

**AN EXPLORATORY RESEARCH STUDY INTO
CLASSROOM-BASED TASK REPETITION**

BY

JASON MOSER

Module 2, submitted to the School of Humanities of the University of Birmingham in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD in Applied Linguistics

This paper consists of approximately 21,000 words

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom

October 2008

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background Information | 1 |
| 1.2 Expanding Task Repetition Research | 1 |
| 1.3 Outline and Direction of this Paper | 3 |
| 1.4 Design and Procedure | 4 |
| 1.5 Collecting the Data | 5 |
| | |
| Chapter 2: Measuring Spoken Language Complexity | 8 |
| 2.1 The AS-unit | 8 |
| 2.2 Using Intonation and Hesitation to Identify AS-units | 9 |
| 2.3 The Role of Pausing in Japanese Conversation | 10 |
| 2.4 Subordination and its Problems as a Measure of Complexity | 13 |
| 2.4.1 Lack of Subordination in Conversation | 14 |
| | |
| Chapter 3: Re-conceptualizing Complexity | 17 |
| 3.1 Starting with the AS-unit Length | 17 |
| 3.1.1 Departing from Bygate's Mean Number of Words | 17 |
| 3.2 Establishing a Word-count Benchmark for Complexity | 18 |
| 3.3 General Characteristics of Various AS-unit Lengths | 20 |
| 3.4 Settling on an AS-unit Benchmark for Complexity | 25 |
| 3.5 Measuring Performance Complexity in Dialogical Tasks | 26 |
| 3.6 Identifying Centres of Interest | 32 |
| 3.7 Minimal Requirements for an AS Cluster | 32 |
| 3.8 Unproductive AS Clusters | 33 |

| | | |
|---|---|------------|
| 3.9 | Counting Productive AS Clusters | 37 |
| Chapter 4: Analysis of Four Learners | | 38 |
| 4.1 | Analysis of Two Productive Learners | 38 |
| 4.1.1 | Kazue's and Miho's Task Performances | 38 |
| 4.1.2 | Number of AS-units at the Benchmark | 40 |
| 4.1.3 | Miho's Reconstructed Units | 47 |
| 4.2 | Productive AS Clustering of Kazue and Miho | 49 |
| 4.2.1 | Miho and AS Clusters | 52 |
| 4.3 | Two Unproductive Learners: Naoko and Rie | 55 |
| 4.3.1 | Rie's Production | 59 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion | | 64 |
| 5.1 | Analysis of the Benchmark and AS Cluster | 64 |
| 5.1.1 | Analysis of the AS Cluster | 66 |
| 5.2 | The Nature of Learner Engagement During AS Clustering | 68 |
| 5.3 | Discussion of the Four Learners | 70 |
| 5.4 | Open-ended Feedback Survey with the Four Learners | 71 |
| Appendix 1 | | 78 |
| References | | 128 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background Information

Research over the past decade has demonstrated that task repetition is a useful pedagogical option for teachers trying to ease the processing pressures learners face during task work (see Willis and Willis 2007; Samuda and Bygate 2008). Task repetition is seen to benefit learners in two ways. First, task repetition facilitates easy retrieval of prior content, and thus allows learners wider access to input that can be used to expand production. Second, learners, through freed-up processing capacity, are better able to monitor or attend to language form in subsequent performances. As Bygate and Samuda (2005) demonstrate, this means that learners make better lexical-grammatical selections, and produce better grammatical accuracy. The two benefits apply predominantly to language complexity, rather than to fluency and accuracy (Williams 2005: 676). Orientation towards language complexity on the part of the learner is a key catalyst in language development (see Robinson 2001; Muranoi 2007) because it demonstrates the learner's willingness and ability to stretch his or her interlanguage, which ultimately facilitates interlanguage development.

1.2 Expanding Task Repetition Research

Since his first work on task repetition Bygate (1996) has called for future task repetition research to focus on what learners might gain from unguided, unprompted task repetition with various partners in a classroom setting. This is an important point considering that task repetition is widely employed by teachers in language classrooms around the world. To date most task repetition research has been conducted in experimental settings with narrative tasks. Bygate's studies used mostly narrative retellings, and in Lynch and Maclean's (2000; 2001) carousel study, learners

did repeated presentations on their posters. While narrative task types are part of many classes, they are nonetheless overrepresented in task-based research. From my experience, and as Ohta (2001: 131) notes, communicative language classes in EFL settings are more often organized around thematic tasks that have a conversation-like orientation to them. The lack of research done with open-ended thematic dialogical tasks is not surprising because, as Van Lier (1996: 168–9) notes, many professionals in language teaching consider doing ‘conversation’ in the classroom to be frivolous and non-educational. Long (1996: 448) has argued that ‘free conversation’ is unsuitable for pushing interlanguage development because it allows learners to give ‘superficial treatment’ to topics, and furthermore allows learners to avoid topics that create linguistic trouble (see also Seedhouse 1999; 2004). Conversation has made a comeback as Long’s position has come under attack for ‘overemphasizing’ the importance of the negotiation of meaning in the classroom, usually realized through transactional tasks (see Van den Branden 1997). Carter and McCarthy’s (2004) work has demonstrated that creative language use is at its densest when it is informal and conversational by nature. Nakahama, Tyler and Van Lier (2001) have shown that learners find conversation tasks more challenging than transactional tasks, and the former do push learner output and facilitate longer and syntactically more complex utterances than the latter. Taking all of this into consideration it seems of some importance to conduct research into task repetition in a classroom setting with open-ended, thematic, conversation-oriented tasks that are very common in communicative EFL classrooms. The need for this research is also consistent with Samuda and Bygate’s (2008) call for more classroom-based research.

1.3 The Outline and Direction of this Paper

This exploratory study will first review the background of the four learners in the study, the classroom context and the data collection methods. I will then discuss the concept of complexity and how it has been conceptualized in task-based research. One of the key tools for measuring complexity in spoken discourse is the AS-unit (Analysis of Speech Unit), and the degree of subordination present in it. I will first discuss the problems involved in codifying AS-units in data in relation to dialogical tasks and Japanese discourse. It will be seen that subordination is not necessarily characteristic of communicative tasks that facilitate conversation-like production, nor is it easy to identify in conversation, especially with beginner learners. In response I will argue and demonstrate that measuring learner productivity by means of AS-unit length is effective. To measure complexity I will also employ an AS-unit complexity benchmark based on length, in which units above a certain word count are deemed complex. The rationale for this benchmark will be discussed, and supported with examples from the data. The other unit created for this study, to be discussed in detail, is what I call an AS cluster. This non-cognitive macro unit is a cluster of AS-units that comprise a topic or centre of interest in a learner's performance, which I will argue reflects the learner's engagement in the L2.

In the next section of the paper I will review the results of measurements made on four learners. Twelve learners were recorded for the study, but four were specifically chosen for the purpose of evaluating the measuring tools, as they characterized the two main types of performances in the group of 12.

The final section of the paper will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the units. Following this there will be a discussion of the four learners' performances, including informal research data used to provide a fuller perspective on their performances. The paper will finish with a look at the implications for task repetition and its use in the classroom, and proposals for further research.

1.4 Design and Procedure

Twelve Japanese first-year students from a university in Japan took part in the study. All learners in my course were language majors in languages other than English. There were three classes, and from each class I chose four learners. I chose them based on their lack of spatial proximity to one another, picking them literally from the four corners of the classroom. I did this to ensure that none of them were close friends, since they sat with their friends in class. An initial survey confirmed that my course was the only English oral communication course that all the learners were enrolled in. Two weeks before I started collecting data, I asked the learners if I could record a few of them for private study. I made it clear that it had nothing to do with their final grades. All of them indicated that they were willing to participate if they were chosen. All learners were at a pre-intermediate or intermediate level of proficiency. The three classes averaged 35 learners per class. In each class learners had worked together with each other at least once during the year, and were on friendly terms. In the previous semester I had observed no problems between any learners in class, and all enjoyed their chance to speak English, as they considered it to be the weak point of their English ability. This study was done in the second semester, so all the learners were well acquainted with one another and with task-based learning and task repetition. A key part of my classroom practice was the use of

task repetition. This was done to expand time on task, and it was hoped that learners would engage in the same learning benefits demonstrated by task repetition research.

In these classes, I followed a task-based methodology similar to Willis's (1996) model. I used topic-based tasks each week, supported by a typical itemized textbook (published by Cambridge University Press) which was very popular with teachers. The textbook served as a structuring tool for the class as it provided themes as well as language that could be focused upon in class and for homework. The type of hybrid syllabus I employed is, as Ohta (2001) notes, very typical of many EFL settings. A theme or topic was covered in a weekly ninety-minute class for two weeks. I spread Willis's model over the two lessons. Task repetition was used during the task cycle phase, and this was always in the first lesson. In this first lesson learners discussed an open-ended theme in pairs, and on my request would change partners two or three times. A week later the second lesson would start with post-task work based on the previous week's task, and the lesson would cycle back into a final, more controlled task similar to the first task in the first lesson.

1.5 Collecting the Data

The data had to be gathered during classroom sessions, and it was paramount that the students' learning and class time were not compromised. A typical first lesson went as follows:

Pre-task

Brainstorming with teacher (5–10 minutes)

Unguided individual planning (10 minutes)

Task Cycle

Find partner, start task (5–10 minutes); no dictionary or notes

Find new partner, repeat task (5–10 minutes)

Find new partner, repeat task (5–10 minutes)

With last partner, prepare report (15–20 minutes)

Pairs read their reports to class (15–20 minutes)

Post-task

Do closed activities from textbook (15 minutes)

The only variation on this plan during the period of recording was that instead of doing textbook work for 15 minutes at the end of class, the selected learners filled in an informal survey related to their performances and task repetition. For this survey, learners were allowed to write in either Japanese or English.

Prior to the recording period I brought in hand-held cassette recorders for two consecutive weeks to familiarize the students with having these in class. None of the students recorded in the actual data was recorded at these times. Each learner selected for this study was given his or her own recorder, with a microphone that could be attached to the clothing. The use of individual recorders made it possible to obtain very clear recordings, useful for cross-checking unclear language. In order to produce an interlocking set of data, learners with these recording devices were only allowed to work with the other three learners who had recorders. The other 30-plus students followed the same classroom procedure of doing a task which involved, on my word, finding a new partner to whom they had not talked this semester. Their participation

grade was partly determined by how many different classmates they talked to in the semester, and records were kept of this for grading.

Chapter 2: Measuring Spoken Language Complexity

2.1 The AS-unit

In current task-based research there are a number of quantitative measures used to codify language complexity (for a review see Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005). Recent measures are derived from Skehan's (1996: 23) definition of complexity, which, he writes, 'concerns the elaboration or ambition of the language which is produced'.

The learner's ambition towards language production depends on his or her willingness to take risks. In current task research the elaboration or ambition in spoken performance is commonly measured by the degree of subordination present in a unit of speech. The degree of subordination measures productivity to a certain extent, but mostly reflects a deeper grammatical complexity. One of the more popular tools for measuring language complexity is the amount of subordination per AS-unit (see the studies in Ellis 2005). The AS-unit has similarities with the T-unit and the Communication-unit, syntactical units comprised of a main clause and any attached subordinate clauses. The difference between these two units and the AS-unit is that Foster *et al.* (2000) have made the AS-unit more suitable for spoken discourse than previous units by allowing for sub-clausal units. A sub-clausal unit is a minor utterance or any utterance that could be made into a full clause by adding 'ellipted' parts. According to Foster *et al.*, complexity is calculated from the number of subordinate clauses per AS-unit: the more subordinate clauses there are, the more complex the AS-unit is. While the AS-unit is primarily a syntactical unit, Foster *et al.* argue that for the AS-unit to be valid, it must reflect the psycholinguistic processes of what a learner can do in a 'single unit' of micro-planning. In determining psycholinguistic boundaries for speaking units Chafe (1980: 14) notes that the key markers are intonational, hesitational and syntactic. He acknowledges that while they

all may be present at the same time, it is often the case that they are not. Furthermore, none of these three is consistently realized in language production. For identifying AS-units Foster *et al.* consider the unit to be primarily syntactic, but prescribe an important secondary role for intonation and hesitation phenomena. In the next section I will review how the AS-unit is codified by using intonational, hesitational and syntactic markers.

2.2 Using Intonation and Hesitation to Identify AS-units

Intonation is seen as a key marker for determining units of speech production, because it is assumed in the research (see Crookes 1990) that a rising and falling intonation contour, accompanied by pausing at unit boundaries, reflects the cognitive processing ability of the speaker. As has been well noted, one problem with using intonation as a unit marker is that it does not necessarily converge with syntactical boundaries. Other problems concern the fact that L2 learners' intonation can be highly variable or, as Foster *et al.* note, full of 'vagaries'. L1 interference, lack of exposure to target intonational patterns, phonological differences between the two languages and processing pressure are key variables that influence learner intonation. The other important marker is hesitational. Foster *et al.* argue for a pause between an independent clause and a subordinate clause of no longer than 0.5 seconds for the clauses to be considered attached. It appears that the use of the 0.5 seconds mark comes from the work of Chafe who, in his studies of L1 narratives, established some general principles for understanding pausing between clause boundaries and how they can be used to demarcate cognitive units. Chafe reports that L1 speakers' pauses at clausal boundaries are generally between 0.2 and 1 second when the clause is part of a multi-clause combination but is not the first clause. Chafe also found that pauses of 1

second, and typically less than 0.5 seconds, characterize pauses between *idea units*, which are cognitively based units similar to the AS-unit. However, as noted these benchmarks apply to L1 monologues, and on this point Goldman Eisler (1968: 15) demonstrates that various speaking tasks produce various pausing lengths. In her study on pausing during spontaneous speech she used data from interviews, discussions, cartoon interpretations and cartoon descriptions, with the final task being consistent with a narrative/monologue task. She found that pause length is determined by individual differences and the type of speaking task, with the first three types of speaking tasks consisting of longer pauses than the description/narrative task. This variability within hesitation and intonation phenomena is probably the reason why Foster *et al.* assign a primary role for syntax in determining AS-units and a secondary role for the other two markers. The next section will look at how Japanese discourse influences the codifying of AS-units and subordination.

2.3 The Role of Pausing in Japanese Conversation

Hughes (2002: 13) notes that informal conversation among two or more people naturally has a ‘give and take’ feel to it. One of the reasons speakers pause is to demarcate their production so a listener can follow and participate in the discussion. In Japanese, pausing, which can also be filled by back channelling, is done by both speaker and listener during conversation, and it often occurs at clause boundaries. It is called *aizuchi* or ‘agreeable responses’, and these responses are critical for the development of conversation in Japanese. Japanese have a strong tendency, especially in informal contexts, to view the flow of conversation as a collaborative process. Hughes (2002: 37) notes that ‘Anglophone cultures’ also view the end of clauses to be the place where speaker turns can change. However, as Ohta (2001: 181) notes, the

Japanese are much more verbal listeners than ‘Americans’, and my own experience is that when aizuchi is transferred over into English and experienced by someone unfamiliar with Japanese discourse, it is often seen as a little peculiar and in some cases impolite. In Japanese conversation, aizuchi is easily recognizable through the large amount of back channelling-like production that is present. In a study of 40 Japanese speakers Maynard (1989: 168) identified 871 back channels in 2112 pause-bounded phrasal units. Aizuchi also consists of non-verbal signals, and laughter. While Maynard refers to aizuchi as back channeling, it is something more than that. Aizuchi is a collaborative process that in many cases involves a ‘speak and wait’ by the speaker, which is often simultaneously filled by an expected ‘back channel and wait’ by the listener before the conversation continues. The ‘speak and wait’ and ‘back channel and wait’ of aizuchi are obviously somewhat problematic for identifying AS-units, because the units are supposed to be psycholinguistic, and aizuchi, because it occurs at clausal boundaries, in many cases ‘breaks up’ the production of the speaker. In reviewing the data in this paper it became clear that aizuchi is very prevalent for Japanese learners doing English tasks. Excerpt 1 is an example of the disruption of learner production (see Appendix 1 for transcription conventions).

