

1. Mr. Matsuda  Open your envelop.
2. Aiko  Mr. Matsuda, open okay? Okay. High school teacher, translator,
Japanese teacher, fight attendant, announcer. ((Aiko picks up each card, reads aloud the text from it to the group, and puts it down on her desk. Emi picks it up.)) Oh, announcer. ((Chika starts laughing.))

3 Chika FIGHT ATTENDANT? ((Chika laughs, covering her mouth with her left hand and bending her body.))

4 Aiko Flight attendant. Sorry, sorry. ((Chika laughs, and Keiko smiles.))

5 Hana What did she say? ((Chika laughs.))

6 Chika Fight attendant. ((Aiko passes a card to Chika, who is still laughing.))

7 Hana Haha. ((Hana and Chika laugh.))

8 Aiko Oh, all cards look great. ((Keiko fans herself with a card.))

In Example 17, Aiko was an animator at turns 2, 4, and 8. She was also an author at turn 2 because her utterance, “fight attendant,” was repeated by Chika at turns 3 and 6. She was a “ratified +” participant at turns 3, 5, 6, and 7, where Chika and Hana were talking about Aiko’s vocabulary mistake of “fight attendant,” which was supposed to be “flight attendant.” Thus, the main focus of their conversation was the vocabulary items, “fight attendant” and “flight attendant.” In this example, Aiko produced a few turns in English. As shown in other examples (see Examples 10, 11, 12, 14, and 16), their focus on linguistic form seemed to bring the participants an opportunities for repair. Therefore, at turn 3, Chika initiated repair, followed by Aiko’s self repair at turn 4.

The previous sections demonstrated how grammar related discussions (see Examples 10, 11, 12, and 14) or vocabulary related discussions (see Examples 15 and 16) led Aiko and her peers to communicate in English. Similarly, Example 17 shows that Aiko’s vocabulary mistake stimulated Chika, who spoke English the least among the group, to produce turns in English.

Therefore, it seems that questions and difficulties related to grammar and vocabulary triggered L2 communication among Aiko and her peers. Table 29 presents the number of episodes of grammar-related discussions and vocabulary-related discussions produced by Aiko and her peers during FF and MF activities. This table includes only grammar-related and vocabulary-related discussions, where participants produced turns using English. It does not
include discussions conducted only in Japanese. Appendix K presents the interactional data of each episode produced by Aiko and her peers (i.e., Group A) using English.

As Table 29 shows, vocabulary-related discussions occurred equally frequently in FF activities (n=5) and MF activities (n=5), while grammar-related discussion occurred more frequently in FF activities than in MF activities. If vocabulary-related discussions occurred equally frequently regardless of the type of activities (i.e., FF and MF activities), the frequency of grammar-related discussions seems to be the main factor contributing to the differences between the interactions in the FF (n= 13) and MF activities (n=8). This raises the question as to why there was little difference in the number of L2 turns between FF and MF activities as shown in Table 15 in Chapter 4. This question will be addressed later in the discussion chapter.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FF activities</th>
<th>MF activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, attention to grammar and vocabulary might have helped the participants to establish their identities as English learners, and encouraged them to interact with each other in English. The results also showed that vocabulary-related discussions using L2 occurred equally frequently regardless of the type of activities (i.e., FF and MF activities). However, grammar-related discussions happened more frequently during FF activities than during MF activities. Therefore, in FF activities, there seemed to be more opportunities for Aiko and her peers to establish their identities as L2 learners and invest in L2 communication. These findings lead to the next question; what would happen if a participant initiated L2 communication before establishing their identities as learners in discussions about vocabulary or grammar? The next section presents data related to this question.
6.5.3. Consequences of L2 communication without establishing learner identities

Example 18 is from a MF activity on Day 4. This example illustrates how the participants reacted to Aiko’s L2 communication in contexts where she did not establish, a priori, her identity as a learner through discussions on grammar. In other words, Example 18 demonstrates the reaction of Aiko’s classmates when she exhibited her identity as an English speaker rather than an English learner.

Example 18: MF Activity on Day 4

85 Aiko Communication skill. To build a good relationship. ((Keiko smiles at Hana. Aiko points at her card with her pen.))

86 Keiko Relationship? ((Keiko smiles and looks at Aiko’s card.))

87 Aiko Right. Study and to the student parent. ((Hana yawns loudly.)) English teacher need communication skill. Okay! ((Aiko looks at Keiko. Keiko and Chika look at Aiko’s card.))

88 Chika Aiko, you do pretty good, don’t you? ((Aiko looks at Chika. Keiko looks at her own paper.))

89 Aiko Yep. ((Aiko nods, smiling proudly.))

90 Hana Oh, she admitted it. ((Hana and Aiko laugh.)) She always pretends to be stupid. ((Hana taps her desk with her pen. Emi looks at Hana.)) She pretends like ((Hana changes her tone of voice and uses a high pitch tone. Also, Hana puts her index fingers to her cheeks, shakes her head, and purses her lips.) “Oh, I cannot do it. I cannot understand it!” ((Hana changes her tone of voice to her regular, lower tone of voice.)) But the truth is that she is like, “Oh, it’s super easy!” ((Hana points at Aiko with her left hand and moves her right hand in the air as if she is writing answers smoothly and easily.)) Actually, she also reads books. [She reads newspaper, too.] (Hana looks at Keiko.))

91 Keiko [In her heart,] she is actually thinking that this is so easy. (Keiko smiles and looks at Aiko.)

92 Hana She reads books and newspaper, too. ((Keiko smiles and looks at Aiko, gently stroking Aiko’s knees.))
In Example 18, Aiko was an animator at turns 85, 87, 89, 97, and 99. She was an official hearer at turns 86, 88, 91, 94, and 98, where Aiko was directly talked to. Although I was not able to see Emi’s face due to the angle of the camera, it seemed that Emi was talking to Hana at turn 96. Thus Aiko seemed to be a ratified participant at turn 96. At the other turns (i.e., turns 90, 92, 93, 95, and 101), Aiko was a “ratified +” participant because her peers were talking about how Aiko pretended to be “stupid.” In terms of the linguistic resources, some turns were overlapped or latched, with a fast speed. Except for Aiko’s first two turns at 85 and 87 and Keiko’s turn at 86, all of the interactions were conducted in Japanese.

In terms of interactional resources, Keiko repaired Aiko’s pronunciation at turn 86. While Aiko was producing English utterances, no one made eye contact with her. After Chika’s sarcastic comment about Aiko’s producing relatively long turns in English, Hana criticized Aiko for pretending to be stupid and hiding her actual ability. At turn 90, Hana used gestures, body movements, and tones of voice to illustrate how Aiko pretended to be stupid and how she is actually smart. After Hana’s turn, Keiko also started jokingly criticizing Aiko for pretending to be stupid. However, Keiko constantly smiled at Aiko, looked at her and stroked her knees, while criticizing her, as if Keiko sympathised with Aiko for being criticized. Thus, there was a great deal of eye contact between Keiko and Aiko, in addition to Keiko’s smiles and physical gestures toward Aiko.
This example shows how tensions between Aiko and her peers were related to Aiko’s attempt to communicate in the L2 without establishing her identity as a learner. The participants’ stimulated recall responses revealed both positive and negative reactions to Aiko’s English turns as presented in Table 30.

**Table 30**

*Aiko’s Peers’ Stimulated Recalls on Example 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Stimulated Recalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chika</td>
<td>I just finished my part, and I had nothing to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emi</td>
<td>Hana, you are awesome. Aiko always loves talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Everybody looks stupid, but actually they are smart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td>Hana is so cute. Aiko is pretending to be stupid but actually she is smart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the stimulated recalls in Table 30 show, Hana and Keiko were thinking about the same theme of “pretending to be stupid” at the time of Example 18. Thus, at later interviews, I further asked them to explain what “pretending to be stupid” meant. Their responses were as follows:

**Excerpt 28:**

Pretending to be stupid while actually being smart is a positive comment. It’s very cool if a person, who always fools around and looks silly, can actually do stuff.

*(Keiko, Interview, June, 2008)*

**Excerpt 29:**

It is cool that a person looks stupid but is actually smart.

*(Hana, Follow-up, MF Activity on Day 4)*

**Excerpt 30:**

It’s all about a gap. It is too ordinary that a person who looks smart is smart. That’s too ordinary. It’s just fine. But it’s great when a person makes us wonder when she is studying! I admire those people who are good at math or science. Of course, I also admire those people who are good at English, but actually they make me feel annoyed. It’s annoying. I would get angry and wonder why only you are good at English even though we take the same class at school. [...] I always wonder and upset about why I cannot do it while others can. I have this feeling only to English. Maybe that’s because I like English.
Therefore, both Keiko and Hana seemed to consider it “cool” that Aiko pretended to be stupid while she was actually smart. In addition, Hana expressed her anger toward others who were good at English. Her mixed feelings of admiration and anger might have led her to produce a longer comment about Aiko at turn 90 with gestures and a unique tone of voice as presented in Example 18 (see transcriptions with double-brackets in Tune 90 in Example 18). Excerpt 31 presents Aiko’s stimulated recall on Example 18.

Excerpt 31:

I was trying to be a smart lady and was trying to finish making sentences.

(Aiko, Stimulated Recalls on Example 18, MF Activity on Day 4)

Surprisingly, Aiko mentioned none of the sarcastic comments that she received after her turns in English as in Example 18. Ironically, however, her expression of “a smart lady” in Excerpt 31 seems to be her after-thought; that is, she might have recalled her behaviour (i.e., the English turns at 85 and 87) after hearing her peers’ sarcastic comments, such as “pretending to be stupid,” in Example 18. Regarding these sarcastic comments, Aiko said the following:

Excerpt 32:

I didn’t care about their comments so much. [...] It is much better than studying hard and being stupid. In our English program, there are many people who don’t appear to be studying but are actually smart. Of course, there are people who look smart and are smart. But I think it’s great that a person who seems to be fooling around is actually studying. [...] So, everybody studies secretly. [...] It would be embarrassing if you got poor grades after telling people that you studied hard.

(Aiko, Interview, December, 2008)

In summary, Example 18 presented tensions among participants caused by Aiko’s use of English, and her peers’ sarcastic comments about it. Different from other examples (e.g., Examples 10-18), where the participants’ difficulty with grammar or vocabulary helped them to
establish their identities as learners and led them to communicate in English, the English utterances initiated by Aiko in Example 18 did not stimulate others to produce English turns. Rather, Aiko’s utterances in English triggered unfavourable reactions from her peers. This might be due to the lack of establishment of their identities as English learners before initiating interactions in English. With fewer opportunities to discuss grammar, learners may experience this type of unfavourable reaction about their use of English more often during MF activities than during FF activities.

6.5.4. Summary of Discursive Practices during FF and MF Activities: Aiko’s Case

Table 31 presents the summary of identity, linguistic and interactional resources for the nine examples that we examined in the previous sections. This is followed by a discussion of the similarities and differences between FF and MF activities in terms of identity, linguistic, and interactional resources.

In Table 31, a checkmark (√) Indicates Aiko’s identity and linguistic resources, such as animator (identity resources) and grammar (linguistic resources). An asterisk was added to one of the identity resources, animator, when Aiko was an animator in English. As for interactional resources, the symbol, “√,” presents Aiko’s interactional resources, such as repair and laughter. Again, an asterisk was added to two of the interactional resources, eye contact and nodding to indicate Aiko’s English turns. In other words, when there was eye contact made with Aiko during her turn in English or when Aiko’s peers nodded during or immediately after Aiko’s turn in English, an asterisk was added. I also created a new category, “conveying messages in L2,” to the interactional resources in this table because I realized there were a few situations where a participant produced English turns for the purpose of communication, rather than for the purpose of practicing English words or phrases.
### Table 31

**Aiko’s Identity, Linguistic, and Interactional Resources in FF and MF Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Resources</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animator (^a)</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official hearer</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratified participant</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ratified +” participant</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Resources (^b)</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary words</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese pronunciation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent speech</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast speed</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Japanese</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactional Resources</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact (^b)</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body movement: nodding (^c)</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body movement: others (^d)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile/giggle</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveying messages in L2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) When Aiko was an animator using English, an asterisk, *, was added.

\(^b\) When there was eye contact made with Aiko while she was producing English turns, an asterisk, *, was added.

\(^c\) When Aiko’s peers nodded during or after Aiko’s turn using English, an asterisk, *, was added.

\(^d\) Body movements other than nodding.
6.5.4.1. Identity Resources

As Table 31 shows, Aiko exhibited a variety of identities during the FF activities, while she seldom exhibited her identities as official hearer or “ratified +” participants during MF activities. This may indicate that Aiko did not receive feedback on her utterances from others even though she produced many turns both in English and Japanese during MF activities. On the contrary, the variety of Aiko’s identities during FF instruction suggests that she produced many turns both in English and Japanese and also received a great deal of feedback from others as an official hearer or a “ratified +” participant after producing them. The reason for receiving more feedback during FF activities from others may be related to linguistic resources available during FF activities, which I discuss in the next section.