Excerpt 1

- 1 M: / (What do what do you do) what would be your ideal wedding honeymoon?/
So (do do) do you want a small or big wedding?/ (2AS 7+9)
- 2 N: /I want to have a big wedding party/ (1AS 8)
- 3 M: /Ah (both laugh) (Wh) why?/ (1AS 1)
- 4 N: /Because I want to invite many friends/ (1AS 7)
- 5 M: /Ah/
- 6 N: /And (I cel) I want to be celebrated by many people/ (1AS 9)

- 7 M: /Un/
8 N: /And I want to honeymoon to all Europe/ (1AS 8)
9 M: /All Europe (laughs)/
10 N: /Yes, especially I want to go Denmark/ (1AS 6)
11 M: /Ah/
12 N: /How about you?/ (1AS 3)
13 M: /Ah I want to a small wedding/ (1AS 6)
14 N: /Oh/
15 M: /Because a big wedding (1.27) take a lot of money /

The example above is typical of instances found throughout the data. M starts off by asking a question to N who then answers and then pauses and waits. M follows this with 'Why?'. N answers, and then waits for M's back channel before continuing. After that N proceeds to talk, and then pauses and waits at clausal boundaries, which are filled by M's back channeling. The roles are then switched. M begins answering N's questions. As in N's first response, M after her first response waits for N's back channel and, once she receives it, continues. Both deliberately pause in anticipation of or to allow an expected back channel. With Japanese discourse there is a clear non-cognitive variable that makes the application of psycholinguistic measures such as subordination per AS-unit very challenging. Social obligation between Japanese conversation partners, whether it is in a foreign language or not, requires them in many situations to forsake longer turns in order, almost ironically, to establish a flow to the conversation. Foster and Ohta (2005) look at the role of aizuchi and conclude that as peer assistance it can play a positive role in learning language. On the negative side, aizuchi can also be used as a coping strategy for learners, allowing them to avoid risk-taking behavior that will stretch their interlanguage. The next section will discuss the problem of applying subordination to open-ended dialogical tasks.

2.4 Subordination and its Problems as a Measure of Complexity

Currently there is very little research that provides an extensive description of the codification of AS-units, including deciding whether a clause is part of a larger AS-unit or constitutes its own AS-unit. Foster *et al.* (2000) provide guidance, but their rules are applied to a short transcript of elliptical language, which has very little subordination or coordination. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) provide four narrative transcriptions that are codified into AS-units but, as will be argued, narratives are of limited value for understanding how clauses are joined in real-time oral production. In task-based research, language complexity has mostly been measured by the amount of subordination occurring in narrative task types. This is not surprising since subordination is characteristic of the discourse structure of narratives, in that most narratives involve the describing of relationships of intentionality and causality (see Brown 1989). Berman and Slobin (1994:14) write that the simplest narratives contain just a temporal sequence of simple clauses. Narratives at their most complex involve ‘a hierarchical layering of circumstances and happenings in syntactically packaged constructions...’. They go on to note that this layering is only possible with adults and that young children are only able to produce a clausal chaining style which is mostly comprised of *and* and *then*. Brown *et al.* (1984) note too that even young adults in their L1 have problems producing layered narratives. Measuring the degree of subordination in narratives is a useful way to gauge the proficiency of those learners proficient enough to employ subordination. However, as Slobin and Berman’s quote suggests, it is of questionable utility when learners are at a basic proficiency level and moreover not engaged in narrative tasks where subordination is expected to be prevalent.

2.4.1 Lack of Subordination in Conversation

Conversation cannot be neatly described using traditional grammatical description. McCarthy (1998: 79) notes that informal spoken data is typically characterized by lack of ‘well-formed sentences’ with main and subordinate clauses. The reason for this is related to the nature of what is involved in informal spoken conversation. Online production in relation to conversation has three basic principles: keep talking, limited planning ahead and qualification of what has been said (Biber *et al.* 1999: 1067). These realities limit the degree of linguistic complexity possible, especially with L2 learners. According to McCarthy, what is normally visible in spoken discourse are turns that have incomplete chunks of language, including clauses that look like subordinate clauses but are in fact not attached to a main clause. Carter and McCarthy (2006: 170) write:

The needs of real-time communication do not allow the speaker time to construct over-elaborate patterns of main and subordinate clauses. Much more common are sequences of clauses linked by coordinating conjunctions (*and, but, or*) or by simple subordinating conjunctions such as *because* (frequently contracted to *cos*) and *so*, which often function more like coordinating rather than subordinating conjunctions.

Carter and McCarthy (2006: 557) note that this multiple coordination is more commonly comprised of coordinators like *and* and *but*. Subordination is considered to be a basic form of integration, but nonetheless the ability to identify it is problematic when learners produce clauses in a continuous chain. On this point Schleppegrell (1992: 119) writes that identifying a main clause and its accompanying subordinate clause is extremely difficult because the subordinate clause can in an expansive utterance become the ‘ideational core’ of the expansion, which is then supported by other clauses that follow. This problem becomes very acute when you are dealing with ‘clausal chaining’ in informal conversation, where long turns can exceed 100

words and are comprised of multiple coordination. Schleppegrell, in summarizing her criticism of subordination to determine linguistic complexity, writes that this relationship has been oversimplified, and, like McCarthy (1998), she also believes that the broad structural and functional roles subordinators play are being ignored. She notes that just counting subordinators is insufficient for determining linguistic complexity, and that any deeper analysis of subordination must also occur at the level of discourse and not just of syntax.

As Carter and McCarthy acknowledge, clausal chaining is the default processing strategy of conversation; however, they would also agree that it is not the only type of processing available to speakers during conversation. Pawley and Syder (2000) point out that simple clause chaining void of a ‘sprinkle of multi-clause units’ is not likely to be considered by native speakers as fluent language. Chafe (1980; 1994) in his studies on spoken production writes that there are two types of cognitive processes involved in language production; see also Skehan’s (1998: 89) dual-mode system. The first is ‘word by word’ processing that normally is reflected in clausal chaining. The second is ‘an extended process’ of clausal integration where the speaker transcends the one-clause-at-a-time strategy. In relation to this latter process Pawley and Syder note that there are two types of formulaic framework that make this extension possible. The first involves multi-syntactical frames which are memorized void of lexical content, requiring the speaker just to slot in lexical content; see Nattinger and DeCarrico’s (1992: 42) sentence builders. The second type is a large set of two- to six-word clusters which are memorized as ‘wholes’, for which the speaker just tacks on grammar at the end of the stem, producing a ‘surge and flow’ intonational pattern. Biber *et al.* (1999) refer to some of these word clusters as

'utterance launchers'. Chafe (1980: 30) notes that speakers, when committing to a multi-clause sentence, avoid 'taking a gamble' with their production by relying on formulaic language or 'linguistic crutches' as explained above. On a similar note Wray (2002: 12) contends that novel language production does not involve grammatical creativity; instead, as she states, '... in most cases "novelty" is much less a question of doing things with grammar than juxtaposing new ideas in commonplace grammatical frames'. In relation to L2 learners, Foster (2001) claims that the ability to use formulaic language is what distinguishes L1 speakers from L2 speakers, and may be one reason why L2 learners have trouble with extended production, including the ability to produce subordinate clauses, which in many cases have a formulaic component to them (see Foster *et al.* 2000; Foster 2001).

In summary, it is fair to argue that there is a mismatch between the way language is produced in conversation and the idea that complexity can be gauged by looking at the degree of subordination in task performance. Moreover, even with multi-clauses being in abundance in conversation, it appears that formulaic language plays a pivotal role in their formulation by speakers. The ability to employ formulaic language to produce multi-clause combinations also appears to distinguish L1 speakers from L2 learners. Taking all of this into consideration, it seemed of questionable utility to measure the complexity of beginner learners' productions during open-ended dialogical tasks by the amount of subordination in AS-units. I therefore tried to think of other ways to conceptualize language complexity. The next section will discuss how I conceptualized complexity in regard to my learners' data.

Chapter 3: Re-conceptualizing Complexity

3.1 Starting with AS-unit Length

Despite the obvious problems associated with trying to codify AS-units, I nonetheless use the AS-unit to analyse my data because of its hypothesized psycholinguistic validity that as a cognitive unit reflects learner language processing outcomes during spoken discourse. However, rather than using the amount of subordination per AS-unit as a marker for complexity, I decided instead to follow Bygate (2001: 34–5) and look at words per unit as a measure of complexity. Bygate demonstrates with T-units that complexity can be calculated by measuring the number of words per T-unit. Besides being a broad fluency measure in relation to overall proficiency, Bygate argues that the number of words per unit reflects complexity in that the learner demonstrates the ability or at least attempts to combine lexical items around syntactic structures. Bygate (1999: 199) found that with argumentation and narrative tasks learners, rather than embedding clauses, resorted to increasing the number of clause elements in their production, which meant that more complex clauses had a greater number of words. In addition word count as a measure of complexity was appealing because, as was discussed earlier, beginner L2 learners tend to process one word at a time when engaged in real-time language production.

3.1.1 Departing from Bygate's Mean Number of Words

Rather than use the mean number of words per AS-unit as a measure for each performance, I instead categorized all AS-units in individual performances into groups based on the number of words per unit. For example, in each performance all five-word AS-units were counted, then all six-word AS-units were counted and so forth. This provided a breakdown of the number of AS-units with various word counts

for each individual performance. Word counts for AS-units ranged from one word to over 25 words. This idea was derived from Skehan and Foster (2005) who measured the accuracy of clauses as a function of word count, establishing a threshold for clause length beyond which learners were unable to produce accurate clauses. Following Skehan and Foster I decided to establish a benchmark for complexity based on AS-unit word count. The basic idea was that if learners produced a majority of AS-units whose word counts exceeded an established benchmark, they were recognized as stretching their language production. The major question was what word count to use as a benchmark. The next section reviews the determination of a suitable word-count benchmark for my studies.

3.2 Establishing a Word-count Benchmark for Complexity

Miller (1956), Chafe (1980) and Biber *et al.* (1999: 1067) contend that, as a result of working memory limitations, humans are only able to process six to seven words at a time during conversation. Skehan (2007) (personal communication) believes the limit to be even less. Skehan's view is supported by Cowan (2001) who argues that the limit is four words. As Sinclair and Mauranen (2006: 35) note, the precise number is unknown; however, the main point is that human processing of language is of limited capacity, and therefore speakers, especially during real-time conversation, cannot be expected to produce overly elaborate turns. If this is the case then it is clearly more limiting for L2 learners. From an initial analysis of my data I noticed that the majority of AS-units are between three and eight words in length, with a significant drop at nine words and up. Considering this and the working memory issue noted above, I assumed that a suitable benchmark might be around five to nine words. In order to verify this, my next step was to analyse AS-unit word counts.

In counting AS-unit length, I ignored grammatical correctness. For example *I living alone now* is missing the auxiliary verb, and I counted it as four words. If it had contained the auxiliary verb I would have classified it as five words. As is common practice I did not include dysfluent language as part of an AS-unit and all dysfluent language is enclosed within brackets with an AS-unit. I counted any words that were part of the learner's attempt to communicate, again minus dysfluencies. This meant that I counted *yes* and *no* as part of an AS-unit's word total when either was present. As is also common practice I counted contractions as two words, and I counted Japanese proper nouns such as city or place names. Back channelling or simple repetition of a partner's words was not counted as part of a learner's production. In the transcripts and excerpts, AS-units are demarcated with slashes; for example:

7 K: /Sleeps ah like a (rou) round/ So we gave it name Maru/ (2AS 4+6 7.82)

The brackets at the end show the number of AS-units in K's turn (two in this example) and how many words each AS-unit contains (four in the first, six in the second); in the transcripts a third term in brackets is the duration of the production in seconds.

One of the problems of analysing units for different features is that learners of course have different interlanguages, as language development is a nonlinear process (Larsen-Freeman and Cameron 2008). Moreover, I was trying to observe qualitative differences between units differing in length by only one to four words. Taking this into consideration, I attempted to tease out very general and tentative characteristics associated with various AS-unit lengths in order to provide myself, if possible, with a threshold above which units become difficult to produce for all four learners, and also to demonstrate learner risking-taking and language complexity. To do this I analysed

all AS-units by word-count group; for example I reviewed all four-word AS-units, then all five-word units and so forth. I did not include question forms in my analysis, as I was only interested in looking at production oriented towards answering and giving information. When I analysed the word counts of units, I looked at general features such as how many AS-units were error-free, and how many were full clauses as opposed to sub-clausal units. I also looked for the presence of subordinators and coordinators, and whether they were present within units or serving as adjuncts between units. In addition I looked for circumstances where a wider breadth of subordinators, for example conditionals or relative clauses, was present. Finally, I checked for other features such as negation, the presence or absence of adjectives and the breadth of verb tenses at various word counts. As expected, learners did not produce equal numbers of, for example, four-word units, so I was careful not to over- or under-represent a learner's production and tried to weigh all four learners' productions equally.

3.3 General Characteristics of Various AS-unit Lengths

In the data (see Appendix 1), with all learners one- to three-word AS-units are mainly sub-clausal units. These units are elliptical and minimal, and many are short exclamatory comments, or short questions and answers. However, a small number of three-word units are basic clauses such as *He is kind*. Of the four-word AS-units in the data, some are sub-clausal units but most are basic clauses, some with adjectives and adverbs. Most basic clauses of this length in the data are error-free, and I found no negation present in any four-word AS-unit. The examples below are typical of the four-word AS-units for all four learners. They are declarative statements in present or simple past tense.

Four-word AS-units:

1. 3 K: /**(mm 3.0) Its name is Maru/ (Appendix 1.1)**
2. 69 K: /**Rabbits hate rain water/ (Appendix 1.2)**
3. 41 M: /**And second is money/ (Appendix 1.4)**
4. 35 N: /**(My) my major is Denmark/ (Appendix 1.8)**
5. 43 N: /**(That that is) maybe that is interesting/ (Appendix 1.8)**
6. 42 R: /**I was very surprised/ (Appendix 1.10)**
7. 42 R: /**I'm from Kyoto/ (Appendix 1.12)**

I concluded that the learners had no trouble with four-word units, which are mostly simple clauses in the simple and past tense.

With five-word and larger units, I found a larger variety of simple verb phrases. Negation is also present from five words onward.

Five-word AS-units:

1. 13 K: /**(It) it don't become round/ (Appendix 1.1)**
2. 25K: /**And (1.60 mm) (I heard 3.30 mm it) ah I heard (4.50) (his his) his voice (laughs)/ (Appendix 1.1)**
3. 43 M: /**she said it is fun (its very fun)/ (Appendix 1.6)**
4. 26 M: /**Ah I think (12.00) over (over fou) four months/ (Appendix 1.6)**
5. 13 N: /**I want a big party/ (Appendix 1.8)**

6. 62 N: /But most important is character (au kado ka maybe)/
(Appendix 1.7)
7. 8 R: /Recently (1.19) such crimes are increasing/ (Appendix 1.11)
8. 37 R: /When she went to bowling/ (Appendix 1.10)

Six-word AS-units:

1. 9 K: /**(When) when it sleep it become (rou) round/** (Appendix 1.1)
2. 14 K: /**And (it likes to) it likes (1.57) to (.84) bite anything/**
(Appendix 1.1)
3. 14 K: /**So it is (mm 1.53 old) old rabbit now/** (Appendix 1.2)
4. 31 R: /**(I don't know) I don't know any crimes/** (Appendix 1.10)
5. 31 R: /**Ah my neighbor was stolen her bike/** (Appendix 1.10)
6. 19 R: /**No no she asked but she said/** (Appendix 1.11)
7. 71 N: /**That is good point I think/** (Appendix 1.7)
8. 56 N: /**(I don't) I don't like who lie (who 2.26 lie)/** (Appendix 1.7)
9. 45 M: /**And second is (3.56 ah) he's tall/** (Appendix 1.4)
10. 27 M: /**It's very difficult for me/** (Appendix 1.6)

A number of units of five- and six-word length are comprised of (*personal pronoun*) + (*verb*) phrases. For beginner learners, producing the appropriate pronoun and simple verb phrase may be easy; however the real difficulty for them, as Willis (2003: 71) notes, is choosing the patterns that follow various verbs. The fact that simple verb phrases are more abundant suggests that learners would have to start tackling more difficult verb complementation in five-word and longer units. Example 8 in the six-

word group appears to be evidence of this. What is noticeable at the six-word AS-unit length is the presence of more units with errors and dysfluencies. Five-word units have dysfluencies, but in my data most are error-free, as are four-word units. I concluded that it is from the six-word unit length that errors become more prevalent. As Skehan and Foster (2005) note, this is to be expected when learners attempt to produce longer units that stretch their processing capabilities.