6.5.4.2. Linguistic Resources

As shown in Table 31, grammar was the focus of the interactions during FF activities, except for Example 16, in which vocabulary was the focus of the interactions. In any case, “form” was the focus for the participants during FF activities. On the other hand, form was not always the focus of their interactions during MF activities. Specifically, Aiko and her peers did not focus on grammar or vocabulary in Examples 13 and 18. Aiko produced turns only in Japanese in Example 13, and her attempt to communicate in English received sarcastic criticism from her peers in Example 18. There were overlapping and rapid interactions in Japanese to jokingly criticise Aiko in Example 18. The use of Japanese pronunciation when speaking English and the use of the Japanese language were equally present in both FF and MF activities.

In relation to identity resources, it seems that the participants’ focus on grammatical or vocabulary form helped Aiko to exhibit a greater variety of identities during FF instruction. Of course, the participants sometimes focused on grammar or vocabulary during MF activities as illustrated in Examples 14, 15, and 17. However, as Table 29 shows, Aiko and her peers focused on vocabulary equally frequently regardless of the type of activities (i.e., FF and MF activities). On the other hand, they focused on grammar more frequently during FF activities than during MF activities. Therefore, a greater variety of identities during FF activities than MF activities may be due to the higher frequency of the participants’ focus on grammar during FF activities. In the next section, I describe how such identity and linguistic resources affected Aiko’s use of interactional resources during FF activities and MF activities.
6.5.4.3. Interactional Resources

The distribution of checkmarks in Table 31 visually shows similarities and differences in the interactional resources between the FF and MF activities. Similarities include the constant presence of participants’ smiles and giggles during FF and MF activities, as well as the constant presence of their body movements, such as leaning forward, learning on their chairs, and flipping pens. Also, there was infrequent use of gestures in both activities. The overall differences between FF and MF activities are the more frequent occurrence of repair, eye contact, nods, laughter, repetition, and conveying messages in the L2 during FF activities. Among these differences, the most noticeable differences were eye contact and nods. That is, Aiko was likely to receive eye contact from her peers during or immediately after her turns in English only during FF activities, as represented by the symbol, “√∗,” in Table 31. On the other hand, during MF activities, her peers rarely made eye contact with Aiko during/after her turns in English. Regarding the second noticeable difference, nods, her peers tended to nod during or immediately after Aiko’s turns more frequently during FF activities than MF activities.

As indicated in previous sections, Examples 14, 15, and 17 included interactions, where Aiko and her peers focused on grammar or vocabulary even though the activities were MF activities. Thus, similar to the FF examples, there were instances of repair, nodding, and laughter. Therefore, the differences between FF and MF activities became much clearer when I compared the FF examples with two MF examples: Examples 13 and 18 in which Aiko’s peer did not nod during or after her turns, laugh, or repeat words/phrases in these MF activity examples.

One of the crucial differences between the FF examples and the two examples of MF activities (Examples 13 and 18) was whether L2 communication was accepted or rejected by peers. As Table 31 shows, two FF examples (Examples 11 and 12) and one of the MF examples (Example 18) included L2 communication. However, when L2 communication occurred and how it was perceived by others differed. In the FF examples, Aiko or her peers communicated in English after establishing their identities as learners by talking about grammar questions, sharing their experience of learning grammar, and collaboratively making sentences/phrases using their grammatical knowledge. Therefore, the transition from discussion about grammar to L2 communication seemed to be expected and accepted among participants as part of their learning.
process, while keeping their identities as learners. However, in the MF example Aiko conveyed her messages in English without reference to grammatical discussion and her utterances in the L2 received sarcastic criticisms from her peers, resulting in further conversations only in Japanese until the teacher came to their group. This MF example (Example 18) is from Day 4. On that day, there was a grammar-related discussion (i.e., Example 14) before Example 18. Therefore, one might expect a smooth transition from grammar discussion in Example 14 to L2 communication in Example 18. However, there were about 25 turns exchanged among the participants mostly in Japanese between Example 14 and Example 18. As a result, it appears to have been necessary for the participants to re-establish their identities as L2 learners before initiating L2 communication (Example 18). Without doing so, Aiko’s initiation of L2 communication led her peers to criticize her use of the L2.

Lastly, there were always repetitions in the FF examples, while the MF examples did not always exhibit repetitions as shown in Table 31. Aiko’s interpretation of repetition is provided in Excerpt 33.

Excerpt 33:

We repeat what the others have just said to liven up the atmosphere. Instead of just saying, “Yeah,” we repeat what the others have said. Then, the atmosphere is livened up. It’s very disappointing when I get no reaction from others after I finish talking. So, if someone repeats what I have just said, then the conversations will continue. We can’t continue conversations in English because we are not native speakers. And we can’t respond in English immediately, so all we can do is just repeating what the others said.

(Aiko, Interview, December 2008)

As Excerpt 33 shows, Aiko and her peers repeated what the others said in order to liven up the atmosphere. Thus, repetition seems to be a sign of their mutual engagement in conversation and their endeavour to continue their conversation in English, which was always exhibited during FF activities.
6.5.4.4. Aiko’s Investment in L2 Communication and Discursive Practices of FF and MF Activities

As described above, Aiko exhibited different discursive practices during FF and MF activities. This appears to be the result of the availability and use of different identity, linguistic, and interactional resources during FF and MF activities. The discursive practices during FF activities are presented in Figure 10.

Figure 10. Aiko’s Discursive Practices in FF Activities.

As Figure 10 illustrates, when Aiko was instructed to focus on a certain grammatical form during communication (i.e., FF activities), Aiko asked her peers grammar questions and discussed them with her peers, which helped Aiko and her peers establish their identities as English learners. While discussing grammar rules, they also shared their experiences of learning grammar and helped each other to make English sentences or phrases collaboratively, exercising
their shared knowledge of grammar. Thus, while establishing their identities as learners though discussion about grammar, Aiko had opportunities to exhibit a variety of interactional roles, such as an animator, author, official hearer, ratified participant and “ratified +” participant during FF activities. Discussion about grammar also led Aiko and her peers to initiate and correct grammatical mistakes (i.e., repair), which often resulted in agreement by nodding, making eye contact, repeating the repaired phrase, and smiling. After confirming that their identities were established and accepted among her peers through grammatical discussion and interactional resources (e.g., eye contact, nodding, and repetitions), Aiko and her peers continued the conversation about grammar, using English. The unique consequence particular to the FF activities was that such discussions on grammar sometimes led them to convey their messages for communicative purposes in English. In sum, during FF activities, Aiko and her peers invested in L2 communication, using grammar as a tool to establish their identities as L2 learners, which provided them with a more secure atmosphere to communicate in English with each other.

Aiko’s discursive practices during MF activities are presented in Figure 11.

Figure 11. Aiko’s Discursive Practices in MF Activities.
As shown in Figure 11, Aiko and her peers did not always talk about grammar or vocabulary items, but they did sometimes talk about grammar or vocabulary in off-task chat, especially when they did not know what to talk about. Once Aiko and her peers started talking about “forms” (i.e., grammar and vocabulary), Aiko exhibited a few of the identity roles, such as animator or ratified participant. Different from the discursive practices of FF activities, however, such insufficient linguistic and identity resources allowed Aiko to have access to only limited interactional resources. One of the most surprising results was the lack of eye contact during MF activities. That is, Aiko did not receive any eye contact during or after her turns in English in the MF examples. Her peers did not nod during or after her turns, either, except for those moments of “off-task” chatting about grammar. Therefore, it seemed that Aiko and her peers did not have opportunities to establish their identities as English learners during MF activities because they were not instructed to focus on form and had fewer occasions to discuss it. Without establishing their identities as L2 learners though grammar discussions, Aiko and her peers did not seem to find a way to invest in L2 communication. Thus, as Example 18 shows, Aiko’s attempt to communicate in the L2 often resulted in sarcastic feedback from others in MF interaction. Different from the discursive practices of FF activities, the identity, linguistic, and interactional resources available for Aiko during MF activities did not seem to provide Aiko with sufficient opportunities to establish her identity as an English learner and to invest in L2 communication.

6.6. Summary of Aiko’s Case Study

Aiko demonstrated different discursive practices for FF and MF activities. She and her peers established their identities as L2 learners through discussing grammar, sharing their experiences of learning grammar, and collaboratively creating English sentences/phrases before communicating in English. In other words, they invested in L2 communication after confirming that their identities as L2 learners were acknowledged among peers. The process of investing in L2 communication through identity establishment was smooth during FF activities because grammar (i.e., linguistic resources) allowed Aiko to have access to the identity and interactional resources, which supported her to further invest in L2 communication.
Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter, the results are discussed and interpreted. First, I discuss the group findings indicating no differences in the amount of verbal communication produced by learners in the FF and MF activities and how this relates to similar findings reported in the second/foreign language literature. Second, I discuss how the discursive practices analysis of two case studies revealed that these learners had different access to linguistic, identity, and interactional resources during FF and MF activities. Lastly, I discuss why the learners were more invested in L2 communication in the FF activities than in the MF activities. These findings are interpreted within the framework of second language socialization theory and research. I conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and pedagogical implications, as well as the strengths and limitations of this study.

7.1. Amount of L2 Communication

7.1.1. Limited L2 Use

The first research question investigated whether there were differences in the amount of verbal communication that learners produced depending on the type of instructional activity. I predicted that learners would communicate more in the FF activities than they would in the MF activities. The results showed little difference in the number and type of L2 turns that learners produced in both activity types. In fact, the participants produced equally few English turns and used more L1 Japanese than L2 English in both FF and MF activities. At the level of group production, learners in Group A and Group B produced almost an equal number of L2 turns during FF and MF activities. At the level of individual learner production, Aiko and Mika also produced an almost equal number of L2 turns during FF and MF activities. Therefore, based on the quantity of L2 turns, the results do not support the hypothesis that there would be more L2 communication during the FF activities than during the MF activities.

Some of the results from this study contradict the findings from questionnaire studies on motivation, anxiety, and willingness to communicate. For example, a recent study on learner anxiety (Dewaele, Petrides, & Furnham, 2008) showed that learners who started learning the target language at a younger age or who used the target language more frequently tended to have less communication anxiety. In my study, however, Aiko exhibited quite a bit of anxiety about English, including speaking English, taking English examinations, and displaying a lack of
English grammar knowledge and poor pronunciation, even though she started learning English when she was in Grade 1. Furthermore, Keiko, who had several close friends from her elementary school years in the U.S. and frequently communicated in English with them through emails and Facebook, expressed her constant anxiety about speaking English in front of her Japanese peers because she was afraid of being bullied for “showing off” her fluent English.

Interestingly, there were also contradictions within the same participant. For example, Keiko expressed strong anxiety and little willingness to communicate in English during the interview, and she rarely spoke in English during the video-taped classroom interaction. However, her questionnaire data showed that she had one of the highest scores in terms of willingness to communicate in English. Furthermore, Mika and Aiko both rated the same in terms of their willingness to communicate as measured by the questionnaire. However, they behaved very differently. That is, Aiko spoke in English the most among her group members (Group A), while Mika spoke the least among her group members (Group B).

Although the results contradict my hypothesis and findings from questionnaire studies, they are consistent with the findings of other empirical studies concerning the limited use of the L2 in classroom settings (Canagarajah, 2001; Duff, 2000, 2004; Goldstein, 2003; Hall & Verplaatse, 2000; Heller, 2006; Nakane, 2007; Pon et al., 2003; Storch & Hill, 2008). It has been suggested that the lack of L2 utterances may not be solely due to the learners’ limited L2 knowledge (Duff, 2002), but may due to the fact that students already know each other through communicating in their first language and that it feels unnatural or artificial to communicate in the target language (Leger & Storch, 2009). This brings to mind a contrast between the participants in my pilot study and those in the main study. The participants in my pilot study were at a similar proficiency level as those in the main study, yet the pilot study participants45 communicated in English throughout. The pilot participants were six Japanese ESL students who had just arrived in Canada and started the ESL program at the time of the data collection. Therefore, they did not know each other very well when they participated in the pilot study.

45 The participants in my pilot study had just arrived in Canada and I visited their ESL school during their first week in the program. Four were the first year university students, one was a third year university student, and one was a graduate from a university in Japan.
Although I used the same materials as the main study, they completed all tasks in English, which was dramatically different from the participants in the main study.

One might argue that the contextual differences (ESL in the pilot study and EFL in the main study) played a role in the participants’ use of English. However, learners’ limited use of the target language has been reported elsewhere in both ESL (e.g., Duff 2002; Pon et al., 2003) and EFL settings (e.g., Canagarajah, 2001; Nakane, 2007). Thus, Duff’s (2000) claim that knowing each other might hinder the use of the L2 seems a reasonable explanation for the limited use of English on the part of the participants in my study. The participants in the main study had been members of the same class since the beginning of high school and would continue together up until graduation, unless they transferred to different programs or schools. They took the same classes and spent every hour together from 7:30am to 5:00pm almost every day. During these times, they communicated mostly in Japanese. Therefore, as Mika told me during the interview, she would be surprised to see one of her classmates suddenly speaking in English because she would look like a totally different person. But why does knowing each other through their L1 impede L2 communication? Research on second language socialization in classroom settings offers some interesting insights to this question. This work is useful to consider in relation to the case study findings and in particular to the different discursive practices of FF and MF activities.