At the six-word length, as the examples above show, there are units with subordination and coordination within them. In case of five-word units, I found no examples of subordination or coordination within them. At both the five- and six-word unit length, subordinators and coordinators are common at the beginning of the unit, whose roles appear to be only as discourse markers. However, this is misleading; in some cases, as Carter and McCarthy (2006: 262) note, coordinators, besides acting as ‘sentence beginners’, can also provide cohesive links between clauses or, in the case of this study, between AS-units. Many of the coordinators and subordinators acting as sentence starters are actually instances of learners trying to structure production that transcends the boundaries of individual AS-units. In this sense they are more than discourse makers, relating to a larger discourse grammar in the data.

Seven-, eight- and nine-word units are essentially the same as six-word units in that I found subordination and coordination occurring within units (see examples below).

Seven-word AS-units:

1. **5 K:** /Mm because (it) it becomes round when it sleeps/

(Appendix 1.2)

2. 11R: /**(Not um I) I through Takarazuka and went to Mukogawa/**
(Appendix 1.12)
3. 71 N: /**But I want to honeymoon to abroad/** (Appendix 1.9)
4. 12 M: /**And (2.91 tsutashimi ga aru friendly) a small marriage**
(will be) will be friendly/ (Appendix 1.6)

Eight- and nine-word AS-units

1. 32 K: /**Cat is (1.99 not) not dislike but (1.98) dog is better/**
(Appendix 1.1)
2. 69 K: /**(So but) So if we raised outside (mm 1.74) it dies (early)**
early (1.65)/ (Appendix 1.2)
3. 15 M: /**Because a big wedding (1.27) take a lot of money/**
(Appendix 1.4)
4. 39 M: /**(I) I don't want to married (si silence) silence man/**
(Appendix 1.5)
5. 54 N: /**He (he) don't have money (we we could (2.22) we could**
live) we couldn't live/ (Appendix 1.7)
6. 77 N: /**Different point is whether I love him or not/** (Appendix 1.7)
7. 20 R: /**So when the sunsets (uh) there is very dark/** (Appendix
1.10)
8. 8 R: /**Of course because a girl kidnapped (and killed) was killed/**
(Appendix 1.11)

Finally, as with six-word units, the examples above show again error and dysfluencies are very common.

3.4 Settling on an AS-unit Benchmark for Complexity

After reviewing all units within the three- to nine-word range, I decided to establish a seven-word AS-unit length as the benchmark for complexity in my data. A six-word length would also have been suitable, since every feature I identified in seven-word units is also present in six-word units. The choice of a seven-word benchmark makes the benchmark standard slightly higher. Table 1 presents the total number of six- and seven-word units produced by each of the four learners.

Table 1. Total Numbers of Six- and Seven-word AS-units by Each Learner

| | Kazue | Miho | Naoko | Rie |
|------------|-------|------|-------|-----|
| Six-word | 11 | 8 | 10 | 12 |
| Seven-word | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11 |

For each learner, the sum of the six- and seven-word totals represents just over 20% of the AS-units for their individual performances. Because of this fairly high percentage I decided to separate these two categories, despite their similarity. I didn't feel this was problematic for the benchmark concept because, as noted above, there appears to be a clear difference in the data between five-word and six-word units. Looking at the examples above, especially of eight- and nine-word units, it seems clear that they indicate language complexity and risk-taking, and moreover stretch all four learners' interlanguage. In fact a nine-word length might have served as a benchmark, as the number of AS-units of nine words and above that learners produce drops substantially. However, I concluded that for these four learners nine words was too high.

In summary, using a seven-word AS-unit as a benchmark for complexity may sound low but, as discussed earlier, L1 speakers during conversation normally produce at least the same number of words per unit. The data discussed above indicates that a learner producing AS-units of seven words and higher during an open-ended dialogical task is usually engaged in a challenging production resulting in language features and outcomes demonstrating language complexity, or at least an orientation towards it. Since this study looks at the same task done three times with three different partners, my benchmark should provide a sufficient picture of any changes in learner performance over the three performances. For example, an increase in the total number of AS-units of seven words and above from one repetition to the next may indicate that the learner is taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by task repetition. One problem with word count and the accompanying benchmark is that it provides no information on how individual units relate to the larger discourse of the learner and his or her interlocutor. This point is demonstrated in the role coordinators play as cohesive links between AS-units. In the preceding example a coordinator may appear to be just a sentence builder and, unless one looks at the overall performance beyond individual AS-units, then a significant feature of learners' performances is being bypassed. In the next section I will discuss another measure of complexity I established to relate individual AS-unit units to a larger non-cognitive view of language complexity that is consistent with real-time production.

3.5 Measuring Performance Complexity in Dialogical Tasks

As I analysed learner data I noticed a specific characteristic of performance that distinguished productive learners from unproductive ones during the task work. I

found that at some point in the task the productive learner would focus on a specific topic and elaborate on it. This elaboration produced a cluster of AS-units that established an overall topic. This process has been categorized by Chafe (1980) as a speaker's 'centre of interest'. Describing this Chafe (1994: 140) writes:

We constantly try, nevertheless, to push the capacity of focal consciousness beyond the bounds of a single focus, attempting to embrace larger more intellectually challenging conglomerates of information. ... These centers of interest are not limited by our wired-in mental capacities, but represent attempts, with varying degrees of success, to push the mind beyond the constraints of active consciousness.

According to Chafe (1980: 1112), centres of interest represent attempts to stretch our limited cognitive capacity as we engage in unfolding language production. Chafe believes that this process is the result of the limitations in our cognitive capacity and reflects the nature of our consciousness. These limitations are:

- Limited capacity for activating information
- Limited duration of this activation
- Consciousness moves in jerks rather than flowing
- Consciousness has a centre and periphery

Chafe sees a centre of interest as a process in which a topic is held in 'peripheral consciousness' and is then 'scanned' and used for extended production. For Chafe, as his quote notes, a centre of interest is comprised of unfolding verbal judgements made during the ongoing process of language production in regard to available information. Another way of understanding this process in relation to language production is to remember that speakers in conversation regularly employ an add-on strategy because of the limitations that Chafe mentions above. Referring to the same process and how

the speaker achieves language complexity through it, Thornbury and Slade (2006: 77)

write:

The complexity is achieved not by embedding constituents within a pre-determined sentence frame, but through the successive (and potentially limitless) accumulation of individual clause-like units. The logical connections between such units are indicated using discourse markers (but, because, unless, in which case, so ...) to signal the incremental twists and turns of the speaker's train of thought.

'Bit by bit' production complexity is, when unpacked, 'syntactically simple', but the overall 'cumulative effect' is 'syntactically complex'. Again what I considered important in the data were moments in the task when a learner would start to produce language based on an add-on strategy that elaborated and expanded on a topic, which led to an accumulation of AS-units that were clustered together. These moments focused around a topic where the learner demonstrated *engagement*. According to Ohta (2001: 250) *engagement* by the learner is positive and sustained orientation towards L2 use and peer interaction during a task. In this paper I use the AS cluster as a structural unit to represent the concept of centre of interest. For beginner L2 learners it is of course a significant challenge to produce the type of complexity described by Thornbury and Slade when doing real-time conversation. I therefore decided to think of language complexity, or orientation towards it, in relation to centres of interests or AS clusters that I found in the data. These clusters reflect the learner's engagement with producing elaborate turns that are based predominantly on a clausal chaining strategy. Excerpt 2 shows an example of a learner's AS cluster (in bold) that is 16 AS-units long, with AS-unit lengths ranging from one word to 10 words.

Excerpt 2

2 P: Hello have you ever had a pet?

3 K: /Yes I have a rabbit in my parents house/ /(mm 3.0) Its name is Maru/
(2AS 9+4)

4 P: Maru?

5 K: /Maru/

6 P: Mm

7 K: /Because (its mm 2.2) it sleep round/ (1AS 4)

8 P: Round?

9 K: /(When) when it sleep it become (rou) round (1AS 6)

10 P: Ah ah

11 K: /But (mm) in summer (it) it sleep (2.5) up length up length/ (1AS 7)

12 P: Mm

13 K: /(It) it don't become round/ (1AS 5)

Shared pause 6.20

14 K: /And (it likes to) it likes (1.57) to (.84) bite anything/ (1AS 6)

15 P: Ah ah

16 K: /It bites my clothes, shoes, and pole of my house/ (1AS 10)

Both laugh

17 K: /Ah my mother (mm 1.59) sometimes angry (laughs)/ (1AS 4)

18 P: You and your family mm (don't try to mm 3.70) don't try to (mm 3.80) have
Maru have Maru stopped

K 19: /Yes/ (1AS 1)

20 P: Ah do you do so?

21 K: /(laughing) Every time (P: says every time) but he runaway very fast/ (1AS
8)

22 P: Ah (laughing)

Shared pause 2.68

23 K: /And (it it runaway) sometimes it runaway from his box/ (1AS 7)

24 P: Mm (1.70)

25 K: /And one day (I) I sleep in my room /And (1.60 mm) (I heard 3.30 mm it)
ah I heard (4.50) (his his) his voice (laughs)/ (He) he enter my house and
(he sleep) he slept in my room (2.72)/ Because he runaway from his box/
(4AS 8+5+10+6)

Shared pause 5.45

26 K: /How about you?/ (1AS 3)

At turn 25 K the learner produces four AS-units. With the exception of one AS-unit, which is coordinated, none of the units are complex; however, combined they produced a fairly complex mini-narrative. The AS-units in this learner's centre of interest are mostly comprised of simple clauses. The centre of interest is about her rabbit, which with the help of her partner she clearly attempts to elaborate on. For example, in response to her partner's initial question, she answers that she has a rabbit. From here, based on her partner's interest and clarification request, she then explains the reason for its name, and even attempts to describe its various sleeping patterns. After a shared pause, she pushes her centre of interest by describing her rabbit's biting habit, for which she adds further detail by explaining her mother's reaction to the biting. Next her partner asks a question to further push the speaker's production, after which the speaker produces a small story about her rabbit.

This AS cluster has a number of positive production and learning activities that constitute the concept of engagement. First, there is the negotiation of meaning and negotiation of content between the pair. In the case of the former, on two occasions the speaker is asked to clarify the rabbit's name and its meaning. In negotiating content, the interlocutor asks the speaker to explain why her family can't stop the rabbit from biting. A second feature of engagement applies to the four AS-units at turn 25 K which when combined produce a mini-narrative. From a processing perspective this is difficult in that it requires the L2 speaker to keep track of prior units while adding on language that maintains the direction and coherence of the narrative. Moreover, while keeping track of units, the learner also manages to show an orientation to accuracy by reformulating correctly the past tense of sleep. At turn 25 K there is also arguably another type of engagement or ambition being demonstrated by

the learner. The dysfluencies are the result of the learner trying to push the limits of her processing capacity and extend production. If psycholinguistic standards for AS-units are ignored then the first two units would be coordinating clauses rather than separate AS-units. Task-based research tends to focus on successful risk-taking and not to acknowledge risk-taking or ambition that was unsuccessful, as in the example above. The argument for recognizing unsuccessful risk-taking is that it is evidence of learner engagement in the L2 for the purpose of language development and learning. Skehan (2001) points out that language that is not fully automated, and is at the limits of the learner's interlanguage, is more complex in that it is more challenging for the learner to produce. One final point worth considering about the AS cluster is that inside an AS cluster the learner is simultaneously engaged in fluency (meaning), form (accuracy) and complexity. Kumaravadivelu (2007) calls this all-at-once focus the 'multidimensionality of task performance'. In this sense the three dimensions are interrelated and, moreover, emerge out of one another. In Excerpt 2 above, the learner shifts her focus as her language production unfolds in time. This idea of multidimensionality contrasts with the idea, popular in task-based research, that learner focus has an 'either/or' dimension.

In summary, AS clusters or centres of interest in this paper represent learner engagement in the L2 for the purpose of language development and learning. Furthermore this engagement is multidimensional in that in any productive AS cluster the learner will be shifting focus between fluency, accuracy and complexity. This period of engagement, which normally centres around a topic or theme, contrasts with segments of the same or a repeated task performance when the same learner is 'disengaged' and producing only minimal and elliptical language, either out of

boredom or for social purposes, which in the end has no benefit for their language development and learning. Furthermore, learner task performances are not constant from start to end, and AS clusters represent portions of performances, or even whole performances, of productive learner engagement. It may also happen that AS clusters are wholly absent from a task performance.

3.6 Identifying Centres of Interest

As Chafe notes, centres of interest are non-cognitive, and the key to identifying them is to identify the speaker's topic. In Chafe's data the longest centre of interest was 147 words. In my data I found that AS clusters are demarcated in a conversation by shared pausing, or by questions that are used by either participant to change the topic or turn. My data shows that speakers frequently complete their AS clusters by asking questions similar to those they are talking on. A learner repeating herself is also evidence of the end of a centre of interest (see Tannen 1985). Questions used to negotiate meaning, content or form are not used to end an AS cluster. Questions, because they are used either to end a turn or to allow the other person a turn to speak, are not counted as part of a speaker's centre of interest. Finally, although there is only one example in the data, an AS cluster may be dropped and then revisited in the same performance.

3.7 Minimal Requirements for an AS Cluster

Deciding on the minimal requirements for an AS cluster is problematic. Chafe thought that one word was sufficient for a centre of interest, but this is not suitable because AS clusters are accumulations of AS-units that constitute learner engagement in the L2. I decided after reviewing the data that the minimally acceptable cluster

would be two AS-units which when combined equal or surpass the seven-word benchmark discussed earlier. In all the data I found no AS clusters of this minimal size. Excerpt 3 below (bold letters) is the smallest AS cluster in the data.

Excerpt 3

Shared pause

28 P: What's ah what is the your favorite animal?

29 K: /My favorite animal is dog/ (1AS 5)

30 P: Dog

31 K: /Un because they are familiar (P uh huh) with us/ (And) and (3.07 inaudible Japanese) soft (they are) their fur is soft and warm and we can touch them/ (2AS 6+13)

Shared pause

32 P: Um my favorite animals is also dog

33 K: /Dog/

34 P: As you said a dog is very friendly and familiar with us and ah shaking tail is very good

Shared pause

35 K: /Eto do you have another pet only dog?/ (1AS 7)

First, what makes this an AS cluster for the learner K is the clear topic or centre of interest, which is demarcated by shared pauses and questions (questions are not included as learner engagement). Second, the learner demonstrates engagement by choosing to elaborate on why dogs are her favorite animals. In addition in the final AS-unit (line 31 K) there is a correct reformulation of a grammatical mistake from *they are* to *their*.

3.8 Unproductive AS Clusters

Besides recognizing a minimal requirement for an AS cluster, I also identified AS clusters that met the first requirement of the learner focusing on a centre of interest, but did not meet the second requirement of representing learner engagement. While they are AS clusters, I counted them as unproductive AS clusters, and therefore did not include them in my data as evidence of learners pushing or working on their language production. Excerpt 4 is one such example.

Excerpt 4

1 M: /What do what do you do) what would be your ideal wedding honeymoon?/

So (do do) do you want a small or big wedding?/ (2AS 7+9)

2 N: /I want to have a big wedding party/ (1AS 8)

3 M: /Ah (both laugh) (Wh) why?/ (1AS 1)

4 N: /Because I want to invite many friends/ (1AS 7)

5 M: /Ah/

6 N: /And (I cel) I want to be celebrated by many people (1AS 9)

7 M: /Un/

8 N: /And I want to honeymoon to all Europe/ (1AS 8)

9 M: /All Europe (laughs)/

10 N: /Yes, especially I want to go Denmark/ (1AS 6)

11 M: /Ah/

12 N: /How about you?/ (1AS 3)

As in Excerpt 3, the above AS cluster for the speaker indicated with bold letters is demarcated by two questions that start and end her centre of interest. The obvious problem with the AS cluster is that the learner is just rattling off her 'wants', which could almost pass as *I want + to (infinitive clause)* grammar-practice. It could be argued that the learner is working on this target, but there is no evidence that she had trouble with the target, and the form appears to be formulaic, which as Skehan noted is evidence of a learner not working at the limits of his or her interlanguage. In

Excerpt 4 the learner did minimally elaborate on why she wants a big wedding, and about her honeymoon, but again this was achieved by repeating the same form in a formulaic manner. Another possible explanation was that the learner indulged in some language play by repeating *I want*; however, as demonstrated in Excerpt 5, she continued to overuse the form throughout her performance.

Excerpt 5

28 N: /How long do you (M Ah) want to honeymoon?/ (1AS 7)

29 M: /Ah ah (about a week) about a week/ How long did you want to honeymoon?/
(2AS 3+7)

30 N: /If I want to go all Europe (M: Un) about one month/ (1AS 10)

31 M: /What?/ (1AS 1)

32 N: /Two weeks/ (1AS 2)

33 M: /Two weeks ah/

34 N: /Two weeks/But (I don't) if I only go to Denmark (M: Ah) I want to a week/ (1AS 12)

35 M: /Ah naru hodo (*I see*)/

Shared pause 5.16

36 N: / If (you want to) you find a partner what character do you want?/ (1AS 10)

In short there is very little evidence of learner engagement in the L2. This is demonstrated by the reliance on formulaic language, minimal elaboration on the centre of interest and almost no evidence that the learner was working at the limits of her interlanguage at this point of her performance. What is more the learner in the same performance produces another AS cluster that clearly demonstrates that her language ability is far greater than what she produces in the excerpts above. These were the basic guidelines I used to determine what makes an AS cluster unproductive, and therefore uncountable as a productive AS cluster. In my data, a productive AS

cluster in one prior performance could become unproductive in a later performance, and an unproductive AS cluster in a prior performance could become productive in a later performance. There are examples in the data of both cases. Excerpt 6 is from the third and final conversation with the learner who talked about her rabbit in her first performance (Excerpt 2). The difference between the two excerpts demonstrates how her production changes from productive AS clustering to unproductive AS clustering.

Excerpt 6

14 P: How about you?

15 K: /I have rabbit(P: Rabbit?) in my parent's house/ (1AS 7)

16 P: Uh huh

17 K: /I living alone now / (Un 1.0 that) Its name is Maru/

18 P: Maru (laughs)

19 K: /Because it become round when sleep/ (3AS 4+4+6)

Shared pause

20 P: Do you have a pet in your own house or a in a now where you live?

21 K: /Ah alone/ (1AS 1)

22 P: Alone?

23 K: /I have it in my parent's house/(1AS 7)

24 P: Mm

25 K: /So I don't live with Maru/ (1AS 7)

26 P: Ah is your rabbit attached be familiar with us?

27 K: /No but when he want food (he beco) he (come to) come to near my family (laughs) only only/ (1AS 12)

Shared pause

In comparison with Excerpt 2 there is clearly a significant difference in length and quality of this AS cluster. In the third performance the learner is, with the exception of the last AS-unit, just repeating minimally what she said in the previous

performance. Judging by the change, I assumed that the learner was no longer focused on her rabbit as a focal point for her production.

3.9 Counting Productive AS Clusters

Chafe decided that the best way to measure centres of interest was simply to count the number of words for each centre of interest. Similarly, I decided on two simple ways to count productive AS clusters. I counted all AS-units that belong to productive AS clusters, representing them as a percentage of the total number of AS-units in a single performance minus the number of AS-units that are questions. For example, the first performance of Kazue, the first learner analysed in this study, contains a total of 26 AS-units. Of these, four are questions, therefore the total number of AS-units to be analyzed as productive or unproductive are 22 AS-units. Of these 22 AS-units I determined that 20 AS-units belong to productive AS clusters. Expressed as a percentage this means that 91% of Kazue's AS-units in her first performance were part of productive AS Clusters. I then carried out the same procedures for the number of words that are in productive AS clusters relative to total words in a single performance. I did this in order to identify any possible discrepancy between number of productive AS-units and the total number of words in productive AS clusters.

Chapter 4: Analysis of Four Learners

4.1 Analysis of Two Productive Learners

In this chapter I present the four learners that I chose to analyse, beginning with a review of two learners who appeared to improve their performances at each task repetition. Of the 12 learners that I initially reviewed, these two learners, plus one additional learner, appeared to take advantage of task repetition. This additional learner (who is not analyzed in this paper) clearly used task repetition to improve her performance. She self-structured her task performances, focusing on one centre of interest in all three performances and trying each time to expand and improve her performance. She is a model of learner engagement of the L2 during task repetition; however, since she is the only example of a model learner, I decided to leave her out of my study, although the other two learners that I analyze first in this chapter demonstrate many of the same qualities. The third and fourth learners I review last in chapter four demonstrate a consistent decrease in the quality of their performances. These latter two learners are typical of what most of the initial twelve learners did in their task performances with the exception of the three learners above. In the summary, I discuss in greater detail the possible reasons why the four learners in this study performed the way they did.

4.1.1 Kazue's and Miho's Task Performances

The two productive learners are referred to here as Kazue and Miho. Both of these learners' performances suggested from an initial analysis that their second or third performances could be better than their first. In the case of Kazue, word count, production time and number of AS-units suggest that her second and third performances are more productive.

Table 2. Kazue’s General Production Measures

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 26 | 36 | 34 |
| Production time | 2.27 | 3.07 | 3.20 |
| Word count (minus dysfluencies) | 164 | 238 | 251 |

Kazue produces 10 more AS-units in her second performance and eight more AS-units in her third, compared to her first performance. Production time increases by almost one minute from the first to the third performance, and word count by almost 100 words. Miho slightly increases her word count each time.

Table 3. Miho’s General Production Measures

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 26 | 24 | 27 |
| Production time | 3.10 | 3.15 | 5.03 |
| Word count (minus dysfluencies) | 214 | 228 | 287 |

Miho’s production time in her third performance is two minutes longer than either of the two previous performances. Looking at Kazue’s general measures I was confident that she had more productive second and third performances relative to the first but, as will be discussed later, AS cluster data indicated some uncertainty about how productive she actually was. In the case of Miho there was even less certainty as her general markers were not convincing. Again, it was because of the uncertainty of their performances that I selected these two learners’ performances for analysis with my complexity tools.

4.1.2 Number of AS-units at the Benchmark

As Table 4 shows, Kazue’s percentage of AS-units of seven words or more increases overall, but as a percentage it drops slightly in the second performance before reaching 50% in the third performance.

Table 4. Kazue’s AS-unit Benchmark

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| AS-units under 7 words | 15/26 58% | 23/36 64% | 17/34 50% |
| AS-units of 7 words or more | 11/26 42% | 13/36 36% | 17/34 50% |

What is significant about this slight increase in the number of AS-units is the increase of ‘long’ AS-units. In Table 5, the first column gives the length of an AS-unit and the other three columns show how many AS-units there are at that word count for each task performance. For example, at the seven-word AS-unit length there are three AS-units the first time, two the second time and six the third time. The numbers in brackets represent how many of these AS-units belong to productive AS clusters. The entry (1–20) in the final column and last row indicates one AS-unit that is 20 words long and belongs to a productive AS cluster.

Table 5. Kazue’s AS-unit Breakdown

| AS-unit length (in words) | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 7 | 3 (2) | 2 (2) | 6 (2) |
| 8 | 4 (4) | 1 (1) | 3 (1) |
| 9 | 1 (1) | 0 | 1 (1) |
| 10 | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 1 (1) |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 1 (1) | 1 |
| 13 | 0 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) |

| | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|----------|
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 15 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 |
| 16 | 0 | 3 (3) | 0 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) |
| 18 | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) |
| 20+ | 0 | 0 | 1 (1-20) |

In Kazue's first performance only one AS-unit is of 12 words and over; in her next two performances she produces, respectively, seven and six AS-units of 12 words and over. At the 12-word length almost all units involve some type of clausal embedding, mostly simple subordinators and coordinators. The other productive learner, Miho, produces a similar pattern of an increase in the count of long units. For this reason I decided to analyse their longer units to see whether these units were verbatim repetitions with more language added, completely new units or reconstructions. If the last two categories (completely new units, reconstructions) comprised the majority of the units then this, I believed, would be a very positive finding for my study.

First I reviewed all of Kazue's AS-units of 12 words and over in her second performance, and determined that four of the seven units (listed below) are completely new in that none of the language in the AS-unit is present in the first performance.

11 K: /Then it is very small we went to the pet shop and we buy it/ (1AS 15)

12 K: /(When) when it was very small it is so cute but now it is become very big/ (1AS 16)

55 K: /(My friends mm 2.90) one of my friends picked turtle (in her 3.00) in the balcony of her house/ (1AS 12)

55 K: /Mm maybe that turtle is (mm 2.5) next neighbors turtle but he pick up and he raise it now/ (laughs) (1AS 16)

With the exception of the third AS-unit, all have some basic clausal embedding present. The first two new AS-units above are from an AS cluster that is about her rabbit. Kazue's production in her first performance is almost entirely about her rabbit. The other two units above are part of another AS cluster in the second performance. The remaining three long AS-units from the total of seven in her second performance originate in her first performance, and are 'reconstructed' units that are combinations or expansions of previous units. All three of these units are derived originally from Excerpt 7, which is from Kazue's largest AS cluster in her first performance.

Excerpt 7

Shared pause 6.20

14 K: /And (it likes to) it likes (1.57) to (.84) bite anything/ (1AS 6)

15 P: Ah ah

16 K: /It bites my clothes, shoes, and pole of my house/ (1AS 10)

Both laugh

17 K: /Ah my mother (mm 1.59) sometimes angry (laughs)/ (1AS 4)

18 P: You and your family mm (don't try to mm 3.70) don't try to (mm 3.80) have Maru have Maru stopped

K 19: /Yes/ (1AS 1)

20 P: Ah do you do so?

21 K: /(laughing) Every time (P: says every time) but he runaway very fast/ (1AS 8)

22 P: Ah (laughing)

Shared pause 2.68

23 K: /And (it it runaway) sometimes it runaway from his box/ (1AS 7)

In her second performance one of Kazue's long reconstructed AS-units is:

15 K: /And Maru likes to bite anything my clothes or my shoes or pole of our house/ (1AS 16)

The first noticeable point about this AS-unit is that Kazue produces it without any false starts or pausing, which are present in the original two AS-units from which it is derived. The absence of dysfluencies cannot be attributed just to rehearsal, because the newer AS-unit above is not a repetition but rather a reconstructed AS-unit. Kazue produces the above AS-unit out of two units by removing the pronoun *it* and the repetitive *bite*, and then juxtaposing the two units. The second AS-unit in the first performance functions as a ‘list’ in the second performance. Kazue also brings some rhetorical effect to the AS-unit by repeating the personal pronoun *my*. For the other two reconstructed units of 12 words and over, Kazue adds new content to both. The next long AS-unit below is also a combination of a number of shorter units from the first performance excerpt above, in particular the last two units.

17 K: /In box but (mm1.53) sometime he runaway from the box and walk around in my house and bite anything/ (1AS 18)

In this new reconstructed unit is the addition of *walk around* and the prepositional phrase *in my house*. Kazue again uses two previous smaller units to create a more complex single unit. Kazue’s final reconstructed long AS-unit below is a partial repetition of units in the first performance seen above.

15 K: /So (mother) my mother always angry and scolds Maru (but) but he runaway very fast/ (1AS 13)

Kazue adds the verb *scold* to the above unit, which fills a ‘gap’ in content between the first act, her mother getting angry, and the second, her rabbit running away. In the first performance Kazue says that her mother is angry about her rabbit. Her partner then asks her why they can’t stop her rabbit, to which she replies that he runs away fast. Kazue in the second performance uses *scold* to make the sequence of events more cause-and-effect: the rabbits bites everything, her mother gets angry, she tries to scold the rabbit, but the rabbit runs away fast.

Kazue in her third performance continues to create new units and reconstruct other AS-units. Below is an example of one of the new units that Kazue produces in her final task work.

41 K: /But (2.31 one) one golden fish that (I) I buy in pet shop (P: Uh huh) it (mm 1.24) alive very long maybe five years/ (1AS 17)

It was the first AS-unit in her production that contained a *that* clause construction. In her third performance, I concluded that five of the six long units of 12 words and over were new. The one repeated unit is a partial repetition of a short unit in her first performance. Of the six units in her third performance only one was about her rabbit. Kazue stops talking about her rabbit, but still produces both an 18-word AS-unit and a 19-word AS-unit, the longest in her three task performances, and both in the same turn.

69 K: /(I also um) when I was three years old I also go to pet safari park but I can’t remember then (both laugh)/my mother and father said (you’ll) you have ever went to pet safari park but (I) I can’t remember/ (2AS 19+18)

The second AS-unit has repeated elements of the first, but Kazue’s second AS-unit is still clearly an elaboration of the first unit. Kazue tries to explain how she knows she went to a safari park, despite being only three years old and not remembering. To explain this she produces *My mother and father said (you’ll)* and then correctly reformulates from the incorrect *you’ll* to *you have*, from which she then tries to produce the present perfect negative. She conflates *ever* and *never*, which are both used in the present perfect indefinite past. Moreover in the first unit she incorrectly produces the wrong tense of *go*, instead of its past form; however, in the second unit she produces the proper past tense *went* and re-establishes the past tense in her performance, but in the end fails to produce the past participle of *go*.

Miho’s data (Table 6), like Kazue’s above, demonstrates that over the three performances the quantity of her AS-units seven words and over remains steady with her third task performance being her best at 19 AS-units .

Table 6. Miho’s AS-unit Benchmark

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| AS-units under 7 words | 10/26 38% | 9/24 37% | 8/27 30% |
| AS-units of 7 words or more | 16/26 62% | 15/24 63% | 19/27 70% |

The number of units with 12 words and over in the three performances is five, seven and 10, respectively (see Table 7).

Table 7. Miho’s AS-unit Breakdown

| AS-unit | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 7 | 3 (1) | 4 (1) | 3 (2) |
| 8 | 3 (2) | 2 (1) | 3 (2) |

| | | | |
|-----|----------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 9 | 4 (2) | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 (1) | 0 | 2 (1) |
| 11 | 0 | 2 (2) | 1 |
| 12 | 1 | 2 (1) | 1 (1) |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) |
| 14 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 1 (1) |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 (2) |
| 16 | 1 (1) | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 1 (1) | 1 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) |
| 20+ | 1 (1-28) | 2 (1-20, 1-24) | 3 (1-21), (1-23), (1-27) |

However, what is different from Kazue's performance, and reflects a difference in proficiency, is that Miho produces a number of 20-word and larger AS-units. After I reviewed Miho's long units I concluded that, like Kazue, her 12-word-and-over AS-units in the second and third performances are mainly new units. In the second performance four of the seven long units are new. In the third performance six of 10 long units are new AS-units. Below are two of the new units from her third performance.

35 M: /so (in so) the fortunate telling say (I I will marry) I will marry when I am twenty-three (laughs) but I think twenty-three is (too) too young to marry/ (1AS 23)

43 M: /So my mother is a housewife but she said housewife is very boring so now (so she) she (do) does a part-time job/ She said it is fun its very fun (1AS 19)

Miho produces a number of AS-units over 20 words and, as both of the new units demonstrate above, she does this by following a clausal chaining strategy. Both new units involve simple coordinators and subordinators.