Within second language socialization research, the lack of L2 use has been attributed to humiliation, attention, and solidarity. Duff (2002) and Pon et al. (2003) observed how high school ESL students in mainstream classes in Canada remained silent to avoid humiliation by other classmates. Drawing on Cheung’s (1993) study on silence, Pon et al. (2003) presents two types of silence due to humiliation: inhibitive silence and attentive silence. Inhibitive silence is often related to fears of being laughed at by others because of a lack of ability and skills, which is usually pronunciation for L2 speakers (Pon et al., 2003). Attentive silence is related to worries about what others think of one’s behavior (Pon et al., 2003). In my study, both inhibitive and attentive silence occurred during the classroom interactions, which was further confirmed through interviews. For example, both Mika and Aiko reported that they did not want to speak in English in front of their peers because they thought it would be embarrassing to make

---

46 The materials I used in the pilot study and the main study were almost the same, except for some minor revisions.
pronunciation or grammar errors (i.e., inhibitive silence), while speaking English as if they were good English speakers. At the same time, they did not want to speak in English in front of their friends because they were afraid what others would think of them if they spoke in English. Speaking English in front of peers was clearly a high risk activity among my participants because they would be criticized for being a “show off” and for pretending to be a native speaker of English.

Second, the lack of L2 use may occur as a result of not wanting attention from others, specifically from peers. Referring to Duff’s (2002) study, Zuengler and Cole (2005) argue that some L2 learners do not want attention from others and choose not to speak up in classrooms. One of Aiko’s group (Group A) members, Keiko, often mentioned this during the interview. Keiko had lived in the U.S. for four years and came back to Japan when she was 13 years old. She expressed her mixed feelings of getting attention from peers because of her fluent English; she was irritated, fearful, and worried about getting attention. For example, she would get irritated when her friends praised her fluent English, and she would fear being bullied by peers because of her different, “native like” pronunciation. She was also worried about being rude to the more senior students if she spoke in English and drew attention to the fact that hers was better than theirs. Therefore, she tried her best not to speak in English in front of her classmates or seniors at school.

Different from Keiko, who did not want attention drawn to her fluent English, Aiko did not want attention drawn to her non-fluent English. As indicated in the results, Aiko had a strong desire to become a fluent English speaker, frequently saying that she had to study English harder. She also observed that Japanese people would show the “wow!” response to fluent English speakers, while they would show more negative reactions, such as “What is she talking about?” to those who pretended to be fluent speakers but were actually not. Thus it could be that Aiko did not want to draw her peers’ attention to her English because she knew that she would not get the “wow!” reaction from them. Failing to get the “wow!” reaction might be disappointing for learners like Aiko who has many friends, is very popular among her classmates, and wants to be a fluent English speaker. As a result, she spoke in English, mostly when she was in a situation where she did not expect the “wow!” reaction from peers.

47 At the high school, students in the English program from different grades sometimes took English classes together, especially in the oral communication class.
Third, the lack of L2 use is often related to learner’s solidarity as L1 speakers (Duff, 2007; Goldstein, 1997; Kim, 2008). For example, Goldstein (1997) showed that many Portuguese immigrant women at a factory in Canada usually used their L1 Portuguese at work in spite of the benefits of speaking English for their job-related promotion. She emphasized the importance of maintaining solidarity with their L1 Portuguese co-workers by speaking Portuguese and the risk that speaking L2 English might lead to the loss of solidarity with the co-workers.

The lack of L2 use due to L1 solidarity has been also reported in second language socialization studies in school settings (e.g., Duff, 2007; Goldstein, 2003; Kim, 2008; Pon et al., 2003). In a study on Korean ESL students’ socialization at a Canadian university, Duff (2007) illustrated how pressure from Korean peers “sometimes forced them to be less active in Anglo-community life…[d]espite their initial intention to become affiliated with local Anglo-Canadian students” (p. 315). Similarly, in my study, Aiko expressed regretfully that she ended up speaking in Japanese most of the time during her school trip to Australia. She told me that she would rather go there alone otherwise she would end up speaking in Japanese again and never improve her English. If Aiko had to speak in Japanese in Australia to maintain solidarity with her Japanese peers, she probably experienced even more pressure to do so at school in Japan. Maintaining solidarity with L1 peers by not using L2 English seems to explain why both Aiko and Mika did not want to speak in English in front of their peers in spite of their strong desire to become fluent English speakers.

In sum, the results showed that there was only limited use of L2 English during the classroom interaction among my participants and that such limited L2 use could be attributed to the fact that students had already known each other through their L1 Japanese, which hindered the use of L2 because of humiliation, attention, and solidarity among peers. However, a closer examination of discursive practices comparing learners’ access to linguistic, identity and interactional resources in the FF and MF activities revealed that there were some situations where participants did communicate in English.

7.1.2. Access to Linguistic Resources and Investment in L2 Communication

From here, I will discuss the second and third research questions together because they interrelate. The second research question was whether FF and MF activities differed in terms of learners’ access to linguistic, identity, and interactional resources. The third research question
investigated to what extent learner investment in L2 communication was related to FF activities. As mentioned above, although the participants rarely communicated in English during the classroom interactional treatment sessions, there were some occasions where they did communicate in English. The analyses of discursive practices revealed three interactional behaviours that enhanced communication in English: collaborative word/vocabulary search, incomplete turn-constructional-units, and repetitions. I will discuss these behaviours in relation to learner investment in L2 communication, drawing upon second language socialization studies in my interpretation of the findings.

First, the results showed that the participants used English when they discussed questions about grammar and vocabulary. As indicated in the results, Aiko and her group members (Group A) produced an equal number of vocabulary-related episodes, during FF activities and MF activities. However, there was a clear difference in the number of grammar-related episodes; there were more grammar-related episodes during FF activities than during MF activities (see Table 29 in Chapter 6). Since I had not noticed the emergence of grammar-related and vocabulary-related episodes in Mika’s data, the post hoc analysis of these episodes for Mika’s group (Group B) was conducted at a later stage. The results of the post hoc analysis are presented in Table 32.

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FF Activities</th>
<th></th>
<th>MF Activities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix L presents the entire list of grammar-related and vocabulary-related episodes for Mika’s group (Group B). Similar to Table 29 for Aiko’s group (Chapter 6), Table 32 above
presents only the episodes for Mika’s Group that consist of three or more turns, at least two of which include English. As shown in Table 32, there were more grammar-related episodes during FF activities than MF activities, while there were almost the same number of vocabulary-related episodes both during FF activities and MF activities. This was similar to Aiko’s group. The question as to why the students spoke English when discussing grammar or vocabulary might be explained by what is referred to as the “collaborative word search” activity.

Drawing on Goodwin’s (1987) findings on collaborative word search, where participants co-constructed their social identities, Park (2007) showed that her participants co-constructed their asymmetrical social identities as native speakers and non-native speakers through searching for vocabulary words collaboratively. Through collaborative word search, non-native speakers displayed their uncertainty about the correct word or correct pronunciation of a word, playing a role as a “requestor” (p. 343) or assessee. On the other hand, the native speakers played a role as “requestees” (p. 343) or “assessors” (p. 346). She argued that such asymmetrical social identities led to successful and engaging communication because they publicly displayed their identities and performed their roles, such as “learners.” In other words, when they knew what roles they were assigned, they found it comfortable playing the role as a learner or as a requestee because they knew what kind of behaviours would be appropriate and expected in a given situation to perform the socially co-constructed identities. In other words, they “fashion[ed] themselves as different ‘kinds of people’” (Gee, Allen, & Clinton, 2001, p. 175) using language appropriate for the assigned roles.

Similar instances occurred in my study which I labelled as vocabulary-related (i.e., collaborative vocabulary search) and grammar-related episodes (i.e., collaborative grammar search). In addition, similar to Park (2007), the results showed that Aiko had established her identity as a language learner by asking questions about grammar or vocabulary before any successful communication in English. Without publicly displaying her identity as a learner through asking questions, Aiko received negative reactions from others and failed to continue conversations in English (see Example 18, a MF activity). Similarly, as indicated in Chapter 5, Mika’s initiation to communicate in English failed to continue and no one responded to her English utterances (see Example 8, a MF activity). This could be due to the absence of the opportunity to publicly display their identities as language learners through asking grammar or vocabulary questions. That is, as in Park’s (2007) study, publicly displayed and established
social identities through collaborative word/grammar search enhanced L2 communication among my participants. Interestingly, similar to Park’s findings, such social identities did not always last for a long time. Therefore, the participants’ roles were “re-categorized” (Park, 2007, p. 346) as learners/requestors and requestees every time they entered into communication on a different topic in the L2. In this study, vocabulary-related episodes occurred equally frequently in both FF and MF activities. However, grammar-related episodes occurred much more frequently during FF activities than during MF activities. Therefore, the participants had more opportunities to publicly establish their asymmetrical social identities and to successfully conduct English communication during FF activities than MF activities.

Second, I would like to discuss incomplete turn-constructional-units in relation to the vocabulary and grammar-related episodes in my database. Introduced by Lerner (1995) and further examined by He (2003), incomplete turn-constructional-units are often used between teachers and students, where teachers end their turn without completing a sentence. By doing so, they invite students’ responses and assign “some authorship to the students” (He, 2003, p. 132). In my study, these incomplete turn-constructional units were frequently used among students. When they produced these units, each turn usually consisted of only one or a few English words. However, as a collection of individual turns, they made a full sentence as in Example 19.

Example 19: FF Activity on Day 1 (Mika’s Group A)

124 Waka  You should.
125 Sato  You.
126 Waka  Should.
127 Sato  Drink.
128 Waka  Drink...water?
129 Sato  Yep.
130 Waka  In Takano city.
131 Sato  Takano city’s water is clean. Although it is tasteless.
132 Waka  Good?
133 Sato  Yeah.
As shown in Example 19, the participants collaboratively constructed two sentences over 17 incomplete turns; “You should drink water in Takano city. Takano city’s water is clean and good because they are all groundwater.” In addition, these incomplete turn-constructional-units comprised both grammar-related (Lines 137-138) and vocabulary-related (Lines 135-136) episodes. Since grammar/vocabulary-related episodes seem to constitute most of the incomplete turn-constructional-units, I further examined them in relation to the incomplete turn-constructional-units. Table 33 presents the number of grammar/vocabulary-related episodes and incomplete turn-constructional-units during FF and MF activities.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Grammar/Vocabulary-Related Episodes (GREs and VREs) and Incomplete Turn-Constructional-Units.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FF Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiko’s Group (Group A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika’s Group (Group B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in parentheses represent the number of incomplete turn-constructional-units. For example, 8(3) means there were eight GREs and three of them entailed incomplete turn-constructional-units.

As shown in Table 33, many grammar-related episodes entailed incomplete turn-constructional-units and there were more incomplete turn-constructional-units during FF activities than MF activities. It was also found that that all of the grammar/vocabulary-related
episodes included repetitions (see Appendix K and Appendix L). Thus, while discussing grammar, the participants often repeated a previous speaker’s utterance and expanded it by adding one or two new words, which was then followed by the next speaker’s repetition and expansion. Such incomplete turn-constructional-units could be referred to as a series of “expansions” in interaction research (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995). In addition to the interactional benefits of “expanding” or adding new information, the incomplete turn-constructional-units with repetitions appear to have social and affective benefits for the learners. According to Aiko’s interview responses, students would repeat frequently because repetition was the only way they could respond to others in English immediately and it would liven up the conversational atmosphere.

Social and affective roles of repetitions during communication have been researched extensively from the perspective of second language socialization (e.g., Broner & Tarone, 2001; Duff, 2000; Hall & Verplaetse, 2000; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009). These studies suggest that repetitions create affective, humorous and supportive environments for interactions (e.g., Duff, 2000; Hall & Verplaetse, 2000), show engagement with the conversation (e.g., Norrick, 1987) and display enjoyment (e.g., Duff, 2000; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009). Given these characteristics, repetitions are considered to provide both speakers and hearers with more secure feelings and promote further communication (see Duff, 2000). Thus, the frequent use of repetitions during incomplete turn-constructional-units appears to indicate the participants’ active engagement with L2 communication.

In sum, learners used English to collaboratively make sentences, during which they repeated and expanded each others’ utterances by adding a few words (i.e., incomplete turn-constructional-units). In other words, by not completing a sentence, learners assigned authorship to each other (He, 2003) and provided each other with opportunities to speak, letting others complete a sentence. They did so especially when they discussed grammar. Such grammar discussions or grammar-related episodes occurred more frequently during FF activities than MF activities. Therefore, participants had more opportunities to access a type of linguistic resource (i.e. grammar), during FF activities than during MF activities. This access to grammar during the FF activities helped the participants to publicly demonstrate and establish their identities as language learners, which encouraged them to further invest in L2 communication. In the next section, I discuss how learners’ access or lack of access to linguistic resources affected the
characteristics of identity and interactional resources available to them during FF and MF activities. I also discuss how such characteristics enhanced or hindered their investment in L2 communication.