4.1.3 Miho's Reconstructed Units

Three of the seven units of 12 words and over that Miho produces in her second performance are reconstructed units (the other four are new). In the case of the third task performance, three of the 10 long units are reconstructed improvements of prior units. Six units are new, and the one remaining unit is a verbatim repetition of a previous unit. The six new units, like Kazue's, contain clausal embedding. In regard to the reconstructed units, the following series of data extracts shows progression from the first to the third task performances in how Miho reconstructs specific AS-units to improve her performance. Moreover, Excerpt 8 demonstrates Miho's risk-taking from the first to the third performance.

Excerpt 8

First performance

45 M: /And second is (3.56 ah) he's tall/ (1AS 6)

46 N: /Tall/

**47 M: /(laughs) Tall/So I don't want to marry the man who is smaller than I/
(1AS 14)**

48 N: /Ah yeah me too/So (so how) how tall do you want to him?/ (1AS 8)

**49 M: /Ah/ (6.66 thinking pause) Eh over (N: Over) eh over hundred seventy-five
centimeter/ (1AS 5)**

Second performance

43 M: /Money/ Because poor is very hard to live together and (thi) third is he's tall/ (1AS 14)

44 P: Tall

45 M: /Tall/

46 P: Oh

47 M: /(I I don't want to) I don't want to the man who is (taldar) taller than I especially his tall over hundred seventy-five (P: Ah) I want/ (But but if I if I find there 2.78) if I fall in love that man so he is smaller than I maybe I don't care/

48 P: Care

49 M: (But) but (my wish) it's my wish/ So what is your three qualities?/ (4AS 20+18+5+6)

Miho in her second performance tries to make one single AS-unit from two smaller units in the first performance. Following this unit, she also produces a new unit to further clarify her point. In the new reconstructed unit she begins with a false start, which appears to 'buy time' as she 'loads up' the language for her attempt to combine the units. She introduces the focusing adverb *especially*, but is unable to employ the necessary conditional in addition to not using the correct noun *height*. What also seems apparent is that making this reconstructed unit was quite challenging for her, and stretched her language resources. For example, in her second performance she produces the opposite of what she wants to say. In her first performance she says: *so I don't want to marry the man who is smaller than I*, but mistakenly produces in her second performance *(I I don't want to) I don't want to the man who is (taldar) taller than I especially his tall over hundred seventy-five) I want*. In addition she leaves out the *to (infinitive)*, and in the second part of the AS-unit mistakenly says *over* 175 centimeters rather than probably wanting to say *under* 175 centimeters. However, Miho in her third performance (see Excerpt 9) produces roughly the same two units

above in the second performance, but in reverse order, and moreover in the third performance she corrects the mistakes she makes in the second performance that were correct in her first performance.

Excerpt 9

Third performance

20 M: /first is character (whether he) (I I want) I want to marry the person who is very funny/ (1AS 13)

21 P: Oh

22 M: /And second is money and third is tall/Ah but (tall is amari wakanai demo) tall is (my) my wish ah (maybe that I) if I fall in love person and he is smaller than I maybe I don't care/But (but I we) (I I want marry) I want to (marry the) marry the person who is (tall tall) taller than I (as) as possible/ (3AS 8+21+14)

Both pause 3.49

The noticeable features of her third performance are the decrease in dysfluency, the self-corrections she makes in regard to *I want + to (infinitive)* and the comparative form of *tall*. Miho also engages in some risk-taking by trying to use the phrase *as much as possible*. Her decision to abandon production around specifying height probably has less to do with an avoidance strategy than with her recognizing that the two key units she produces in her second performance are more central to what she wants to tell her partner.

4.2 Productive AS Clustering of Kazue and Miho

In this section I present the data from Kazue and Miho's three task performances. Much of Kazue's data is represented in the examples for explaining AS clusters, and therefore only her quantitative results are presented.

Table 8. Kazue's AS Cluster Data

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 26 | 36 | 34 |
| Number of AS-units belonging to productive AS clusters | 20 | 25 | 15 |
| Productive AS cluster word total | 135 | 207 | 136 |
| Productive AS cluster word total as percentage of total words minus question word count | 91% | 100% | 62% |
| Productive AS-unit cluster total as percentage of total AS-units minus question AS-units | 91% | 100% | 55% |
| AS-unit question total | 4 | 11 | 6 |
| Question word total | 16 | 31 | 30 |

Kazue's best AS clustering is in her first and second performances. The number of AS-units involved in clustering reaches 25 at its peak in the second performance before dropping to 15 in the third performance. In the first performance Kazue is mostly engaging in AS clustering. There are two clusters, one that is 16 units long and has AS-units ranging from one to 10 words with the overall cluster totaling 101 words (see Excerpt 2). The other AS cluster is about her preference for dogs over cats, and consists of four AS-units: a three-word unit, two eight-word units and a 15-word unit. In her second performance she produces three main AS clusters. Her second

performance is impressive in that of her total of 238 words for the performance, 207 words are part of AS clustering with the remaining 31 attributed to asking questions. In her second performance, where Kazue is not engaged in AS clustering she is asking questions. Her longest cluster in the second performance is 124 words, consisting of 15 AS-units ranging from two to 18 words. In this cluster five of her seven long units of 12 words and over are present. This cluster is again about her rabbit; she recycles ideas from the first cluster in the first performance and adds new content regarding where she bought it and its size. This elaboration is partially the result of her partner pushing her to say more. All of her long AS-units in the second performance are in one of the three clusters. In addition three 10-word AS-units are part of these clusters. The long units in these clusters in her second performance are analysed in the section above on long AS-units.

Kazue has four AS clusters in her third performance. Her longest is seven units long and contains one 17-word AS-unit. As in her second performance, long units are prevalent in her AS clusters in the third performance. In her third performance five of the six long units are in AS clusters. However, as Table 8 shows, Kazue's AS clustering decreases. In her first two performances her best centre of interest is her rabbit, but as I showed in Excerpt 6 this centre of interest in her third performance is only 47 words and is classified as an unproductive cluster and therefore not counted. This is the main reason why her productive AS-unit cluster total and her productive AS cluster word total drop as percentages of overall AS-unit total and word total. However, her AS cluster word total is still at the same level as in the first performance, and there is only a difference of five AS-units in relation to the first measurement.

4.2.1 Miho and AS Clusters

In the case of Miho's AS cluster data the total word count for total clusters increases at each performance, with a difference of 68 words between the first and third performances.

Table 9. Miho's AS Cluster Data

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 26 | 24 | 27 |
| Number of AS-units belonging to AS clusters | 14 | 14 | 17 |
| Productive AS cluster word total | 144 | 163 | 212 |
| Productive AS cluster word total as percentage of total words minus question word count | 86% | 82% | 88% |
| Productive AS-unit cluster total as percentage of total AS-units minus question AS-units | 82% | 70% | 85% |
| AS-unit question total | 9 | 4 | 7 |
| Question word total | 47 | 28 | 46 |

The number of AS-units that belong to clusters stays relatively constant. As Table 7 shows, most of Miho's long AS-units are a part of her clustering activity: 4/5, 6/7 and 9/10 respectively. Miho's first performance consists of three clusters, the longest being six AS-units totaling 52 words, and AS-units ranging from two to 16 words. In her second performance there are just two clusters, both comprised of seven units and

totaling 83 and 80 words respectively. Lastly, her third performance consists of four clusters, the largest being six units and totaling 77 words. What is different between her performances and Kazue's is that she produces fewer AS-units per cluster, with smaller word totals; however, her clusters have bigger single units. Miho has six AS-units of 20 or more words that are part of her various AS clusters.

Looking at her topic choices in the first performance, Miho focuses on weddings, arranged marriages and the three qualities she wants in a partner. In her second performance she continues to focus on the topic of partner qualities, and also introduces another topic related to marrying someone older. In the final performance there are four centres of interests, two of which are repeated: partner qualities and weddings. There are two new clusters, on international weddings and on the age when she would like to get married. The topic on partner qualities is the only centre of interest that spans all three, but despite showing improvements, as discussed in relation to single long units, this is not her most committed, and she makes minimal improvements or expansions to it. Her largest Productive AS cluster (Excerpt 10 below), from her second performance, is her most challenging in that it contains a number of examples of her trying to be ambitious in her production.

Excerpt 10

Shared pause 6.73

5 M: /**(Before laughs) before conversation (the) she says (the 1.32) the age had nothing to do with marriage (inaudible) /But (mm) I think her idea is (1.88) right / (1.73) because I / (2AS 12+7)**

6 P: (Interrupts) nani to nani ga kankei nai marriage to

7 M: /**Marriage (to toshi) age/**

8 P: Ah

10 M: /Because I also think (2.74) the age is (not) not so important so my mother's friend married the person ah who is the same age my grandpa/ (1AS 24)

11 P: Oh Oh great story great story

12 M: /great story/ (So and so the she her her) her son is (my) my same age/ (1.91 but 2.60) but he said his father grandpa/ (2AS 6+6)

Both laugh

13 P: Ah little strange

14 M: /(So that umm between the fufu between the)

15 P: Eh couple

16 M: /Between the couple so (age) age (is) has nothing to do (with) with marriage / (But 2.02) and (kids) the kids care the father's age because he always seems a little strange (from eve) from someone/ (2AS 11+17)

This cluster starts from a question from Miho to her partner about marrying someone older. After a shared pause Miho pursues the topic at the fifth turn of the performance by introducing her previous partner's opinion. In all the data this is the only case of a learner talking about his or her partner's ideas. It should be noted that actual language is Miho's. This consists of two AS-units, both of which contain two utterance launchers with *(a personal pronoun) + (lexical verb phrase)*. She also employs a five-word formulaic bundle, *(noun) + (has nothing to do with) + (noun)*. This specific chunk appears for the first time in her performance, and is a summary of her partner's views (note: she uses it again at the end of her cluster, with the correct tense). Miho then tries to qualify what she has just said, by producing one AS-unit that involves clausal embedding (see 10 M in the excerpt). She starts with *Because I think* with a *that-clause* ('that' is omitted), followed by the subordinator *so*, which appears to be part subordinator and part discourse marker. Finally, she finishes the AS-unit with a relative clause involving the relative pronoun *who*. From here Miho continues to try to expand on the previous unit relating to age and marriage.

**12 M: /great story/ (So and so the she her her) her son is (my) my same age/
(1.91 but 2.60) but he said his father grandpa/ (2AS 6+6)**

She produces the two short AS-units above, which involve a dysfluency in the first unit and then a long pause in the second. In the second, despite the pause she still produces a unit that is mostly incomprehensible. At this point Miho is struggling with her production; she appears to know what she wants to say, and tries to, but is unsuccessful. One possible reason is that the previous unit, with its multiple clausal embedding, taxed Miho's processing capacity to the point where she is unable to keep her production going in real time at that rate. In addition, what she wants to say, which becomes evident at turn 16, is quite difficult. While this part of her production appears to be a production failure, from another perspective it demonstrates learner risk-taking despite obvious limitations in doing so. What is more, Miho does not give up but again attempts in her final two units to qualify what she unsuccessfully previously said and, while not being completely successful, her explanation is comprehensible enough. This final cluster is also a formulaic (*pronoun/noun*) + (*always seems*) + (*adjective*) + (*to*) + (*noun/pronoun or verb*). This latter relates back to the idea that language complexity is often characterized by the slotting of language into multi-syntactical frames, of which the above appears to be a case.

4.3 Two Unproductive Learners: Naoko and Rie

The two unproductive learners are referred to as Naoko and Rie in this study. As Table 10 shows, Naoko's production over her three performances is very clear. At each performance, with the exception of AS-units, all her general measures decrease.

Table 10. Naoko's General Production Measures

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 30 | 25 | 37 |
| Production time | 3.26 | 2.29 | 1.50 |
| Word count (minus dysfluencies) | 263 | 212 | 195 |

By the third performance her talking time has dropped by almost two minutes, and her word total has dropped by 68 words. What is really telling about her three performances is the increase in AS-units of under seven words.

Table 11. Naoko's AS-unit Benchmark

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| AS-units under 7 words | 11/30 37% | 11/25 44% | 25/37 68% |
| AS-units of 7 words or more | 19/30 63% | 14/25 56% | 12/37 32% |

In the first performance 63% of AS-units are seven words and over. In addition 11 of these 19 units are 10 words and over. Naoko produces three 16-word units and two 17-word units in her first performance. As was seen with the previous two learners, when learners produce long units they are usually part of productive AS clustering. Naoko's first performance demonstrates this again, as all of her seven AS-units of 14 words and over are in AS clusters (see brackets).

Table 12. Naoko's AS-unit Breakdown

| AS-unit | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 3 | 3 (2) | 3 (1) | 4 |
| 4 | 1 (1) | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 2 |
| 6 | 4 (3) | 1 | 5 |

| | | | |
|-----|-------|-------------|-------|
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 8 | 3 | 1 (1) | 0 |
| 9 | 2 (1) | 2 | 1 |
| 10 | 2 | 4 (1) | 3 (1) |
| 11 | 1 (1) | 1 | 3 |
| 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 1 (1) | 0 | 1 (1) |
| 15 | 1 (1) | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 3 (3) | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 2 (2) | 1 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20+ | 0 | 2 1-24 1-31 | 0 |

However, in the third performance her long unit production drops considerably. While she produces 37 AS-units, 25 of these are under seven words; moreover, she produces only one unit of 12 words and over in the third performance. Fifteen of her units are three words or less. The clear trend is that Naoko's production from the first to the third becomes more elliptical and minimal. In the third performance, she asks more than twice as many questions as she did in the first. However, half of the 12 questions are three words and under, which again provides evidence of how elliptical and minimal the conversation is.

There is a significant drop from the first to the third performance in regard to productive AS clustering.

Table 13. Naoko's AS Cluster Data

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 30 | 25 | 37 |
| Number of AS-units belonging to productive AS clusters | 16 | 4 | 2 |

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|
| Productive AS cluster word total | 164 | 26 | 24 |
| Productive AS cluster word total as percentage of total words minus question word count | 72% | 17% | 18% |
| Productive AS-unit cluster total as percentage of total AS-units minus question AS-units | 64% | 25% | 8% |
| AS-unit question total | 5 | 9 | 13 |
| Question word total | 35 | 55 | 62 |

In her first performance she has two AS clusters. The longest and most productive is on arranged marriage, and is nine units long, ranging from a six-word unit to two 17-word units that total 121 words. In contrast, her second and third performances each have one AS cluster. The second is four units long (5+8+3+10) and the third is two AS-units totaling only 24 words. In regard to the third performance the chart shows that only 8% of her AS-units, and only 18% of her words, are productive. Naoko's production was discussed previously (Excerpts 4 and 5) as an example of lack of learner engagement in the L2. Excerpt 11 is from her third performance.

Excerpt 11

26 N: /Un Un second time (is) (1.64) is small party (P: small party) but don't have a party/ (1AS 11)

27 P: Don't have a party

28 N: /(Both laughing) Only hand paper/ (1AS 3)

29 P: (What) what do you look for in a partner three

30 N: /Three/

31 P: Yes

32 N: /First (eto 2.13) is economic power/ (1AS 4)

33 P: (laughing) Economic power

34 N: /Second is honesty/ (1AS 3)

35 P: Oh honesty

36 N: /Third (kind) (P: Kind) kindness/ (1AS 2)

37 P: Kindness very important

**38 N: /Very important but (financial) eh economic power is most important/
(1AS 7)**

39 P: You are economical

40 N: /Economical?/Maybe economical/ (1AS 1)

41 P: Economical

This brief extract captures the many features of her performance in both the second and third performances. Topics change abruptly and lack detail, and AS-units are short. In addition there is a shortage of negotiation of content between the two.

4.3.1 Rie's Production

Rie's performance follows the same pattern as Naoko's, but there are differences in quality. Her first performance contains the single most impressive productive AS cluster in all the data. Of her impressive 48 AS-units, 28 are seven words or more, with 18 of those being 12 words or longer (see Appendix 1.10). Rie's main AS cluster in her first performance is 22 AS-units long and totals 235 words. The centre of interest is about her sister's experience of having her bike stolen. A remaining 134 words belong to three other smaller productive AS clusters.

Table 14. Rie's General Production Measures

| Totals | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 48 | 21 | 36 |
| Production time | 6.38 | 2.90 | 2.53 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Word count (minus dysfluencies) | 465 | 193 | 216 |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|

Despite being the most productive of any learner in the first performance, Rie's performance, like Naoko's, drops in the second and third performance. In each her of next two performances Rie produces 14 AS-units at or above the seven-word benchmark.

Table 15. Rie's AS-unit Benchmark

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| AS-units under 7 words | 20/48 42% | 7/21 33% | 22/36 61% |
| AS-units of 7 words or more | 28/48 58% | 14/21 67% | 14/36 39% |

This is consistent with the other three learners in terms of quantity. However, based on her first performance, of 28 AS-units, both her second and third performances constitute a substantial drop in her production. In her second performance her 14 AS-units comprise 67% of her total AS production, while in the third performance they comprise 39%. In addition, as Table 16 reveals, the number of AS-units of 12 words and over decreases from 18 to eight, and to only three in the third performance.

Table 16. Rie's AS-unit Breakdown

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 12 | 7 (5) | 2 (1) | 1 |
| 13 | 2 (2) | 1 | 0 |
| 14 | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 1 (1) |
| 15 | 2 (2) | 1 (1) | 0 |
| 16 | 1 (1) | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 2 (1) | 0 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20+ | 4 (1-21), (2-23), (1-28), (1-32) | 0 | 0 |

Rie's AS clustering data is very striking in that her second and third performances are considerably poorer than her first. In her first performance 34 of her AS-units (the units in brackets) belong to productive AS clustering, while in the second and third performances this drops to 10 and 13 AS-units respectively.

Table 17. Rie's AS Cluster Data

| | First Performance | Second Performance | Third Performance |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Number of AS-units | 48 | 21 | 36 |
| Number of AS-units belonging to productive AS clusters | 34 | 10 | 13 |
| Productive AS cluster word total | 369 | 95 | 91 |
| Productive AS cluster word total as percentage of total words minus question word count | 92% | 56% | 55% |
| Productive AS-unit cluster total as percentage of total AS-units minus question AS-units | 87% | 59% | 54% |
| AS-unit question total | 9 | 4 | 12 |
| Question word total | 66 | 25 | 51 |

It is somewhat surprising that Rie, despite producing a strong centre of interest in her performance, chooses not to use it in the next two performances. Her next two performances each have one AS cluster, of 10 and 11 units respectively. In addition two of the productive AS clusters in her first performance are briefly repeated, though they are classified as unproductive. While Rie's AS cluster in her second performance

is clearly productive, the AS clustering in her third performance (Excerpt 12) is only marginally productive.

Excerpt 12

55 P: Okay hmm have you ever read the book ah nan dake (says title in Japanese)
you know that?

56 R: /No/ (1AS 1)

57 P: You know?

**58 R: /I know the title but I don't know the story/ (P: Mm) But he has twenty-
three or twenty-four (face) faces/ (2AS 11+7)**

59 P: Twenty-four characters

60 R: /Characters?/ (1AS 1)

61 P: Ahh and he crime commit commit crimes and in the cold I forgot details there
in the world there are like case there are case kind of like what do you think he
ah a man killed something killed someone but he had twenty-four faces and ah
one of the twenty faces commit this commit the crime but other twenty didn't
do that

62 R: /Un once/ (P interrupts)

63 P: We have to we have to make him ear make him earn

**64 R: /Mm (do I believe) Do I believe (something) someone like (says name of
character)/ (1AS 6)**

65 P: Un

66 R: /Once I watched on TV such a man/ (1AS 8)

67 P: Un

68 R: /Un/ (he) he suddenly changed character/ (1AS 4)

69 P: Really how is that?

70 R: /He suddenly said a different name/ (1AS 6)

71 P: Mm

72 R: /Yeah I have watched on TV/ (1AS 6)

73 P: His his face changed?

74 R: /Yeah/ (1AS 1)

Shared pause

75 R: /Yeah a little bit change as the characters (changed) changed very strange (laughs) not normal human/ (laughing) (1AS 14)

76 P: Oh oh

77 R: /So mm in the world there are some strange people like that/ (laughing) (1AS 11)

Shared pause 16.06

What makes this AS cluster productive is that despite Rie not trying to be overly elaborate, she is neither trying to be elliptical nor minimal in her production. Her partner asks her a number of questions, and Rie tries to contribute despite the fact that, as she states in the beginning, she is not very familiar with the topic. The other important point about the excerpt is that her partner asks a lot of questions, and appears to be focused on engaging in a conversation-like interaction with Rie.

In concluding this section on the four learners the data appears to give a fairly clear picture of the direction in which the learners' performances proceeded. However, this data does not explain why the learners' performances evolved in the way they did. For example, why did Rie turn in a really strong performance in her first performance and then let her engagement activity decline in her next two performances? In the next chapter I will discuss the possible reasons for this. I will summarize the performance of the four learners, and discuss the reasons for their varying performances using some informal feedback that I collected from them. Before this, in sections 5.1 and 5.2 I will assess the two complexity measurements I used for this study.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Analysis of the Benchmark and AS Cluster

My original focus in this preliminary exploratory study was to investigate whether and how learners respond to immediate task repetition during open-ended conversation tasks. After data collection and initial analysis, it became apparent that measures commonly used in task-based research could not easily be applied to my data. The first problem centred on the nature of language production during conversation, and the problem of using subordination for determining complexity in conversation-like dialogical tasks. As discussed, subordination is not necessarily an obvious feature of conversation. The second problem, identified immediately when I reviewed my data, was the gap between what seemed important to analyse and report in relation to student production and what most tools lead the researcher to focus on. With the first problem I developed the idea of using AS-unit length as a benchmark for complexity. With the second I proposed a unit called an AS cluster.

The idea of using word count for AS-units as a measure of language complexity was based on the work of Bygate (2001). The taxing nature of conversation, coupled with cognitive pressures in the L2, presents learners with significant challenges in producing even short units. I decided that establishing a benchmark based on AS-unit length was an acceptable option for measuring a beginner learner's language complexity during real-time conversation, because the number of words per AS-unit reflects the learner's ability to attach language to syntactical structure and to also follow a clausal chaining strategy.

In regard to word count per AS-unit as a measure of complexity, the credibility of the measure was dependent upon demonstrating that AS-units above a certain length start to contain features of language complexity that are not present in shorter units. I demonstrated that in AS-units of six or more words subordinators, coordinators and clausal embedding are present, and moreover that most units consist of complete clauses rather than being sub-clausal. I also demonstrated that at this length and above a larger breadth of tenses is present and, furthermore, that learner errors and dysfluency increase as learners' processing capacity is stretched. I also singled out the 12-word AS-unit as a benchmark, because at this length almost all units involve some degree of coordination or clausal embedding. The presence of AS-units of 12 words and over also clearly distinguished the productive learners from the unproductive ones. These long units clearly represented L2 engagement by the learners. With the really long AS-units, of around 17 words and over, I found that these long AS-units partially conflate the relationship between complexity and fluency. These long AS-units were formed mostly by an add-on strategy, which means that, in many cases, I could determine an AS-unit only by relying mostly on hesitational and intonational markers rather than syntax. This is in contrast to the claim by Foster *et al.* (2000) that the AS-unit is primarily syntactical. I believe this problem relates to the nature of conversation, in which clausal chaining makes it difficult to identify an utterance's ideational core. Overall I was satisfied with using AS-unit length combined with a benchmark, and felt it was an effective measure for identifying general changes in the learners' productions over the three task performances. I think its effectiveness is partially attributable to the fact that, aside from back-channel language, I included almost all of the learners' language to track their performances. Even the small units

provided valuable information about movement towards or away from minimal and elliptical language production.

5.1.1 Analysis of the AS Cluster

In this study I proposed a unit called an AS cluster to measure learner engagement. Learner performance during a task fluctuates as regards productivity and quality, and AS clustering represents the best part of a task performance in that it represents learner L2 engagement. In my study learner engagement in the L2 consisted of a conscious holistic effort on the part of the learners to make their productions more complex, fluent and accurate. The product of this engagement is a group of AS-units in close proximity, focused on a particular theme, what Chafe calls a centre of interest. Currently, much research on task-based learning tends to dissect a task performance rather than looking at it holistically.

In the study I established two types of AS clustering, productive and unproductive. Other language that was not classified as an AS cluster was considered to be of no value to student language learning and development. Both types of AS clusters were for the most part easy to identify. All four learners demonstrated AS clustering in their first performances. First, learners displayed a language complexity characteristic of conversation by engaging in clausal chaining. This resulted in some cases of learner AS clustering reaching over 100 words. In the first performance, AS clustering also demonstrated learners engaging in risk-taking that was either successful or unsuccessful. Unsuccessful risk-taking occurred in two ways. First, at the limits of their interlanguage learners were unable to successfully produce the language form or meaning they wanted, and as a result their productions broke down

and became partially incomprehensible. Unsuccessful risk-taking was also demonstrated as a cognitive activity when learners tried to produce longer single units but ended up producing two units demarcated by dysfluencies and pausing. Besides the focus on complexity and fluency, learners also engaged in trying to be accurate by reformulating incorrect language form.

For the second and third performances the key feature of the AS clusters that made them complex was the presence of long AS-units. It was expected that long units would be present in AS clusters, but it was somewhat surprising that almost all of them were part of productive AS clusters. Only one or two long AS-units in the productive learners' data involved verbatim repetition. Surprisingly, the majority were in fact new, which is a decent indicator that the learners were trying to be ambitious. The longest units were in the second and third performances. The presence of a larger number of long units in the productive learners' second and third performances suggests that the learners' processing capacity benefited from task repetition. Perhaps more interesting than the increase of new long AS-units was the way learners recycled units. Most of these units were reconstructions formed from smaller prior units, and were clearly more than the sum of the previous units. Learner reconstruction of units is an orientation towards complexity in that learners, when formulating more concise single units, must recall during real-time conversation what they said previously, while in the same process engaging in one or more engagement activities. Learners demonstrated engagement with reconstructed units by making better lexical choices, filling gaps in content, adding new content, reformulating incorrect language form, trying to use more complex language form or new vocabulary, and even in one case improving the rhetorical quality of the unit. Of course these engagement activities

were done while the learner also maintained a rate of fluency that established the unit as a single unit, which meant they also eliminated dysfluencies, pausing or redundant language.

5.2 The Nature of Learner Engagement During AS Clustering

As noted above, the language engagement behaviour found in the data was multifaceted. On this point I discovered that learners during clustering activity shifted focus between meaning and form. This finding coincides with the recent work of Kumaravadivelu (2007). Both of our studies reveal that learners have a lot of influence on where they allocate their attentional resources. Many studies have focused on task types and instruction as ways to influence learner attentional focus, without acknowledging the role the learner plays in determining what they focus on in regard to meaning, form and function during task performance. As Kumaravadivelu notes, learners shifting focus between meaning and form probably has less to do with ability than with their seeing form and meaning as one and the same thing.

The AS cluster is relatively easy to identify and demarcate in learner production, and moreover I believe it is a useful concept because it reflects the holistic process of learner engagement in the L2 during a task performance. The AS cluster is also helpful in demonstrating that learner production and engagement are not constant during a task performance. I believe there are three problems with the AS cluster. The first weakness of the clustering concept is that within the cluster most activities by the learner are classified as learner engagement. I viewed all engagement as positive; however, this is not too problematic as the AS cluster is meant to represent holistic learning and, therefore not discriminate between degrees of risk-taking or the

reformulating of errors for example, and the reformulating of performance mistakes. The second obvious problem with the AS cluster is that its designation as productive or unproductive depends on my interpretive judgement on what constitutes learner engagement. The researcher cannot know for certain what the learner is doing or trying to do. As Batstone (2007: 89) notes, nothing in the classroom is self-evident, and everything in the classroom involves interpretation by the researcher. He rightly points out that quantitative studies are also interpretive in that researchers convert data into 'abstract tokens' by 'cutting away' data and decontextualizing it. In doing this, researchers are sometimes guilty of forcing the data to fit the research. In the case of the AS cluster no discourse or language is left out, and while some of my examples are disputable in terms of their relevance to language learning and development, it nonetheless seems fair to conclude that the AS cluster does reflect a certain reality of learner performance that is holistic and constitutes engagement in the L2 relative to other parts of the same performance.

I concluded that the biggest problem with the AS cluster is that it focuses on the individual learner's production, despite it being demonstrated that success was significantly dependent on the interlocutor's willingness to ask questions and give support. The most productive clustering was clearly supported by the interlocutor, so the productive AS cluster is somewhat wrongly classified as indicating an individual's engagement in his or her own production. However, it is incorrect to attribute the speaker's production strictly to the interlocutor's support, as the speaker makes the choice of engagement, which of course influences the interlocutor's actions. AS clustering involves a collaborative process between two learners, but the interlocutor's role is almost entirely supportive and secondary while the speaker's L2

engagement is primary. The interaction is not an evenly balanced dialogical conversation, but rather involves a learner establishing a centre of interest within his or her own recognized individual discourse space, which is then supported by the interlocutor. This type of discourse pattern was the most productive. More conversation-like productions between learners consisted of more topics and shorter turns, which resulted in those portions of their productions not being classified as productive. This means that pairs that tried to be conversational were deemed as unproductive. In this sense the AS cluster reflects that part of a conversation that is perhaps the least ‘conversational’.

5.3 Discussion of the Four Learners

In this study four learners were analysed using two basic measures, which proved effective for tracking learner engagement during task repetition. However, it was also necessary to account for any other variables that could explain learner performances. Productive performances revealed one common feature, a strategy of self-structuring their productions. Productive learners, rather than just engaging in ‘back and forth’ conversational chat during task performances, chose instead to concentrate their productions around one or more centres of interest, which materialized into AS clusters. Moreover, when it came to repeating a task, the productive learners would repeat and build on their previous centres of interest. In short, what separated productive from unproductive learners in this study was their willingness to follow self-structuring task strategy, which resulted in deeper engagement of production and learning. After teaching the students for a year and also reviewing the data, I concluded that the willingness to self-structure had no connection to proficiency. For

example, the weakest student of the four (Kazue) was in fact one of the most productive.

5.4 Open-ended Feedback Survey with the Four Learners

While I did not use it in my data, I did conduct an open-ended informal feedback survey at the end of the lesson to gauge learner response to open-ended tasks and task repetition. The learners were asked to choose their best and worst performances and to give reasons. They were also asked to comment on the topics, how they felt about doing task repetition and finally what they thought the purpose of task repetition was. Kazue, who had talked about her rabbit, wrote that she felt her first performance was her worst, and her third was her best. Interestingly, while her rabbit topic was an unproductive cluster in her third performance, nonetheless the data supports her in that her second and third were better than the first, and her third was probably her best. Her reason for choosing the third performance had nothing to do with production, but rather she wrote that she enjoyed talking to her partner, which is also supported by the amount of laughter in that performance. The other productive learner, Miho, failed to give a clear indication of what she thought her best and worst performances were. Both the productive learners liked the topics and responded that task repetition provided them with chances to improve their English; as Kazue wrote, *I can remember my story because of the repeating*. In addition both mentioned, as did the other two, that they liked talking to various people and hearing various ideas. Kazue liked the number of times she repeated the task, but Miho thought two times would have been better. The comments of the two unproductive learners differed slightly from those of the productive learners. Naoko, who had talked about weddings, felt her third performance was her best, and her second was her worst. This

is quite an interesting judgement because, as the data shows, her first performance was clearly her best, while the third was almost half the length of the first and clearly unproductive. Like Kazue, Naoko also noted that she enjoyed the last performance because it was ‘fun’, and this performance too had a lot of laughter. While both Kazue and Naoko cited having fun in the third performance, nonetheless their performances were considerably different in quality. I concluded that their respective partners were similar in that they were more extroverted than other students, which was strictly coincidental. Finally, Rie chose her first as her best and her second as her worst. Considering how large and impressive her first performance was, it seems reasonable that she would notice how significant it was in relation to the other two performances. She noted that her second performance was her worst in that she could not express herself well. On this point, this is the only example I have where there appeared to be some ‘issue’ that emerged between speaker and partner. Rie starts off engaged with her partner, but when her partner questions one of her comments in a seemingly friendly way, from that point on she does not participate as actively. However, despite this potential influence on her production, nonetheless the second performance is still better than her third in a number of key areas, which thus suggests that there was a larger trend at work. Having observed the learners for a year I had seen no instances of class members being unfriendly or uncooperative with one another. In the data I saw no competition for talking, and stronger students were quite supportive in helping weaker students. All learners were quite attentive to sharing talking time equally and being supportive of one another. As noted earlier, Japanese discourse is generally viewed as a cooperative process (*aizuchi*), and this trait naturally was present during the task performance.