7.2 Linguistic, Identity, and Interactional Resources

In this section, I discuss characteristics of identity and interactional resources resulting from both access and a lack of access to linguistic resources during FF activities and MF activities.

7.2.1. Access to Linguistic Resources: Identity and Interactional Resources during FF Activities

In the previous section, I discussed how learners had more access to linguistic resources, specifically grammar, during the FF activities than during the MF activities. In this section, I discuss the identity and interactional resources that were available to learners during FF activities because of their access to linguistic resources. As a reminder, identity resources consist of, for example, an animator (a speaker), author (an original source of information), official hearer (a person who is directly talked to), and ratified participant (a hearer who is not directly talked to). Interactional resources include eye contact, gesture, and facial expressions. In this section, I will discuss three characteristics related to identity and interactional resources during FF activities: creativity (Tarone, 2002), “go ahead” signs (Sato, 1981), and “right to speech” (Bourdieu, 1977).

First, as Mika said during the interviews, grammar was a navigator and stimulus of L2 communication for her because she knew what kind of stories or topics she was supposed to tell based on a given grammar form (e.g., comparatives and conditionals). Therefore, she could think of many stories and express them to her group when she was told to use a certain grammar form. In other words, utilizing linguistic resources (i.e., grammar) during the FF activities, Mika became creative in making stories and had access to identities resources, such as animator and author. Mika’s remarks on grammar and creativity seem to be connected to Tarone’s (2002) argument about creativity during language play through noticing linguistic features. Referring to Cook (2000), she categorises creativity in language play into two types: “play with language form” (Tarone, 2002, p. 293) and “semantic play” (p. 293). The former refers to humorous and
joyful interactions using certain linguistic forms that learners notice, while the latter creates stories, triggered by linguistic form (Tarone, 2002). Both types of language play emerged in my data. For example, Aiko’s case study presented language play (see Example 12 in Chapter 6), when she and her peers jokingly conjugated the word, *convenient*, such as *convenient, convenienter, and convenience*. Also, Mika’s case study showed semantic language play (see Example 5 in Chapter 5), where she and her peers collaboratively created a story, using conditional phrases. As Tarone (2002) suggests, noticing linguistic form and learner’s creativity seem to be related. Therefore, communicative activities that also draw learners’ attention to form appear to encourage learners’ creativity and elicit further communication in English as language play.

Second, the results showed that the access to linguistic resources during FF activities generated discursive practices with a variety of interactional resources, such as frequent eye contact, nodding, gestures and smiles. It was found that these interactional resources supported learners’ investment in L2 communication. Focusing on communication behaviours in classroom discourse, Sato (1981) found that many Asian ESL students needed a “go ahead” sign (Sato, 1981, p. 20) before entering conversations. These signs, including eye contact and nods, gave learners the floor. Similarly, my participants utilized interactional resources (e.g., eye contact and nods) to invite others to participate in the conversation, by giving them the floor.

These “go ahead” signs (e.g., eye contact and nods) provided learners with what (Bourdieu, 1977) refers to as the “right to speech” (Bourdieu, 1977), which may be necessary to become an animator or author successfully. According to Bourdieu, everybody has different degrees of “right to speech.” For example, some people are considered to be more powerful and more worth listening to than others (see Atkinson, 2003; Norton, 2000; Norton & Toohey, 2002). In many studies on L2 learning, those who have power and have the “right to speech” are often native speakers of a target language or culture (e.g., Angelil-Carter, 1997; Kanno, 2003; Norton Peirce, 1995; Norton, 1997, 2000). Since my study was conducted in an EFL classroom in Japan, everybody was a non-native speaker of the target language, English. Without native speakers of English, therefore, it could be expected that those who are good at English might have the right to speech in the EFL classroom context. However, my data showed that learners who publicly demonstrated difficulty with English by asking questions about grammar or vocabulary were often the most successful in gaining the “right to speech” in English. In other words, they
strategically used linguistic resources by asking grammar/vocabulary questions, while assigning themselves “requestor” roles and others “requestee” roles (Park, 2007). Such publicly demonstrated identity roles appeared to give both speakers and hearers the “right to speech” because they were expected to play their roles properly by listening carefully to each other and conveying messages as requestors or requestees.

In sum, the access to linguistic resources during FF activities provided learners with identity and interactional resources that stimulated their creativity as an animator or author and encouraged them to invest in L2 communication with the supportive “go ahead” signs. In the next section, I discuss the consequences of lack of access to linguistic resources during MF activities.

7.2.2. Lack of Access to Linguistic Resources: Identity and Interactional Resources during MF Activities

The results showed that learners had limited access to linguistic resources, specifically grammar, during MF activities. Such limited access to linguistic resources resulted in lack of identity and interactional resources necessary for learners’ investment in L2 communication. That is, they did not have opportunities to establish their identities as learners through asking and discussing grammar questions. Thus, as shown in the case study results, instead of getting encouragement to speak English, both Mika and Aiko experienced negative reactions from others when they initiated English communication during MF activities. For example, when Mika expressed her future dream in English (see Example 8 in Chapter 5), her peers did not respond to her or look at her. Instead, some were chatting between themselves and some were looking up words in their dictionaries. Similarly, when Aiko expressed her opinion in English, she was criticised extensively by her peers that she always pretended to be stupid when she was actually very smart. Her peers made fun of her and criticised her, by referring to her as “pretending to be stupid” repeatedly, acting out her behaviours, and imitating her tone of voice. Thus, in spite of their effort to speak in English, they failed to gain access to identity resources, such as an animator and author, as well as interactional resources, such as eye contact and nods, due to lack of opportunities to display their identities as L2 learners using linguistic resources.

Such negative reactions have been reported in several studies on language learners in multilingual classrooms (Goldstein, 1997, 2003; S. K. Lee, 2001; Pon et al., 2003), as well as
Japanese students’ use of English with their Japanese peers (Kanno, 2003; Ryan, 2009). The common phenomenon among these studies is that speaking L2 English has the risk of being considered a “show off” by your L1 peers (Goldstein, 1997, 2003; Kanno, 2003; Pon et al., 2003). Cantonese-speaking ESL students in Goldstein’s (1997, 2003) studies claimed that speaking English to their Cantonese-speaking peers in class was “rude” because speaking English would show how “special” you were (Goldstein, 2003, p. 16). Similarly, Kanno (2003) showed that one of her returnee participants was negatively told by her Japanese peers that she was showing off when she uttered a phrase in English unintentionally during a conversation. Due to the risk of getting such negative reactions, some learners choose to “mask” their fluent use of English (S. K. Lee, 2001, p. 224).

As indicated above, the tendency to regard speaking English as “showing off” was evident among my participants. First of all, many of my participants, including Mika and Aiko, commented on the image of proficient, fluent L2 English speakers during the interviews, such as being smart, bright, global and cool. In fact, many of the participants’ friends in different programs or at different schools considered them to be smart because they majored in English and had to communicate with native speaking teachers more often than other students. Also, the participants themselves were likely proud of being a student in the English program at this high school because of these intellectually positive images about L2 English speakers. In addition to such intellectual images, as Mika told me during the interview (see Chapter 5), speaking English tends to be considered different from knowing the grammar of English. That is, according to Mika, grammatical knowledge of English indicates how hard the person has studied the language, while fluency in English represents the speaker’s special experiences and opportunities that not everyone has, such as living abroad and being surrounded by the foreign language and culture. Thus, according to Mika, a general consensus among her peers is that the former (i.e., grammatical knowledge) is equally available and possible for everybody, while the latter (i.e., fluent speech) is available and possible only for a privileged few. As Ryan (2009) states, Japanese students often admire fluent L2 English speakers because of the “social prestige that comes with this ability” (Ryan, 2009, p. 416). As a result, speaking English in front of peers can be seen as “showing off” and tends to trigger negative reactions from peers. Secondly, the results documented in the stimulated recalls and interviews showed anger toward a peer’s use of English in class. For example, one of Aiko’s group members (Group A), Hana, expressed her anger and
frustration toward Aiko’s use of English in the class. During the stimulated recall and the interview, she complained that Aiko could speak English well, while Hana could not, even though they took the same English classes. Her anger was also directly expressed toward Aiko in the form of making fun of her and criticizing her extensively, as discussed above.

In sum, both Mika and Aiko experienced negative reactions toward their use of English during MF activities. However, considering the fact that the same participants did speak in English without experiencing such negative reactions during FF activities, the negative reaction during MF activities seems to confirm the role of grammar in L2 learner communication. That is, grammar, a type of linguistic resource, was used to mask one’s fluent command of English and helped both Mika and Aiko to perform as language learners with proper identity and interactional resources, necessary for L2 communication. Thus, during FF activities, learners showed difficulty with grammar, asked grammar questions, discussed grammar problems, and communicated in English as learners of English, rather than fluent speakers of English. During MF activities, on the other hand, learners rarely had the opportunity to establish their identities as learners due to the lack of linguistic resources (e.g., grammar) available for them. In the following section, I discuss how my participants used grammar as a symbol and tool in order to gain access to linguistic, identity and interactional resources necessary for investment in L2 communication.

7.3. Grammar as a Symbol and Tool

The above discussions on the amount of L2 communication (Research Question 1) and learner investment in L2 communication (Research Questions 2 and 3) shed light on the role of grammar in helping learners to invest in L2 communication. As Cole and Zuengler (2003) argue, language can be a symbol to represent social structures, as well as a tool to establish “social and psychological realities” in learners’ language socialization processes (Cole & Zuengler, 2003, p. 99). My study supports the role of language, specifically the role of grammar, in helping the L2 learners’ language socialization process. That is, my participants used grammar as a symbol to represent asymmetrical power relations between English speakers and English learners. The results showed that asymmetrical power relations positively enhanced L2 communication when learners publicly displayed their identity as English learners by demonstrating their difficulty and struggles with grammar. In other words, learners used grammar, a type of linguistic resources, as
a tool to establish their identities as English learners and to be publicly accepted as learners. This allowed them to have access to identity and interactional resources and encouraged them to invest in L2 communication.

Although my data suggest that presenting oneself as an English learner was welcome and displaying oneself as an English speaker was rejected among my participants, it is important to keep in mind that acceptable identities are different in different situations and time and that appropriate participation also varies depending on time and place (Cole & Zuengler, 2003; Duff, 2007; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). In this study, grammar played an important role in helping learners to establish the desired identity (i.e., learner identity) for EFL students at this high school in Japan and in encouraging them to further invest in L2 communication as English learners. In the next section, I discuss the theoretical implications based on the findings of this study.

7.4. Theoretical Implications

This study has theoretical implications in several areas, including learner investment, motivation, willingness to communicate, language socialization, and social perspectives in second language acquisition.

First, Norton (2000) and Norton Peirce (1995) define learner investment as learners’ ambivalent desire to learn language taking into consideration power relationships between the learner and the target language. As a result, many studies on learner investment in L2 learning focus on how learners interact with native speakers of the target language, how they participate in activities related to the target culture, and how they study or learn the language (e.g., Angelil-carter, 1997; Mckay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 2000; Norton & Kama, 2003; Norton Peirce, 1995; Potowski, 2004; Russell & Yoo, 2001; Skilton-Sylvester, 2002). Therefore, it appears that investment is relevant only to L2 contexts, where learners are surrounded by the target language and culture. Surrounded by the L2 language and culture, they can choose either to expose themselves to the L2 culture or not. The results of this study indicate that theory and research on learner investment need not be restricted to L2 contexts. This study was conducted in an EFL context, where the learners have less contact with native speakers of English and they have little
choice about learning English. All of the participants shared the same L1 and all of them were required to take the same English courses. Even in this context, learners exhibited an ambivalent desire to learn English. Therefore, this study provides evidence that learner investment is not only relevant to ESL contexts but also EFL contexts, where learners do not have direct contact with L2 speakers or cultures.

The results of this study also suggest that learner investment in L2 communication is demonstrated not only by how learners use the target language but also how they listen to each others’ L2 utterances. Some of the previous research on learner investment emphasizes how learners initiate and continue the conversation in the L2 (e.g., Kanno, 2003; Norton, 2000). However, analyzing the discursive practices during FF and MF activities in this study has revealed a number of participant behaviours while listening to others’ utterances in English. For example, they nodded, smiled, used gestures, and made eye contact to show their engagement with the conversation in English. At other times, they stared at their desks, flipped their erasers, looked up words in their dictionaries, and rarely made eye contact while someone was speaking in English. It was observed that a participants’ active engagement with the conversation as displayed by their supportive listening behaviours encouraged further communication in the L2, while their lack of engagement hindered conversations in the L2.