In this paper AS clustering was the key characteristic of learner engagement during task performance and between task performances. In the case of the two unproductive learners, their inability – or more accurately their unwillingness – to take advantage of task repetition stems from their orientation towards their task performances and task repetition. In the informal feedback both learners' responses suggested that they did not try to self-structure their performances. Naoko wrote that she thought talking about the same thing was uninteresting, so she tried to talk about something different each time. Rie, who produced the excellent first performance but did not bother to carry it over to a second or third performance, also wrote that she tried to talk about something different each time. Another of the learners reviewed in the preliminary stages wrote that she did not know if she was supposed to repeat the same topics. These comments reflect the naivety I showed in relation to how learners would view task repetition. I had assumed that learners would automatically use it to improve performance and would achieve this by repeating topics and working on them. However, most of the data I looked at in the preliminary stages did not reveal this thinking on the part of the learners. This problem relates to Breen's (1989) notion of 'task-as-workplan' and 'task-in-process', which contrasts 'intended pedagogy' with 'actual pedagogy'. The two unproductive learners who represent most of the learners that I reviewed interpreted the purpose of task repetition differently than I had intended.

Despite orientation towards task repetition as an obvious factor in their performances this is still not sufficient to explain why Naoko's and Rie's production decreased at each performance, as did the majority of students' performances. I would argue that the reason is not related to orientation towards talking about different topics each

time, but towards conversation-like interaction at the expense of L2 engagement. As Thornbury and Slade (2006: 25) note, 'casual conversation' and 'conversation' are interchangeable terms, and casual conversation typically involves 'light' discussion on a mutually agreed series of topics. The nature of conversation is social and symmetrical, which requires both speakers to cooperate and engage in clear, brief, relevant and informative conversation (see Grice 1975). The purpose of my course and the open-ended, theme-based tasks was not to have the students participate in casual conversation, but rather to use themes as a basis for facilitating language learning and development through mostly oral production. These topic-based tasks are in fact different from casual conversation in that learners need to talk about non-trivial topics such as crime or marriage for an extended period of time. Naturally, focus within the topics will change but, unlike social chat which allows for complete topic changes from the weather to health, it is not easy to change topics or focus within a topic even if resources are available. On this point I believe the two unproductive learners approached the task in a casual, conversation-like manner despite it being impossible for them to engage in such discourse within a single theme-based topic. Naoko, in her informal survey feedback, admitted that she had not been able to talk about the topic in the way she had hoped to. In short, Naoko and Rie viewed the task as casual conversation between two people on a specified topic. Again the problems with this are that, first, conversation does not facilitate learner engagement very well and, second, the learners did not have the resources to engage in single themes in a collaborative dialogical manner. In Excerpt 12 there is an example of this, with Rie admitting to her partner that she did not know much about the subject her partner was trying to converse on.

What appeared to be missing with the two unproductive learners was an educational or language learning purpose or engagement in their spoken productions. The two productive learners appeared to be motivated to maintain their productions over the three performances because they were focused on engaging in language learning, and used task repetition as an opportunity to work on their language. The unproductive learners unintentionally de-prioritized learning engagement in favor of conversation and social chat. By focusing on interactive conversation over self-engagement with a task unsuited for conversation, I believe that these two learners became bored with repeating the task, and this contributed heavily to a decline in their productions. Again, this boredom arose from their being unable to engage the topic as they could in their L1, and furthermore being too oriented to social interaction at the expense of learning engagement. One possible finding is that offering learners the opportunity to engage in social chat and conversation may not sustain interest for very long if there is no priority or attention given to learning engagement or to their own spoken productions. The issue of conversation in the classroom relates back to the discussion at the start of this paper. Critics contend that conversation leads to elliptical and minimal language use, while proponents argue that learners' language production during conversation tasks is more complex than transactional tasks. I would argue that both positions are valid, and that the real issue is the learners' orientation and how the teachers design the lesson. Conversation for the sake of conversation will not promote language development, nor will it sustain motivation in the classroom. However, theme-based discussion tasks that partially mimic 'conversation' can successfully promote learner engagement in the L2 if the teacher orients the learner to the pedagogical reasons and goals for doing a task. Furthermore, if this focus is present

then learners will continue to maintain their L2 engagement even when immediately repeating the same task one or even two times.

In conclusion this exploratory study, the main outcome that emerged from the student task performances was that most learners did not take advantage of task repetition. There are a number of reasons for this. First, I had learners do the same task with three different learners without making the purpose of repetition clear to them, and without emphasizing that they should try to work on and improve their successive performances. A partial resolution to this problem lies in the teacher making clear how learners should approach task repetition, and showing them how to take advantage of it effectively. This would also suggest that, instead of task repetitions in immediate succession, some form of pedagogical intervention or scaffolding might be more productive in between repetitions. Another finding is recognition of the potential pitfall of promoting conversational chat in the classroom and assuming that it facilitates deep learning engagement. If conversation becomes the focus of a task then, based on my initial findings, I would suggest that it has a negative effect on learner language engagement, and actually results in learner boredom. This last point highlights the complexity of teaching classes that are based on oral production in settings like Japan. In my study all of the students commented that this was their only production-based English language course for the year. They all expressed a keen interest in improving their oral production. My intention has always been to use task repetition to increase learner talking time, and at the same time to ease processing burdens. What needs to be pointed out is that the three performances by each learner comprise only 30 minutes out of two 90-minute lessons that make up the coverage of the topic. Of these 30 minutes most learners would only speak on average for about

10–13 minutes, as my data shows. In the two-lesson time frame there would be another five minutes of open-ended task work, but overall this is not a lot of talking time to allocate to learners. The remaining minutes are spent on other practice and awareness-raising activities. One would expect that, because of the relatively small amount of time afforded for speaking, learners, regardless of having to repeat a task, would take full advantage of the opportunity afforded them. There appear to be mixed messages from the learners, and this preliminary data suggests that the goal of many EFL settings to increase speaking to meet the perceived needs of students is a complex pedagogical issue.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that this study does lend support to the role of task repetition in the classroom. First, all the learners in this study had positive things to say about it and felt it was important in the classroom. In regard to the data itself the value of task repetition was demonstrated with the two productive learners, who used it to improve their performances. This was clearly demonstrated with the long units in this study. What is more, this study also demonstrated that open-ended thematic tasks are effective ways to facilitate learner engagement in language learning and production. In the informal survey, the majority of learners commented that they preferred open-ended tasks over transactional tasks. The next step in this ongoing study is to look at task repetition in the context of the classroom to evaluate its effectiveness as a pedagogical option in the classroom. In my next study I intend to look at how some form of pedagogical intervention can be used in conjunction with task repetition.

Appendix 1: Transcripts

Transcript Conventions

- 1 K Identified learner and turn (e.g. first turn, Kazue)
- 2 P Partner (not the focus of the study) and turn (e.g. second turn, partner)
- () Dysfluencies and timed pausing (not counted as part of an AS-unit)
- // AS-unit boundaries
- (2AS 4+3 10.00) Indicates two AS-units per turn, their word count (four words and three words) and time in seconds to produce the units (10 seconds)

Appendix 1.1: Kazue's First Performance

Kazue: K

Partner: P

1 K: /Hello/

2 P: Hello have you ever had a pet?

**3 K: /Yes I have a rabbit in my parents house/ /(mm 3.0) Its name is Maru/
(2AS 9+4 8.60)**

4 P: Maru?

5 K: /Maru/

6 P: Mm

7 K: /Because (its mm 2.2) it sleep round/ (1AS 4 6.95)

8 P: Round?

9 K: /(When) when it sleep it become (rou) round/ (1AS 6 3.47)

10 P: Ah ah

11 K: /But (mm) in summer (it) it sleep (2.5) up length up length/ (1AS 7 10.30)

12 P: Mm

13 K: / (It) it don't become round/ (1AS 5 2.46)

Shared pause 6.20

14 K: /And (it likes to) it likes (1.57) to (.84) bite anything/ (1AS 6 8.07)

15 P: Ah ah

16 K: /It bites my clothes, shoes, and pole of my house/ (1AS 10 6.52)

Both laugh

17 K: /Ah my mother (mm 1.59) sometimes angry (laughs)/ (1AS 4 3.63)

18 P: You and your family mm (don't try to mm 3.70) don't try to (mm 3.80) have
Maru have Maru stopped

19 K: /Yes/ (1AS 1 .2)

20 P: Ah do you do so?

**21 K: / (laughing) Every time (P: says every time) but he runaway very fast/ (1AS
8 4.60)**

22 P: Ah (laughing)

Shared pause 2.68

23 K: /And (it it runaway) sometimes it runaway from his box/ (1AS 7 6.51)

24 P: Mm (1.70)

**25 K: /And one day (I) I sleep in my room /And (1.60 mm) (I heard 3.30 mm it)
ah I heard (4.50) (his his) his voice (laughs)/ (He) he enter my house and
(he sleep) he slept in my room (2.72)/ Because he runaway from his box/
(4AS 8+5+10+6 40.56)**

Shared pause 5.45

26 K: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .45)

27 P: Ah (I I'm) I have not have pet (.98) but (ah.70) I like animals (Ah 3.84) (when
I was when I when I walk to) when I go walk in the park (ah 3.26)

In the park (um 2.70) many (5.56) (people) other people ah also go to the park (with their) with their dogs so (uh 2.25) at the weekend in the park there are many dogs/ (is this change ok) ah I think the number of dogs (2.9) are (more) than ah (people) the number of people (laughs)

Shared pause 3.8

28 P: Ah (5.0 mm I I) ah If possible I would like to have a cat (3.56) (but ah 2.16 now) but now I live in (ah 2.06) apartment (ah 1.41) So (mm 2.12) (I can't I can't) I can't have a pet

29 K: /You like cat better than dog?/ (1AS 6 3.80)

30 P: Ah mm yes uh but (I don't like ah I don't hate to) I don't hate dogs

Shared pause 6.00

31 P: How about you?

32 K: /I like dog/Cat is (1.99 not) not dislike but (1.98) dog is better/ (2AS 3+8 10.02)

33 P: Mm

Shared pause 4.52

34 K: /Cat (1.68) it don't like to be touched/ (1AS 8 7.21)

35 P: Mm

36 K: /Ah if I try to touch they don't like that so I can't touch/ (1AS 15 9.39)

37 P: To to be touched (B says this right when A says 'try to') (I) ah (3.00) (the reason) the reason why I like cats is (mm 9.81) I I assume that (I 1.50) was I was ah I (1.50) I tend to be like by cat mm I don't know(laughs)

Shared pause 3.00

38 P: (So (ah 2.73) so ah (when I) when I went to the house of friends (ah 1.78) the friends had a pet a cat (1.34) so(my friend) the cat of friend (ah 4.54)) (don't

ah be ah were not 2.25) were not friendly with my friend ah but ah (7.38) and
(they (2.4) they (3.63) they (4.97) they they (3.0) they they makes) they makes
around they makes (11.18) (the cat) ah (3.42) the cat (go to my go to me) go
around me And (ah 3.32 make their head) make their head touch my leg

Shared pause 1.49

39 P: So I like cats they are very pretty

Shared pause 7.27

40 K: /Have you ever have goldfish?/ (1AS 5 4.07)

41 P: Ah yes

42 K: /Me too goldfishes is very popular?/ (1AS 6 3.02)

43 P: Yeah

44 K: /But we can't touch or (P: interrupts yes) speak/ (1AS 7 6.33)

Both laugh

45 P: Ah (5.43 I) also have had ah a goldfishes (ah 3.49) a goldfish (I have) I had
(is was very (2.65) was very (3.30 long life)long life so (ah 3.07 when I was a
child) when I was a child (um 1.88) I get it in the festival of summer

46 K: /Ah in shrine?/ (1AS 2 .73) (cuts in on P after summer)

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.2: Kazue's Second Performance

Kazue: K

Partner: P

1 P: Do you have a pet?

2 K: /Yes I have a rabbit/ (1AS 5 1.55)

3 P: Rabbit?

4 K: /Yes in my parent's house/ (1AS 5 2.05)

Shared pause 2.15

5 K: /Mm its name is Maru /(P: Maru!)/ Mm because (it) it becomes round when it sleeps/ (2AS 4+7 10.42)

6 P: Sleep?

7 K: /Sleeps ah like a (rou) round/ So we gave it name Maru/ (2AS 4+6 7.82)

8 P: Ah (how ah) what color is your rabbit?

9 K: /White and grey/ (1AS 3 .74)

10 P: Did you buy or . . . ?

11 K: /Yes buy so pretty/ Then it is very small we went to the pet shop and we buy it/ (2AS 4+15 10.51)

Shared pause 3.95

12 K: /(When) when it was very small it is so cute but now it is become very big/ (1AS 16 7.80)

13 P: Ah how how how many years do you raise your rabbit?

14 K: /Mm five years (2.05) (P: 5 years!) /So it is (mm 1.53 old) old rabbit now/ (2AS 2+6 9.68)

Shared pause 10.59

15 K: /And Maru likes to bite anything my clothes or my shoes or pole of our house (C mm)/ So (mother) my mother always angry and scolds Maru (but) but he runaway very fast/ (2AS 16+13 28.16)

16 P: Did you do you raise your rabbit some box or at home?

17 K: /In box but (mm 1.53) sometime he runaway from the box and walk around in my house and bite anything/ (1AS 18 12.09)

18 P: Now I raise tropical fish at my parents house and (2.55) we when I was young
I was raising dogs (1.55) and my brother picked him in his high school/

19 K: /*(Mix) mixed?*/ (1AS 1 .43)

20 P: Pick pick (repeats in Japanese)

21 K: /*What kind?*/ (1AS 2 .27)

22 P: It's a shiba

23 K: /*Shiba*/

24 P: Shiba (inaudible) we raise him about a year (1.51) but he was hit by a car
(1.36) so he was dead (1.04) and now we are raising tropical fish at my house
(1.89) it's very expensive to take care

Shared pause 8.30

25 K: /*(Your) your aqua museum is big?*/ (1AS 5 4.34)

26 P: Ah big

27 K: /*(How) how length?*/ (1AS 2 .72)

28 P: It's very very ah it's bigger than ah table dining table

29 K: /*Dining table?*/ (1AS 2 .30)

30 P: It's it's located in our living room (1.38) but (2.86) my house's living and
dining room is together

31 K: /*Mm*/

32 P: And dining is here and the living is here and our (3.31) tank is locate next to
the TV (1.29) so maybe the fish is (2.13) every time we are watching TV at
the living room my fish is maybe annoying

33 K: /*Annoying?*/ (1AS 1 .37)

34 P: Saragashi (translates into Japanese - noisy) because the TV is on

35 K: /*Ah ah*/

36 P: So we we want to move from TV but (ah 1.80) the tank is (1.94) heating with gas (1.05) so we can't move from consent