Secondly, the questionnaire results of motivation and willingness to communicate did not always match participants’ behaviours during classroom interactions. This suggests that learner responses to questionnaires might be based on their imaginary and ideal situations, where they are allowed to speak English freely without worrying about negative reactions they may get from peers if they speak in English. If the purpose of the questionnaire was to examine their motivation or willingness to communicate in such ideal situations, of course, the results would be useful. However, if the purpose of the questionnaire was to understand learners’ motivation and willingness to communicate in real situations (e.g., classroom), then a greater variety of situations needs to be specified including, for example, speaking English in front of close classmates during group work in class.

Third, this study showed that language socialization is a useful theoretical framework to explain language learning in the EFL context. There appears to be an assumption in the L2
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There was one exchange student from an English speaking country. Since the exchange student was a native speaker of English, he was not required to attend English classes.
language socialization literature that the issues are specific to a dichotomy of newcomers (or novices) and old timers (or experts). However, as Duff (2007) and Zuengler and Cole (2005) claim, these dichotomous categories can be a problem in explaining situations, where such a dichotomy does not exist. For example, in my study, all of my participants entered high school at the same time, had stayed in the same classroom since then, and all of them were learners of English. Therefore, they were all old timers as classmates, and simultaneously they were all newcomers as English learners. This profile does not match the type of participants examined in most second language socialization studies. Nonetheless, the theory of language socialization has served as a cogent explanation of learners’ linguistic behaviours and attitudes in this study. Therefore, this study is an example of how the theory of language socialization can also be extended to EFL contexts and others, where clear dichotomous categories of newcomers and old timers are non-existent.

Finally, the importance of social perspectives in second language acquisition research has been confirmed in this study (e.g., Block, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997, 1998; Hall, 1997; Zuengler & Miller, 2006). The results support the claim that cognitive, social and affective factors of L2 learning (e.g., investment) complement each other (Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003). That is, one of the reasons for the positive effects of FF activities on L2 language use was that it encouraged learners to further invest in L2 communication, providing them with useful linguistic, identity, and interactional resources for L2 learning. These results complement the findings of cognitively-oriented interaction-based SLA studies. That is, as a result of learner investment in L2 communication during FF communication and practice, learners had opportunities, for example, to notice the gap, to raise their awareness about their own and others’ utterances, to receive corrective feedback and to modify their utterances. Without investment in communication, these opportunities would not be available for or accepted by learners.

7.5. Pedagogical Implications

This study showed that grammar was used by learners as a tool to further invest in L2 communication. That is, learners asked and discussed grammar questions in order to establish their identities as L2 learners, which led to further communication in English. Many Japanese teachers of English have expressed their worries and concerns that they have difficulty communicating fluently in English, while they have a great knowledge of grammar (e.g., Amaki,
The results of this study suggest that their background in grammar can help to encourage L2 communication among students. Even though learners in this study did communicate in English during FF activities without constant support from teachers, it was also found that teachers’ assistance with grammar was enough to encourage students to continue communication in the L2. Therefore, EFL teachers’ knowledge about grammar is a valuable resource for their students to invest in L2 communication. The current English curriculum in Japanese high schools that focuses on communicative language teaching can be improved by exercising teachers’ knowledge about grammar and by training them in the use of instructional techniques that draw students’ attention to grammar during communicative activities.

I conducted this study because, as a high school teacher, I wanted to know why my students started communicating in English when I asked them to focus on grammar during communicative activities, while they resisted speaking English when I asked them to participate in communicative activities with no focus on form. Also, as a learner of English, I was interested to discover why I have an ambivalent desire to speak English. Like my participants, I hesitate to speak English in front of my Japanese friends, although I have been dreaming of becoming a fluent English speaker. As my participants said, the main reason for this hesitation is that it is uncomfortable and embarrassing to show a different self when speaking an L2 to your peers with whom you share an L1. This study showed that the participants were more likely to speak English even in front of their friends only after establishing their identities as language learners through publicly displaying and discussing grammar questions during FF activities. Therefore FF activities can provide learners with more opportunities to practice English in EFL classrooms, where students may, otherwise, feel uncomfortable about speaking English in front of their friends. Considering the very limited opportunities to use English in EFL contexts, the use of activities focused on form and meaning rather than activities focused exclusively on meaning may be one way of helping learners to get closer to their dream of becoming fluent English speakers.
7.6. Strengths and Limitations of the Study and Future Directions

As with all research undertakings, there are strengths and limitations to this study. The theoretical strengths include examining the effects of FF and MF activities on L2 learners’ language use from a social perspective. Previous research that has investigated the effects of form and meaning-based instruction on L2 development has explained their effects primarily from cognitive perspectives, including but not restricted to theories related to information processing, learnability, noticing, awareness and linguistic markedness. To my knowledge no other study has taken a social perspective on the impact of FF and MF activities on L2 learners’ use of the target language. Drawing on second language socialization theory (Duff, 2007), the results indicate that during FF activities, learners co-constructed discursive practices, using linguistic resources (e.g., target grammar forms) to have access to identity and interactional resources. These linguistic, identity, and interactional resources jointly supported learners’ investment in L2 communication. In other words, in the discursive practices during FF activities, learners used the target grammar as a tool to establish their identities as language learners, which symbolized the asymmetrical relations between L2 learners and L2 speakers. Interestingly, my participants seemed to prefer to identify themselves as L2 learners rather than L2 speakers. After establishing their identities as learners, they entered into L2 communication with more investment in it. Therefore, the results of this study suggest that FF activities can be viewed as beneficial for learning not only from a cognitive perspective but from a social perspective as well. That is, while there is accumulating evidence that FF activities contribute more positively to L2 development than activities that focus exclusively on meaning, the results of this study suggest that FF activities also create a social context for learning that enables learners to use the target language with more engagement and greater investment than in exclusively meaning-focused activities.

In terms of the methodology and analysis, the strength of this study is that I was able to investigate the effects of FF activities on learner investment, utilizing methods associated with cognitively-oriented research (e.g., quasi-experimental design, motivation questionnaire) and those associated with ethnographic methods (e.g., field notes, diaries, and interviews). In particular, I used discursive practices as an analytic tool and examined interactions that are often coded as “miscellaneous” and are not discussed in most cognitively-based instructed SLA studies (see Block, 2003 for further discussion). These “miscellaneous” interactions present learners’
humorous language play and their anger toward a classmate’s fluent English use. Also, discursive practices in two different types of activities (i.e., FF and MF activities) exhibited different linguistic, identity, and interactional resources available for learners. In other words, by utilizing both cognitively oriented and ethnographic methods, this study illustrated participants’ language socialization behaviours including what they did using language, what linguistic behaviours were accepted, and what identities were welcome and co-constructed using language.

This study also responds to the call for further investigation on adolescent learners in EFL classroom contexts. As Duff (2005) points out, while there has been considerable research with adult EFL learners in university contexts, there has been little research in EFL classes in high school. As indicated above, there were considerable differences in the behaviours of the participants who took part in the pilot study compared with those in the main study. The pilot participants were mainly Japanese undergraduate students studying English in Canada and the main study participants were high school EFL students in Japan. Even though the same instructional materials were used with both groups, the older learners in Canada completed all activities in English, while the younger learners in Japan used a very limited amount of English. This could be due to age differences, the ESL/EFL contextual difference, or the combination of both. Similar to a language socialization study on Thai children’s use of standard Thai and vernacular Thai at school as reported in Howard (2008), the results of this study showed that the “language practice of the peer group” (Howard, 2008, p. 193) was more important for my high school participants than the language practice that the teachers expected them to adapt. As both Aiko and Mika said during the interviews, they spoke mostly in Japanese and did not want to speak English in front of their Japanese peers even though the teachers told them to speak English during the class.

This study analyzed oral production data from relatively natural conversations among students during FF and MF activities, with little influence from the teacher or researcher. Although there are many studies that have analyzed learners’ oral production in similar contexts, most of the data come from interactions between a learner and a researcher or native speaker (e.g. Loewen, 2005; Spada & Lightbown, 1993 Mackey, 1999; Mackey & Philp, 1998). While there are some studies that have examined more extensive use of learners’ speech production with peers during form and meaning-based classroom interaction (e.g., Williams, 1999), they are
few in number. Thus, this study contributes useful oral data from a population of under-researched EFL learners engaged in peer interaction during FF and MF activities.

Somewhat ironically, the above-mentioned strengths can also be viewed as limitations of this study. For example, while it can be argued that the use of both cognitive and social perspectives is a strength, it can also be argued that because the study is ‘hybrid’ in nature it does not wholly represent one perspective or the other. For example, this study did not have a pretest-posttest design or a control group, which are important elements in cognitively-based research in order to examine whether learning has occurred or not. On the other hand, in this research I did not “shadow” any of the participants wherever they were at school or outside of school over a long period of time, which is essential for socially-oriented ethnographic studies that have examined learner investment. In sum, the limitation of this study is that neither perspective was fully exploited theoretically or methodologically.

Similarly, the strength of the natural interactional data was also the limitation of the study. That is, I had little control over the quality of the data. For example, I set the angles of the video cameras at the beginning of the instructional treatment lessons and touched them as little as possible during the lessons because I did not want to interfere with the participants’ interactions. Although I was able to obtain the audio data of natural interactions among participants with little influence of a researcher or presence of the cameras, I was not always able to obtain the visual data of the interactional behaviours, such as facial expressions, body movements, gestures, and eye movements due to a limited control over the angle of the cameras. Placing multiple cameras for each group might have solved this problem, but it was not practical or possible in the current study.

In addition, due to a lack of control over classroom management outside the treatment lessons, some data seemed to have been affected by events outside the treatment lessons. For instance, I noticed that there were clear differences in the number of utterances between the first sessions (i.e., Day 1 and Day 2) and the second sessions (i.e., Day 3 and Day 4). I asked the homeroom teacher whether something had happened between the two sessions. He told me that he scolded the students for being too loud during the class and told them to be quiet between the first and second sessions. Since I have also been a homeroom teacher at a high school in Japan, I totally understand the necessity and importance of what he did. Similarly, I had no control over the influence of school events on students’ behaviours. The homeroom teacher also told me that
the students were excited about the upcoming school sport festival during the first sessions and thus their behaviours were active, energetic, and dynamic. However, they were out of energy after the sports festival and were quieter during the second sessions. Although this is an expected part of doing classroom research and reflects the reality of the classroom, teachers, and students, it also means that the activities were not as controlled as one might expect for example in laboratory-based research.

Another limitation of the study relates to the instructional materials. First, although I counterbalanced the effects of tasks by assigning two FF activities and MF activities to two groups of participants, some activities were more open-ended and others were more closed with explicit instruction/guidance. Therefore, some might argue that the amount of communication might have been affected by the existence or lack of explicit instruction/guidance, rather than type of instruction (i.e., FF and MF). However, the results of turn analysis and stimulated recalls did not reveal that the existence or lack of clear instruction/guidance affected the number of turns in L2. For example, the activities with explicit instruction/guidance were (1) Activity 1 on Day 1; (2) Day Activities; and (3) Day 4 Activities (see Appendix B). As Tables 14 and 15 showed, there did not seem to be any pattern in the amount of L2 communication in relation to explicit instruction/guidance. Furthermore, none of the participants mentioned the explicit instruction/guidance during stimulated recalls, while some mentioned the grammar instruction. Thus, it did not seem that the explicit instruction/guidance affected the amount of L2 communication. Second, some activities were not as interesting as others to the high school participants. According to the recorded interactional data, one of the focal participants complained about an activity on their future dreams. She said that she was tired of this type of activity about future dreams because she had done similar activities in different English classes since she had entered high school and she already knew the future dreams of her classmates. For the pilot study participants, on the other hand, this dream activity was the most popular because they did not know each other well and were interested in each other’s dreams. Therefore, more care could have been taken in the design and preparation of the materials. This could have included, for example, a survey of the participants’ preferences of activity types and/or conducting a pilot study with the same population.49

49 I had originally planned to conduct a pilot study with high school ESL learners in Canada. However, it was not possible to find a school. Therefore, I chose participants who were similar in
Methodological limitations include the procedures of stimulated recalls and interviews. First, as explained in the methodology chapter, I had to change the modality of stimulated recalls from oral to written recalls because the computer lab was not available. Although written stimulated recalls allowed me to collect data from a group of participants at one time within a short period, their written recalls might have been less spontaneous than the oral recalls. However, Krauskopf (1963) demonstrated that written stimulated recalls can be substituted for oral stimulated recalls as a data collection method. By presenting validity and reliability of written stimulated recalls, he recommended the use of written stimulated recalls for classroom studies to obtain data from many students at one time. These findings are encouraging for researchers who are interested in using written stimulated recalls in classroom studies.

The interview procedures were also challenging because I noticed that most students appeared to be more eager to respond to my questions after I finished interviewing them, thanked them for coming to the interview, and closed my files. Most students talked for more than 10 or 15 additional minutes and some went on for more than one hour! They seemed to be eager to tell me about their lives as high school students and learners of English in Japan. In other words, many of my participants expanded their interview responses after I thought the interview session had been completed. Of course, I was interested in their stories, and I did not stop them talking. This experience often made me wonder why they did not tell these stories during the interview sessions. Did they need some time to think about the interview questions? Did the formality of the interview make them too nervous to provide much detail? Did they feel time pressure to respond to my questions? It would be useful to consider these factors in preparation for future interviews.

Lastly, there were 24 participants, including 10 focal students. Therefore, the sample size was too small to conduct any statistical testing. Thus, this study did not tell us whether investment in L2 communication during FF activities contributed to L2 learning. This question about L2 learning was originally included as a research question, but I excluded it because it was not practical to recruit a large sample size from more than one classroom to measure learning. In addition, the trade-off associated with having a larger population would have meant less in-depth qualitative analyses of fewer participants. Thus, I decided to focus on 10 focal students for the detailed qualitative analyses of their investment in L2 communication.

terms of L1 background, age, and proficiency level.
With these limitations of this study, I would like to conduct a study with a larger sample size utilizing both ethnographic and psychometric methodologies to investigate both social and cognitive factors of language learning in the future. First, in addition to the pretest-posttest design to see the growth of second language knowledge, I would like to measure the growth of learners’ actual interactional utterances both individually and as a group over time. Since this study presented collaborative group oral production as a form of incomplete turn-constructional-units, the results suggest that learners do not always produce sentences individually and that they sometimes intentionally stop their utterances and give others the floor to continue the sentence in their real lives. Therefore, I would like to measure learners’ utterances not only individually but also as a group.

Second and as a prerequisite for what I have just said, it is important to develop measurement instruments and scoring rubrics by thoroughly examining the constructs of oral communication in different contexts (e.g., EFL high school classrooms and adult ESL schools). For example, this study showed that learners’ utterances and their investment in L2 communication were greatly influenced by interlocutors’ verbal (e.g., incomplete turn-constructional-units and repetitions) and non-verbal behaviours (e.g., “go ahead” sings). Thus, different from traditional speaking tests, the constructs of oral communication may need to cover wider ranges of behaviours, such as giving others the floor, showing engagement in conversation verbally and non-verbally, and continuing the conversation by producing appropriate words and phrases. Such measurement instruments and scoring rubrics might provide us with new insights about what communication is in different contexts, what verbal and non-verbal behaviours are expected in a given situation, and what a learner has accomplished through communication.

Lastly, I would like to examine whether the results are applicable to other contexts with different populations and with different languages. This study showed that the Japanese high school students used grammar (i.e., linguistic resources) to publicly demonstrate their identities as language learners before further investing in L2 communication. They needed to do so because speaking English had a risk to be considered as a “show off” among them and it might cause negative reactions from peers. Therefore, FF activities helped learners invest in L2 communication. While writing this thesis, I began to wonder whether I obtained these results because it was English that they were learning and because it was the adolescent female population that I targeted in this study. What if the target language was Japanese, what if the
population was elementary school students or university students, and what if the study was conducted in more multilingual contexts, such as in Canada? Similar to the Japanese high school participants in this study, do they use grammar to establish their learner identities before further investing in L2 communication during FF activities? More empirical studies are necessary to answer these questions.

7.7. Conclusion

This study revealed that EFL learners at a Japanese high school were more willing to communicate in English after establishing their identities as English learners through displaying grammar difficulty and discussing grammar questions. Thus, the results suggest that FF activities help learners to invest in L2 communication, which may in turn lead to further L2 learning. The results of this study also provide support for the claim that social and cognitive processes complement each other in fostering L2 learning. More research to examine a larger number of participants from a variety of L1 backgrounds, ages, and learning contexts is needed to confirm these findings. It is hoped that future studies will examine L2 learning from social and cognitive perspectives to better understand learners, the learning processes, and the learning situations. Such research will contribute in important ways to the provision of better second language education.
References


Suzuki, J. (2010). Eigoryokuteika no gennin to taisaku: Gutaiteki jirei to jisshou deta wo fumaete [Reasons for the decrease in English proficiency and solutions for it: Empirical data]. In H. Yokokawa (Chair), Chukodai no eigoryoku no teika wo dou sapoto suruka: Ima motomerareru eigoryoku towa? [How to stop the decrease in English proficiency among junior high school, senior high school, and university students: What kind of English ability is essential?]. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the 36th annual meeting of the Japan Society of English Language Education, Kansai University, Osaka, Japan.


Yokokawa, H. (Chair). (2010). Chukodai no eigoryoku no teika wo dou sapoto suruka: Ima motomerareru eigoryoku towa? [How to stop the decrease in English proficiency among junior high school, senior high school, and university students: What kind of English ability is essential?]. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the 36th annual meeting of the Japan Society of English Language Education, Kansai University, Osaka, Japan.


Appendix A

The COLT Scheme for Post Hoc Observations

Based on the COLT Part A Scheme by Spada and Fröhlich (1995)

Teacher(s) ______________________________________________________________________
Lesson ___________________________________________ Visit Number _______________________
Date ____________________________________________ Page ______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication Patterns</th>
<th>Lang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
<td>Student [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear Lucy,

Thank you very much for your letter. I am very happy that you are interested in studying in Japan as an exchange student. I would like to answer your questions about Takano and Tokyo. Use as many comparatives as possible (出来るだけ比較級を使いなさい).

Environment:

Life style:

Public transportation:

House:

Food:

People:

---

You would like Lucy to study as an exchange student in Takano rather than in Tokyo. You asked your classmates to make a collection of commercials to advertise Takano and send it to Lucy. Work in a group and make a 30-second commercial so that Lucy will choose Takano rather than Tokyo. Create a commercial script. Use as many comparatives as possible (出来るだけ比較級を使いなさい).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Activity 1**  
(First 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period) |

**Letter 1:**

I have a great homestay family, but I have a problem only during dinner time. There is another Japanese girl who stays with us. She is a very kind and nice person, but her fluent English often makes me feel uncomfortable. At the dinner table, the girl and the host family talk very fast, and I usually cannot understand what they are talking about. I want to join their conversation, but I cannot. Then, I feel lonely and isolated during dinner time every night. What would you do, if you were me?

*Please use as many imaginative conditionals as possible.*

**Letter 1:**

I have a great homestay family, but I have a problem only during dinner time. There is another Japanese girl who stays with us. She is a very kind and nice person, but her fluent English often makes me feel uncomfortable. At the dinner table, the girl and the host family talk very fast, and I usually cannot understand what they are talking about. I want to join their conversation, but I cannot. Then, I feel lonely and isolated during dinner time every night. What would you do, if you were me?

| Activity 2  
(Second 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period) |

**Letter 2:**

Hello. I have been with the host family for a couple of months, and I have felt frustrated with the meals that they provide me. I am smaller than the host family members. So, the host family mother assumes that I do not eat a lot, and she provides me with small amount of dinner. She once asked me, “Is this enough for you?” and I answered, “OK.” Since then, she has provided me with very small amount of meals. I always feel hungry, but I cannot say that I want to eat more because I am afraid it may not be polite. Could you please let me know what you would do, if you were me?

*Please use as many imaginative conditionals as possible.*

**Letter 2:**

Hello. I have been with the host family for a couple of months, and I have felt frustrated with the meals that they provide me. I am smaller than the host family members. So, the host family mother assumes that I do not eat a lot, and she provides me with small amount of dinner. She once asked me, “Is this enough for you?” and I answered, “OK.” Since then, she has provided me with very small amount of meals. I always feel hungry, but I cannot say that I want to eat more because I am afraid it may not be polite. Could you please let me know what you would do, if you were me?
### Day 3

#### Activity 1
(First 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period)

Work together with your group members and answer the following questions. **Please use as many passives as possible** (出来るだけ受動態を使って答えなさい).

1. What languages are studied at high schools in Australia? Give three examples.
2. How many sister-city relationships have been made between Australia and Japan?
3. How many working holiday visas are issued to the Japanese people to work in Australia every year?
4. What was imported the most from Japan to Australia last year?
5. When you were in Australia, did you notice any Japanese culture there? What types of Japanese cultures were introduced to Australia?

#### Activity 2
(Second 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period)

Please read the passages on the posters and answer the questions. **Please use as many passives as possible** (出来るだけ受動態を使いなさい).

1. What languages are studied at high schools in Australia? Give three examples.
2. How many sister-city relationships have been made between Australia and Japan?
3. How many working holiday visas are issued to the Japanese people to work in Australia every year?
4. What was imported the most from Japan to Australia last year?
5. When you were in Australia, did you notice any Japanese culture there? What types of Japanese cultures were introduced to Australia?
6. When you were in Australia, were you asked about Japan? What kinds of questions were you asked about Japan?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>Activity 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(First 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period)</td>
<td>(Second 15 minutes during the 30-minute treatment period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity 1

What is your dream? What do you want to be in the future? People have dreams, and they try hard to make the dreams come true. Ask your group members the following questions. **Use as many structures, “I find/think it---that/to/ing---,” as possible** (出来るだけ I find/think it---that/to/ing の構文を使って答えなさい).

1. What is your dream? What do you want to be in the future?
2. What do you find attractive about your dream?
3. What do you think important to make the dream come true?

### Activity 2

Each member has a card describing a job. Exchange the information and answer the following questions. **Use as many “I find/think it---that/to/ing” structures as possible** (出来るだけ I find/think it---that/to/ing の構文を使いなさい).

1. What do you find necessary to become a Japanese language teacher? Why?
2. What do you find surprising about becoming an announcer? Why?
3. What do you find attractive about becoming a translator? Why?
4. What do you find interesting about becoming a flight attendant? Why?
5. What do you find important to become a high school English teacher? Why?

---

**Note.** Day 1 activities were adapted from Larsen-Freeman, Badalamenti, and Stanchina (1997). The stories of Day 2 activities were adapted from [http://www.koukou-ryugaku.net/story](http://www.koukou-ryugaku.net/story) and the activities were adapted from Dave’s ESL Café. Day 4 activities were adapted from Larsen-Freeman, Frodesen, and Erying (1997) and Shimozaki (2007).
### Appendix C

**Sample Items of Questionnaires (Yashima, 2002)**

#### A. Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think I spend fairly long hours studying English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. After I graduate from high school, I will continue to study English and try to improve.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compared to my classmates, I think I study English relatively heard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find studying English more interesting than other subjects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I have assignments to do in English, I try to do them immediately.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Attitude toward the international community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Studying English is important to me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Studying English is important to me because I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I want to make friends with international students studying in Japan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I often read and watch news about foreign countries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I want to live in a foreign country.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Communication Confidence in L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale 0</th>
<th>Scale 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Talking in a small group of strangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking in a small group of acquaintances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Talking in a small group of friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talking with an acquaintance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Talking with a friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D. Willingness to communicate (WTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale 0</th>
<th>Scale 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Talking to a friend while standing in line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talking to a stranger while standing in line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Talking to an acquaintance while standing in line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talking in a large meeting of friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Talking in a large meeting of strangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
A Complete Questionnaire of the Japanese Version (Yashima, 2002. Adapted with permission. The original questionnaire can be obtained from T. Yashima’s website at http://www2.ipcku.kansai-u.ac.jp/~yashima/index.html)

これは英語学習とコミュニケーションについての調査です。それぞれの問題を良く読み指示に従って回答してください。回答はまとめて統計的に処理いたします。成績など個人的な影響は全くありませんので、正直にお答えください。この調査について質問があれば調査責任者に尋ねてください。御協力お願いいたします。

調査責任者
トロント大学大学院 富田恭代

May, 2008
記入日 月 日 名前_________________ 性別 （ 男 ・ 女 ）

Part I
1. 3月の修学旅行以外で、これまでに海外旅行や滞在の経験はありますか。あてはまるものを一つ選んでください。尚海外に行ったことのある人はその行き先も書いてください。六ヶ月以上の人のはその期間も書いてください。

a. 日本から一歩も出たことはない。
b. 二週間以内の旅行経験はある。 行き先_____________
c. 二週間を超えて三ヶ月以内の滞在をした。 行き先_____________
d. 三ヶ月を超えて六ヶ月以内の滞在をした。 行き先_____________
e. 六ヶ月を超えた滞在経験がある 行き先_____________ 期間___________

2. 中・高等学校の授業以外で英語を勉強した経験についてお答えください。
1） 小学生の時、塾や英会話学校で______年 勉強した。
2） 中学生の時、塾や英会話学校で______年 勉強した。
3） 英語圏に______年_______ヶ月滞在していたことがある。

これから尋ねる質問には正しい答えも間違った答えもありません。正直に自分の気持ちを表しているものを、手早く選んでください。
4. 以下のこととは、あなたにどの程度当てはまりますか。まったく当てはまる場合は 1、完全に当てはまる場合は 7を選んでください。あるいは、その間であなたの気持ちを最もよく表すと思う数字に○をつけてください。学校の成績には全く関係ありませんので正直に答えてください。
（例 自分は数学が好きだ 1 ---- 2 ---- 3 ---- 4 ---- 5 ---- 6 ---- 7）
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全く自分には
あてはまらない
全く違う
全く同じで
そのとおりだ

1) 自分の同級生と比べてよく英語を勉強する 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
2) 英語の授業で習ったことや英語についてよく考える 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
3) 学校で教科として英語がなくても自分で学習したい 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
4) 平均すると英語の勉強に時間をかける方である 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
5) 私は英語を学習する気が十分にある 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
6) 高校卒業後も英語を勉強したり、なんらかの形で英語力を向上に勉める 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
7) 英語の宿題はできるだけ早く取り組む 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
8) 授業に関係がなくても英語で新聞や雑誌を読んでもみたい 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
9) 英語の勉強中は内容に興味をもって集中できる 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
10) できることなら学校の英語の時間を増やしてほしい 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
11) 英語は学校で必ず教えられるべきである 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
12) 他の科目に比べて英語は興味がもてる 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7

5. あなたにとって英語の学習はどのような意味がありますか。次に示す英語の学習の理由がどれぐらい自分に当てはまるか、最もあなたの気持ちをよく表すところに○をしてください。

全く自分には
あてはまらない
全く違う
完全に当て
はまる
そのとおりだ

英語を勉強する理由
1) より多くの多様な人々と会って話ができるから 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
2) 将来就職に役立つと思うので 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
3) インターネットを使うのに必要だから 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
4) 英語が話せるいろいろな文化を知り、文化背景の異なる人々と知り合えるから 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
5) 英語の検定試験などに挑戦するため 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
6) 英語が話せると異文化の人々の活動に自由に参加できるので 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
7) 英語で情報や知識を得るため 1 --- 2 --- 3 --- 4 --- 5 --- 6 --- 7
8) 英語は自分が将来つきたい仕事に必要だから
9) 外国人と友達になりたいので
10) 英語を話せると教養があると評価されるので
11) アメリカ人やイギリス人を理解し
生活様式を知ることができるものから
12) 英米の文化に興味があるから

Part II
これから日本に滞在している外国人（異文化背景をもつ人）に関する質問をいたします。この場合外国人とは、勉強や仕事などが目的で日本へ滞在しているアジア、アフリカ、ヨーロッパ、オセアニア、アメリカの人を指します。旅行者も含みます。滞在期間が長期に及ぶ人もいるでしょう。あなたが、主観的に文化背景が異なると考える人を思い浮かべて回答してください。

あなたは、留学生や外国人の先生などの友人知人がいますか。あてはまるものを一つ選んでください。

a. _____ 外国人で親しくしている友人がいる。
b. _____ 外国人で一般的な話をする友人はいる。
c. _____ 外国人で挨拶する程度の人はいる。
d. _____ 外国人で話をしたことがある人はいるが、その後会っていない。
e. _____ 外国人と話したことはない。
f. _____ 外国人で話したことがあるのは英語の先生だけだ。

1. 以下のことは、あなたにどの程度当てはまりますか。これまでと同じように自分にあてはまるところに○をしてください。

- 完全に当てはまる
- ほぼ当てはまる
- あまり当てはまらない
- 全く当てはまらない

1) 日本に来ている留学生など外国人と
2) 故郷の街からあまり出たくない
3) 外国の人の言動に違和感を感じることがある。
4) 外国に関するニュースをよく見たり、
5) 外国人と話すのを避けられれば避ける方だ。
6) 日本以外の国に住んでみたい
7) 自分と習慣や価値観の異なる人より似た人と
8) 日本の学校で留学生がいれば気軽に声かけようと思う。
9) 国連など国際機関で働いてみたい
10) 習慣や価値観の異なる人と協力して物事をする  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    のは困難だと思う。
11) 外国の情勢や出来事について家族や友人と  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    よく話し合うほうだ
12) 留学生や外国人の学生と寮やアパートなどで  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    ルームメートになってもよいと思う。
13) 青年海外協力隊などの途上国でのボランティア活動に興味がある
14) 自分に似た考え方、価値観をもった人の方が  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    すぐれていると思う。

    全く自分には
    完全に当てはまらない
    全く違う そのとおりだ

15) 国際的な問題に強い関心をもっている  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16) 地域の外国人を世話するようなボランティア  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    活動に参加してみたい。
17) 海外の出来事は私たちの日常生活にあまり関係  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    ないと思う
18) もし、隣に外国の人が越してきたら  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    困ったなと思う
19) 海外のニュースにはあまり興味がない  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20) 習慣や価値観の異なる人は信用できない。  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21) 海外出張の多い仕事は避けたい  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22) レストランや駅で言葉が通じず困っている  1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    外国人がいれば進んで助けると思う。

2. あなたは、次のような状況でどの程度英語でコミュニケーションをしましたか。高校
    に入学してからの約1年を振り返って、自分の行動に最も近いところに○をしてくださ
    い。

1) 英語の授業中自分からすすんで発表したり質問したりした。
    全くなかった  たまにあった  時々あった  よくあった  非常に頻繁にあった

    0............1............2............3............4............5............6............7............8............9

2) 英語の授業中先生に指名されて発言した。
    全くなかった  たまにあった  時々あった  よくあった  非常に頻繁にあった

    0............1............2............3............4............5............6............7............8............9
3) ペアワークなど教室内の活動に参加した。
全くなかった  たまにあった  時々あった  よくあった  非常に頻繁にあった
0.........1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7.........8.........9

4) 授業外で先生に英語で質問したり話をした。
全くなかった  たまにあった  時々あった  よくあった  非常に頻繁にあった
0.........1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7.........8.........9

5) 学校外の友人や知り合いと英語で話をした。
全くなかった  たまにあった  時々あった  よくあった  非常に頻繁にあった
0.........1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7.........8.........9

Part III
A
英語で人とコミュニケーションをとるときに、あなたがどう感じるかについて、12の
状況について答えていただきます。 それぞれの状況において、どれくらいのパーセンテージで
不安を感じるか、下線の上に書いてください。正しい答えも間違った答えも
ありません。
すばやく第一印象を記していくのが一番よいやり方です。
例1：知らない人と英語で話す時、全く不安を感じないのであれば、0 や10 などの数字を
書いてください。
_______ 1. 知らない人と話すとき

例2：半分ぐらいの場合に不安を感じるのであれば、40, 50, 60 などあなたにとって
最も適切と思われる数字を記してください。
_______ 1. 知らない人と話すとき

例3：ほとんどいつも不安を感じるのであれば、90 や100 など大きな数字を記してください。
_______ 1. 知らない人と話すとき

0%  ---------------------------------------------------------- 100%
英語を喋るのは                  英語を喋るのは
決して不安を感じない              いつも不安を感じる

英語で話す状況 （日本の国内や外国でおこりうる状況です）
(こういう状況を経験したことがなくても想像で回答して下さい。）
_______ 1. 知り合いの小グループで会話をするとき
英語でコミュニケーションしなければならないような状況を次に示します。効果的なコミュニケーションをする力は、人により大きな差があり、同じ人でも状況により差が出ることがあります。下に示すそれぞれの状況で、あなたのコミュニケーション能力はどのくらいだと考えるか書いてください。0%から100%の間の数字を書いてください。

これはあなたの英語を話す力を問うものです。

| 0% | 100% |
|--------------------------------|
| 全く能力がない | 十分に能力がある |
| （全くできない） | （大変上手である） |

英語でコミュニケーションする状況（日本の国内や外国でおこりうる状況です）
(こういう状況を経験したことがなくても想像で回答して下さい。)

______ 1. 知らない人の一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をする

______ 2. 知り合いと会話する

______ 3. 友人の大きな集まり（会議）で発言する

______ 4. 知らない人の大きな集まり（会議）で発言するとき

______ 5. 知らない人の小グループで会話をするとき

______ 6. 友人の大きな集まり（会議）で発言するとき

______ 7. 友人と会話をするとき

______ 8. 知り合いの大きな集まり（会議）で発言するとき

______ 9. 知り合いと会話するとき

______ 10. 知り合いの一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をするとき

______ 11. 知らない人と会話するとき

______ 12. 友人の小グループで会話をするとき
C. 英語でコミュニケーションをするかしないかを選択するような状況を、下に20示します。コミュニケーションをするかしないかは、全くあなたの自由だと仮定してく
ださい。それぞれの状況において、どれぐらいのパーセンテージでコミュニケーションすると思うか考えてください。（日本の国内もしくは外国でおこりうる状況です）。下線の上に、そのパーセンテージを記入してください。その状況で絶対にしないという
場合は0、必ずするという場合は100となります。すべて英語で話す状況です。

絶対コミュニケーション

必ずコミュニケーション

例：_______ 1. 英語の先生と話す
英語で話す状況（こういう状況を経験したことがなくても想像で回答して下さい。）

_______ 1. ガソリンスタンドの店員と話す
_______ 2. 医者と話す
_______ 3. 知らない人の一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をする
_______ 4. 何かを待つ列に並んでいるとき知り合いと会話をする
_______ 5. 店で店員と話をする

_______ 4. 知らない人の小グループで会話をする
_______ 5. 友人と会話をする
_______ 6. 知り合いの小グループで会話をする
_______ 7. 知り合いの大きな集まり（会議）で発言する
_______ 8. 知らない人と会話
_______ 9. 友人の一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をする
_______ 10. 知らない人の大きな集まり（会議）で発言する
_______ 11. 友人の小グループで会話する
_______ 12. 知り合いの一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をする
6. 友人の大きな集まり（会議）で発言する
7. 警察官・婦人警官と話をする
8. 知らない人の小グループで会話をする
9. 何かを待つ列に並んでいるとき友人と会話をする
10. レストランでウェイター・ウェイトレスと話をする
11. 知り合いの大きな集まり（会議）で発言する
12. 何かを待つ列に並んでいるとき知らない人と会話をする
13. 秘書と話をする
14. 友人の一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をする
15. 知り合いの小グループで会話をする
16. ごみを集めにくる係員と話す
17. 知らない人の大きな集まり（会議）で発言する
18. ボーイフレンド・ガールフレンドと話す
19. 友人の小グループで会話をするとき
20. 知り合いの一団にスピーチ（プレゼンテーション）をする

Thank you for your cooperation!
Appendix E
The COLT Scheme For Post Hoc Observations
Based on the COLT Part B Scheme by Spada and Fröhlich (1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>On task</th>
<th>Off task</th>
<th>Manage</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>Pred. Give</th>
<th>Unpre. Give</th>
<th>Pseudo Request</th>
<th>Gen. Request</th>
<th>1 word</th>
<th>2 or 3 words</th>
<th>Longer than 3 words</th>
<th>Reaction to Form</th>
<th>Reaction to Mean</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Clarification Request</th>
<th>Elaboration Request</th>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Reading Aloud</th>
<th>To Teacher</th>
<th>To Peers</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

211
Appendix F

Emotional Temperature: English Translation (Imai, 2007. Adapted with permission.)

Group [     ] Name

Emotional Temperature Questionnaire

For each of the emotions/moods below, please decide whether you (1) don’t feel at all; (2) hardly feel; (3) uncertain; (4) feel; or (5) strongly feel and circle the appropriate number. If there is no word to describe your current emotional or mood state in the list appropriately, please describe it in your own words in the bottom space. You don’t need to specify the cause, reason or the object of your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t feel at all</th>
<th>Strongly feel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enjoyment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Boredom</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hope</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxiety</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anticipatory joy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hopelessness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relief</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Outcome-related joy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sadness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pride</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Disappointment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shame/Guilt</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gratitude</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Anger</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Empathy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Jealousy/Envy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Admiration</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Contempt</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sympathy/Love</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Antipathy/Hate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Excitement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<Comments>
Emotional Temperature: Japanese Version (Imai, 2007. Adapted with permission)

**Group [ ] 名前**

**Emotional Temperature Questionnaire**

感情の温度

以下の感情あるいはムードについて、(1) 全く感じない、(2) ほとんど感じない、(3) わからない、(4) 感じる、(5) 非常に強く感じる、のうち、あてはまるものと思われる番号ひとつに○をつけて下さい。もし、あなたの感情やムードを表している言葉がない場合には、下の空欄に自分の言葉で表現してみてください（一語でなくても結構です）。その場合、あなたの感情やムードの原因、理由、または対象については、説明いただかなくても結構です。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>全く感じない</th>
<th>非常に強く感じる</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 楽しみ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 退屈</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 希望</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 不安</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 期待から来る喜び</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 絶望、あきらめ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 安堵</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 達成感から来る喜び</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 悲しみ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 自尊心、プライド</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 失望</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 恥、または罪の意識</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 感謝</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 怒り</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 共感</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 嫉妬</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 賞賛</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 軽蔑</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 思いやり、愛情</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 反感、憎しみ</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 興奮、高揚感</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

＜記述用回答欄＞
Appendix G

Complete Results of Patterns of Communication in L2 English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Expansion</th>
<th>Clar Req</th>
<th>Elb Req</th>
<th>Singing</th>
<th>Read Aloud</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H

**Complete Results of Lengths of Turns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 word</th>
<th>2 or 3 words</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FFI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I

**Complete Results of Word Types, Sentence Types, and Sentence Tokens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Word Types</th>
<th>Number of Sentence Types</th>
<th>Number of Sentence Tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td><strong>FF</strong></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td><strong>FF</strong></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td><strong>MF</strong></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td><strong>MF</strong></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Transcription Conventions Adapted from
Ten Have (2007, pp. 215-216) and Young (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>The onset of overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>The end of overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Latching or no gap between two turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(</td>
<td>A tiny time interval within a turn or between turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>A stressed part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>::</td>
<td>Prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>A cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>A falling tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>A low-rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD</td>
<td>Especially loud sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°</td>
<td>Quieter sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Speeding up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Inability to hear what was said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(word)</td>
<td>Dubious hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( smiles ))</td>
<td>Description of nonverbal action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Italics</em></td>
<td>Utterances originally uttered in Japanese and translated into English by the author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Grammar-Related Episodes (GREs) and Vocabulary-Related Episodes (VREs) Produced by Aiko and Her Peers (Group A)

Utterances in italics represent speech originally produced in Japanese. The number next to the participants’ names represents the number of the turn in the entire exchange of the FF or MF activity on the day. These GREs and VREs described in this appendix only present participants’ utterances and do not include information about their gestures or eye contact.

**GREs during FF Activities**

GRE 1 (Day 1)
See Example 1

GRE 2 (Day 1)
See Example 2

GRE 3 (Day 1)
78 Mr. Matsuda Did you come up with anything?
79 Emi Cleaner is.
80 Aiko *Is cleaner a comparative form?*
81 Mr. Matsuda Yes.

GRE 4 (Day 1)
See Example 3

GRE 5 (Day 1)
161 Aiko People.
162 Hana People are.
163 Aiko People are...Tokyo people are...people. *How about calmly?*
164 Keiko Calm.
GRE 6 (Day 2)
90 Aiko  *If you cannot say... If you can’t say about it.*
91 Hana  Can’t tell. *Isn’t it “tell”? Tell about it.*
92 Aiko  Tell?
93 Hana  About it.

GRE 7 (Day 4)
16 Hana  ((Reading aloud)) What is your dream? What do you want to be in the future? *Okay, okay.*
17 Keiko  I find...I think...I find?
18 Aiko  *Or think?*
19 Keiko  I think it... that...

GRE 8 (Day 4)
73 Aiko  I find it...as possible?
74 Hana  As possible?
75 Emi  As possible?
76 Aiko  *What?*
77 Hana  As possible? *Why? Just let Aiko write “as possible.”*
78 Keiko  I find it interesting.
79 Aiko  *What’s the difference between “as possible” and this?*
80 Keiko  “As possible” is “*possible.”*

**GREs during MF Activities**
GRE 9 (Day 3)
See Example 6

GRE 10 (Day 4)
12 Emi  In order to.
13 Aiko  *What is “in order to”?*
14 Keiko  In order to.
15 Hana  We’ve learned “in order to.” Chika, you want to be a flight attendant, right?

GRE 11 (Day 4)
See Example 5.

VREs during FF Activities

VRE 1 (Day 1)
101 Aiko  Does publish mean public?
102 Emi   What? Trans...transport...transportation.
103 Aiko  Trans...Translate? Translate?
104 Hana  Transportation.
105 Keiko Transportation.
106 Aiko  Oh yeah, that’s right.

VRE 2 (Day 2)
23 Hana  Aussie beef was delicious. It was huge.
24 Aiko  What is Aussie beef?
26 Emi   Hard.
27 Hana  I don’t remember the taste.
28 Emi   Hard.
29 Hana  It was soft.
30 Aiko  It has a character. A pink pig.
31 Hana  A pig? It’s beef.
32 Aiko  Oh, a cow. A pink cow, wearing sunglasses. It said Aussie beef.

VRE 3 (Day 4)
30 Aiko  Seventeen is a wonderful age.
31 Emi   Seventeen sounds great.
32 Aiko  Seventeen sounds really nice.
33 Hana  Sweet seventeen, _right_?
34 Emi  _What is sweet seventeen? Is it sweet? Why is it sweet?_
35 Hana  _Well, are you guys sweet seventeen?_

**VRE 4 (Day 4)**

See Example 7.

**VRE 5 (Day 4)**

125 Mr. Honda  What do you find attractive about your dream?
126 Aiko  Attractive.
127 Hana  ((Hana is singing))
128 Emi  Attractive? Attractive? _Do you know that?_
129 Aiko  Attractive. Wait. I will check it.

**VREs during MF Activities**

**VRE 6 (Day 2)**

75 Hana  You speak very fast.
76 Aiko  Too fast.
77 Hana  Very too fast.
78 Emi  Very /feisto/.
79 Hana  _But right, /feisto/. We write like /feisto/ Fast._
80 Aiko  Like /dan-ge-rousu/.
81 Emi  _Sorry?_
82 Aiko  _Never mind._

**VRE 7 (Day 3)**

1 Junko  _What is “relationship”?_
2 Keiko  _Relationship._
3 Junko  _Huh?_
4 Keiko  _Relationship._
5 Emi.  _Like Friendship. Friendship._
Junko: Does “ship” mean relationship?
Keiko: Not really.

VRE 8 (Day 3)
See turns 22, 23, and 24 in Example 6

VRE 9 (Day 3)
111 Junko: (Reading aloud) What technique was brought to Australia from Japan at the beginning of the 20th century?
112 Aiko: What is import?
113 Junko: The 20th century.
114 Aiko: Does import mean import?
115 Emi: Import. Because it has “in” in it.

VRE 10 (Day 4)
See Example 8.
Appendix L

Grammar-Related Episodes (GREs) and Vocabulary-Related Episodes (VREs) Produced by Mika and Her Peers (Group B)

Utterances in italics represent speech originally produced in Japanese. The number next to the participants’ names represents the number of the turn in the entire exchange of the FF or MF activity on the day. These GREs and VREs described in this appendix only present participants’ utterances and do not include information about their gestures or eye contact.

**GREs during FF Activities**

GRE 1 (Day 1)

39 Sato Are you tire, tire...
40 Tami Are you tired of your life? *Are you tired of your life?*
41 Sato Of your life?

GRE 2 (Day 1)

65 Sato Takano city has.
66 Nao Has.
67 Waka Good.
68 Sato Good many.
69 Nao Good many.
70 Waka Many good. Good many? Many good?
71 Sato Many good, *I think.*

GRE 3 (Day 1)

74 Waka *Is hot spring a countable noun?*
75 Tami *Sorry?*
76 Waka *Can we add “s” to hot spring? Was it U or C? Hot spring...s?*

GRE 4 (Day 1)

104 Sato Do you have plan?
Waka: Anything.

Sato: Do you have your anything plan in this?

Mika: Do you have?

Waka: In summer vacation?

GRE 5 (Day 1)

Waka: You should.
Sato: You.
Waka: Should.
Sato: Drink.
Waka: Drink...water?
Sato: Yep.
Waka: InTakano city.

GRE 6 (Day 1)

Sato: Waters are.
Tami: Are? Groundwater is. Sorry, I am not sure about this.
Waka: That's okay.
Tami: Because, because? They are all groundwater.

GRE 7 (Day 1)

Sato: This plan began.
Tami: It is a good place.
Sato: I got it. Its plan makes you happy.
Tami: It is a good place to live.
Waka: We have to use as many comparatives as possible. It is a good place to live, to live.
Tami: In Takano-city.

GRE 8 (Day 2)

Waka: I would?
If you wanted to talk to them, you should speak to them. *How about using the structure of “it is...for you”?*

*Sato*

*I see. To.*

*Sato*

*It is. Well.*

*Nao*

*For.*

*Sato*

*The sentence with “it- for- to.” It is something.*

*Waka*

*Difficult?*

*Sato*

*Difficult. Difficult for you to.*

*Nao*

*For you.*

*Sato*

*To stay in a foreign country. A foreign country.*

*Waka*

*Another country?*

---

**GRE 9 (Day 3)**

2 *Sato* Australia? *Using passives.*

3 *Nao* Australia.

4 *Tami* What languages are studied at high schools in Australia? *What languages are studied at high schools in Australia?*

5 *Waka* Japanese.

6 *Sato* Studied. *Past tense?*

7 *Tami* It’s studied. What languages are studied? *So?*

8 *Nao* *Passive.*

9 *Tami* It’s a passive voice.

10 *Waka* English are studied.

11 *Sato* English are studied.

---

**GRE 10 (Day 3)**

22 *Sato* *So, we have to use passives.*

23 *Tami* Let’s add “They learn.” *Something is something.* Is learned at high school. At high schools in Australia. *Does this language mean a foreign language?*

24 *Sato* *I don’t know what languages are learned.*
25 Waka  I don’t know.
26 Sato  Japanese?
27 Waka  English is?
28 Tami  Maybe Japanese, French.
29 Sato  Studied by.
30 Tami  We can use this.
31 Sato  In Australia.

GRE 11 (Day 4)
30 Tami  I found it. I find it surprising.
31 Waka  It?
32 Tami  It surprising, surprising.
33 Sato  That.
34 Tami  That...surprising that is it ...it is very competitive.

GRE 12 (Day 4)
40 Tami  To get a job.
41 Mika  To get.
42 Tami  A.
43 Mika  A.
44 Tami  Job.

GRE 13 (Day 4) (see Example 7 in the result chapter)
57 Tami  I find it important.
58 Nao  Interesting.
59 Mr.H  Yeah, yeah.
60 Mika  That? Is this fine? That I need to.
61 Waka  That.
62 Nao  I need to.
63 Mika  Take several English tests.
64 Waka  Several.
**GREs during MF Activities**

GRE 14 (Day 1)

16  Tami  We have a lot of...we have.
17  Sato  We have...good.
18  Tami  Better?
19  Nao  Better than.
20  Sato  Better than.
21  Tami  Better environment?
22  Waka  *Is this correct?*
23  Tami  *I think so.*
24  Sato  Than in Takano city.

GRE 15 (Day 1)

54  Sato  So, Takano city is clean. *Add something.*
55  Waka  City...Are?
56  Sato  *We have to think about the next one.*
57  Tami  Are?
58  Waka  Are.

**VREs during FF Activities**

VRE 1 (Day 1)

50  Sato  Let’s go to hot spring. *Hot spring.*
51  Tami  Hot spring? Hot spring.
52  Sato  Hot spring?
53  Waka  Spa?
54  Sato  *Isn’t it spa?*
55  Mika  Spa?
56  Tami  Spa? Hot spring.
57  Waka  Spa?
58  Tami  Hot spring *is something that is part of nature.*
59 Sato Never mind.

VRE 2 (Day 1) (See Example 1 in the result chapter)
81 Sato Next, you should, should see? Is this okay because we are talking about Mt. Midori?
82 Mika I agree that we can see things from Mt. Midori, but how about climb?
83 Sato I see. Climb? Does climb mean climb?

VRE 3 (Day 1)
86 Tami You should see. You should see, see.
87 Waka View.
88 Tami The view of Mt. Midori. V-i-e-w of Mt. Midori.

VRE 4 (Day 4)
36 Tami Competitive. Com-p-e-t-i-t-i-v-e. V-e.
37 Mika B-e?
38 Tami V. V-e.
39 Mika Sorry?
40 Tami Competitive. V-e.

VRE 5 (Day 4)
79 Nao Time, Time...during flight.
80 Waka (Waka wrote “bring”).
81 Nao It’s “d.”
82 Waka Sorry?
83 Nao D, d.
84 Waka I see.
85 Nao During. Thank you.

VREs during MF Activities
VRE 6 (Day 1)
95  Sato  But it is tire...tire to ride a...
96  Waka  But it is...tired?
97  Sato  Tire.
98  Waka  To use?
99  Sato  To use.
100  Tami  Tiring. To use them because there are.

VRE 7 (Day 1)
107  Waka  There are rush.
108  Sato  Rush. R-u-s-h.
109  Tami  Yeah. R-u-s-h.

VRE 8 (Day 1) (See Example 6 in the result chapter)
120  Sato  Many high. High.
121  Waka  How about tall?
122  Nao  Many tall.
123  Sato  Tall bill.
124  Waka  Tall, right?
125  Sato  Bill? Is bill okay?
126  Waka  Building.
127  Mika  High building.
128  Waka  High?
129  Mika  High, high Building.

VRE 9 (Day 1)
152  Waka  Fruits? Takano city can make? Is this okay?
153  Tami  Product.
154  Nao  Can make.

VRE 10 (Day 2)
116  Waka  How do you say serve in English?
117  Sato  How do you say serve in English?
118  Waka  Take?
119  Tami  It’s Serve, serve, serve.
120  Waka  You serve.
121  Sato  Your dinner...dinner.
122  Waka  Is meal okay?
123  Sato  Yeah.

VRE 11 (Day 4)
26  Mika  What do you find attr..?
27  Mr. M  Attractive.
28  Mika  Attractive about your dream?
29  Waka  What is attractive? What does it mean?
30  Mr. M  What is attractive? In Japanese?
31  Sato  Attractive?
32  Mr. M  Yes.