Shared pause 7.07

37 K: /How many how many fishes in the tank?/ (1AS 6 2.74)

38 P: Maybe 100

39 K: /100!/?

40 P: Or more but it's very (1.45) small fishes

41 K: /Ah/

42 P: Small fishes so (1.81) it's very beautiful at night

43 K: /Eto Guppy or (inaudible)/ (1AS 2 2.55)

44 P: We we we raise them too

45 K: /Very beautiful/

46 P: In one day we are raising turtle too

47 K: /Turtle I don't know?/ (1AS 5 1.16)

48 P: Kame

49 K: /Ah (tu tu) turtle oh/ Is it (eto 2.18) tropical fish?/ (1AS 4 3.70)

Both laugh

50 P: May be not tropical fish but we raise them together

51 K: /In the tank/

52 P: In the tank so one day he raise up from the tank (1.28) and at in the morning my mother (3.10) find him in the dining table (1.56) so she was very surprised and I was called to see it (.89) and I see {the} the turtle in the on the table so I was very surprised and maybe he jumped from the tank in the night

53 K: /Ju Jumped!/ (both laugh)

Shared pause 3.25

54 P: Maybe

Shared pause 2.86

55 K: / (My friends mm 2.90) one of my friends picked turtle (in her 3.00) in the balcony of her house/ Mm maybe that turtle is (mm 2.5) next neighbors turtle but he pick up and he raise it now/ (laughs) (2AS 12+16 27.00)

56 P: How big is that turtle? (surprised)

57 K: /Five or six centimeters/ (1AS 4 2.68)

58 P: Ah so it is small

59 K: /Yes but she likes the turtle and she raise it/ (1AS 10 5.96)

60 P: She she is living alone or . . . ?

61 K: /Yes alone/ (1AS 2 .59)

62 P: Alone and she is raising?

63 K: /Yes she (1.30) run to Konan (store's name) and (buy tank) buy tank or light/ (1AS 10 8.35)

64 P: My my friend is raising rabbit too at not in the house but out of the house and I told her not to raise rabbit outside but he said she said it's very stink

65 K: /Stink?/ (1AS 1 .2)

66 P: Kusai

67 K: /Ah/

68 P: Smells bad (1.20) when she raised inside so she is raising outside

Shared pause 3.11

69 K: /My rabbit raised in my house ah but (in) in the box / (P: mm)/ (so but) So if we raised outside (mm 1.74) it dies (early) early (1.65)/ So we raised it in my home (P: mm)/Rabbits hate rain water/ (5AS 10+8+7+4 27.33)

70 P: If (1.38) her hair is wet if she died

71 K: /Ah (not not) not die but/ (inaudible because teacher interrupts to end)

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.3: Kazue's Third Performance

Kazue: K

Partner: P

1 P: Hi nice to meet you

2 K: /Hi /(Have you ever) have you ever have pet?/ (1AS 5 3.09)

3 P: Yes now I have a pet in my house ah a dog

4 K: /Dog/

5 P: Called fuku

6 K: /Piku?/

7 P: Fuku

8 K: /Fuku/

Both laugh

9 K: /Is he a pup?/ (1AS 4 1.92)

10 P: No very small

11 K: /Small/ (What kind) what kind of dog?/ (1AS 4 2.66)

12 P: Ah dash dash

13 K: /Mix?/ (1AS 1 .4)

14 P: How about you?

15 K: /I have rabbit (P: Rabbit?) in my parent's house/ (1AS 7 2.82)

16 P: Uh huh

17 K: /I living alone now /(Un 1.0 that) Its name is Maru/

18 P: Maru (laughs)

19 K: /Because it become round when sleep/ (3AS 4+4+6 10.95)

Shared pause

20 P: Do you have a pet in your own house or a in a now where you live?

21 K: /Ah alone/ (1AS 1 .2)

22 P: Alone?

23 K: /I have it in my parent's house/(1AS 7)

24 P: Mm

25 K: /So I don't live with Maru/ (1AS 7 8.58)

26 P: Ah is your rabbit attached be familiar with us?

**27 K: /No but when he want food (he beco) he (come to) come to near my family
(laughs) only only/ (1AS 12 16.58)**

Shared pause

28 P: What's ah what is the your favourite animal?

29 K: /My favourite animal is dog/ (1AS 5 2.54)

30 P: Dog

**31 K: /Un because they are familiar (P uh huh) with us/ (And) and (3.07
inaudible Japanese) soft (they are) their fur is soft and warm and we can
touch them/ (2AS 6+13 20.32)**

Shared pause

32 P: Um my favorite animals is also dog

33 K: /Dog/

34 P: As you said a dog is very friendly and familiar with us and ah shaking tail is
very good

Shared pause

35 K: /Eto do you have another pet only dog?/ (1AS 7 4.13)

36 P: Unn gold fish

37 K: /Oh oh/

38 P: But mm I don't know now if they are living

Both laugh

39 P: Living they are alive I think so

**40 K: /When I was little I also have goldfish/ But (mm 1.30) most of them die
(ve) very early/ But (2.31 one) one golden fish that (I) I buy in pet shop (P:
Uh huh) it (mm 1.24) alive very long maybe five years/ (3AS 8+7+17 27.77)**

41 P: Five years

42 K: /It become very big/ (1AS 4 1.49)

43 P: Un huh

44 K: /Maybe 15 centimeter/ (1AS 3 2.44)

45 P: Oh oh

46 K: /Very big golden fish/ People said (is it ah nan da koi koi carp)

47 P: Ah (laughs)

48 K: /(Eto koi wakanai) (is it) it is not goldfish people said/ (2AS 4+8 17.04)

Both laugh 10.52

49 P: My golden fish uh was almost ten centimeter

50 K: /Ten/

51 P: Ten centimeter, but ah so he is not pretty

Shared pause 8.38

52 K: /Have you gone to zoo?/ (1AS 5 2.93)

53 P: Yes ah in ah when when I was 10 years old I uh I went to (name in Japanese)
park I feed the animals for example lion and zebra and

54 K: /Oh/

55 P: Rabbit it is very interesting but um the um lion approach me

56 K: /Oh/

57 P: And it is very um very scareful

58 K: /Can you give lion a block of meat?/ (1AS 8 6.00)

59 P: Yes raw meat

60 K: /Raw meat/

Both pause

61 P: So ah and um a lion touch touch me koko (here)

62 K: /Oh oh/

63 P: So um I I cra cried

64 K: /Cried/

65 P: Cried very loudly so ah a lion was very surprised

66 K: /Lion lion surprised!/
Both laugh

Both laugh

67 P: Yes yes from me

**68 K: /(I also um) when I was three years old I also go to pet safari park but I
can't remember then (both laugh)/My mother and father said (you'll) you
have ever went to pet safari park but (I) I can't remember/ (2AS 19+18
19.75)**

69 P: laughs

70 K: /But I want to go/ (1AS 5 1.31)

71 P: Did you sleep?

**72 K: /Maybe mm but (I like) I like to go zoo /so mm still now (I) sometimes (I
went) I go to zoo (2AS 6+8 16.55)**

73 P: Have you ever seen a panda?

74 K: **/Yes but only back/ (1AS 4 2.34)**

Both laugh

75 K: **/In front of a panda (P: Uh huh) there is many people (P: Uh huh)/ So (I can't nan daro 1.56) I can panda only back and very short time (P: Uh huh) so (in Japanese mita to ienai) (2AS 9+10 18.21)**

76 P: I also have seen the panda but uh he uh he slept and um so when I went to zoo first I run to the ah panda (laughs) but he he was sleeping and so when I go to the home I want to ah I want to ah see panda at last so but but he is sleeping he was sleeping always sleeping

77 K: **/When I (went) went to Australia (I) I watched koala koala but he is not so pretty/ (1AS 14 10.21)**

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.4: Miho's First Performance

Miho: M

Naoko: N

1 M: **/(What do what do you do) what would be your ideal wedding honeymoon?/ So (do do) do you want a small or big wedding?/ (2AS 7+9 8.89)**

2 N: /I want to have a big wedding party/ (1AS 8 3.23)

3 M: **/Ah (both laugh) (Wh) why?/ (1AS 1 2.56)**

4 N: /Because I want to invite many friends/ (1AS 7 5.97)

5 M: **/Ah/**

6 N: /And (I cel) I want to be celebrated by many people/ (1AS 9 6.41)

7 M: **/Un/**

8 N: /And I want to honeymoon to all Europe/ (1AS 8 4.75)

9 M: /All Europe (laughs)/

10 N: /Yes, especially I want to go Denmark/ (1AS 6 1.96)

11 M: /Ah/

12 N: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .74)

13 M: /Ah I want to a small wedding/ (1AS 6 3.06)

14 N: /Oh/

15 M: /Because a big wedding (1.27) take a lot of money / And sometimes a big wedding (ah 2.60) (is) is very boring (1.44)/ So it takes a longtime (b un un) and (1.24) the (1.31) dish (is) sometimes is good but sometimes it's very bad (N: Un un)/ (And honeymoon) and a (small) small wedding is (nan to uttura nan ka tsutashimi ga aru)

16 N: /Un un/

17 M: (so) so kindly

18 N: /Kindly/

19 M: (kindly ja nai) friendly

20 N: /Friendly/

21 M: friendly/ (4AS 9+8+17+8 46.94)

22 N: /Okay/

23 M: /And honeymoon so I want to go England/ (1AS 8 4.11)

24 N: /England/

25 M: /England and (I want to (N: Nani?) sightseeing I want to sigh) I want to go sightseeing around England/ (1AS 9 12.02)

26 N: /England/

27 M: /Un/

- 28 N: /How long do you (M: Ah) want to honeymoon?/ (1AS 7 1.81)
- 29 M: /Ah ah (about a week) about a week/ How long did you want to honeymoon?/ (2AS 3+7 5.62)**
- 30 N: /If I want to go all Europe (M: Un) about one month/ (1AS 10 8.13)
- 31 M: /What?/ (1AS 1 .2)**
- 32 N: /Two weeks/ (1AS 2 .71)
- 33 M: /Two weeks ah/**
- 34 N: /Two weeks/But (I don't) if I only go to Denmark (M: Ah) I want to a week/ (1AS 12 5.49)
- 35 M: /Ah naru hodo (I see)/**
- Shared pause 5.16
- 36 N: /If (you want to) you find a partner what character do you want?/ (1AS 10 10.62)
- 37 M: /Ah (Thre) three qualities?/ (1AS 2 1.34)**
- 38 N: /Three qualities/ (1AS 2 .40)
- 39 M: /(Ehh ch ch character) his character ah and what is the most important things is (he is 2.06 whe ah) whether he is funny or not (laughs)/ (1AS 16 14.84)**
- 40 N: /Ahh/
- 41 M: /And second is money/ (1AS 4 3.17)**
- 42 N: /Yeah/
- 43 M: /If he is very poor I don't marry him/ (1AS 10 4.52)**
- 44 N: /Mmm/
- 45 M: /And second is (3.56 ah) he's tall/ (1AS 6 6.07)**
- 46 N: /Tall/

47 M: /**(laughs)** Tall/So I don't want to marry the man who is smaller than I/
(1AS 14 6.31)

48 N: /Ah yeah me too/So (so how) how tall do you want to him?/ (1AS 8 1.95)

49 M: /**Ah/ (6.66 thinking pause) Eh over (N: Over) eh over hundred seventy-five centimeter/ (1AS 5 5.02)**

50 N: /Me too/

(Both laugh)

51 M: /**(What) what is your three qualities?/ (1AS 5 3.84)**

52 N: /Un first is he has economic power/ (1AS 6 3.52)

53 M: /**Oh (laughs)/**

54 N: /Because whether he is a good person (3.65 um) /he (he) don't have money
(we we could (2.22) we could live) we couldn't live/ (2AS 7+9 18.61)

55 M: /**Ah/**

56 N: /Second is honesty/ (I don't) I don't like who lie (who (2.26) lie)/ (2AS 3+6
9.30)

57 M: /**Ah/**

58 N: /Un/ And third is kind/ (1AS 4 2.73)

59 M: /**Kind/**

60 N: /Kind//He is kind/ (1AS 3 .81)

61 M: /**Ah/**

Shared pause 3.78

62 N: /But most important is character (au kado ka maybe) (1AS 5 6.84)

Shared pause 9.19

63 N: /Do you want to do arranged marriage?/ (1AS 7 3.13)

64 M: /Arranged ah it's a very difficult question/ (eh because) So (if 4.99 if if it seems) it seems to be impossible for me (to 1.40 to) to get married (N: laughs)/ because (N: Ah) that time (I I don't)I don't have boyfriend ah so (maybe I) that time maybe I will do arranged marriage / But I don't want to do arranged marriage dekiru dake (N: Uh huh) as much as as long as shiranai/ (3AS 7+28+9 52.41)

Shared pause 3.28

65 M: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .60)

66 N: /(I) I would arranged marriage if I couldn't find a partner/ (1AS 11 6.02)

Both laugh

67 N: /And (around around whe) before I will be (thir) thirty years old I couldn't find partner I would arranged marriage/

68 M: /Ah/

69 N: /Maybe (1.97) if (1.54) I could find a partner that time / (2.65) (I) I never find a partner any longer/ (3AS 17+9+7 32.29)

70 M: /I see/

Shared pause 3.37

71 N: /So but some person told me arranged married couple can fall in love each other before marriage. / (M: oh) That is good point I think/ (2AS 17+6 15.25)

72 M: /Ah/

73 N: /If (eto before eto they they have the) they have had long time each other before marriage after marriage they will become (inaudible Japanese)/ (1AS 15 21.72)

74 M: /Ah (could you) would you marry the person who is ten years older than you?/ (1AS 12 8.86)

75 N: /Yes (both laughs) (yes because because) because if (I) I fall in love with him
(the age is not) I don't mind age/ (1AS 14 12.76)

76 M: /Ah/

77 N: /Different point is whether I love him or not / so the person who (I) I love is
(twen) twenty years older than (I) I would married him/ (2AS 9+16 21.67)
(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.5: Miho's Second Performance

Miho: M

Partner: P

1 M: /**(Wo would) would you marry the person who is ten years older than
you?/ (1AS 12 4.90)**

2 P: Ah I want to get married thirty-three years old

3 M: **(restates question in Japanese)**

4 P: (laughs) (Ah I don't I want to closest)/I to a want a man who is closest

Shared pause 6.73

5 M: /**(Before laughs) before conversation (the) she says (the 1.32) the age had
nothing to do with marriage (inaudible) /But (mm) I think her idea is
(1.88) right / (1.73) because I/ (2AS 12+7 21.45)**

6 P: (Interrupts) nani to nani ga kankei nai marriage to

7 M: /**Marriage (to toshi) age/**

8 P: Ah

10 M: /**Because I also think (2.74) the age is (not) not so important so my
mother's friend married the person ah who is the same age my grandpa/
(1AS 24 18.41)**

11 P: Oh Oh great story great story

**12 M: /great story/ (So and so the she her her) her son is (my) my same age/
(1.91 but 2.60) but he said his father grandpa/ (2AS 6+6 18.74)**

Both laugh

13 P: Ah little strange

14 M: /(So that umm between the fufu between the)

15 P: Eh couple

**16 M: /Between the couple so (age) age (is) has nothing to do (with) with
marriage / (But 2.02) and (kids) the kids care the father's age because he
always seems a little strange (from eve) from someone/ (2AS 11+17 32.75)**

17 P: (I think I want) Ah I think that age is important (but but ah 2.63 age is ahh
2.34) but (my my mother 2.26 say eh today today) my mother today live with
a man (eh 3.52) (one eh ju-ichi) eleven years old 2.00 toshi shita

18 M: /Ah/

19 P: (asking for help in Japanese)

20 M: /Younger?/ (1AS 1 .41)

21 P: You younger younger hmm she looks happy (I think) recently I think mm 2.73
age is not important

Shared pause 6.64

**22 M: /Ah (ja tsugi wa where where would you would you ah) where do you
want to go (by) in honeymoon?/ (1AS 8 8.13)**

23 P: (Ah I want to)I want to go abroad (as marriage) at the honeymoon (I don't I
never have been have been have gone to have been to have been to) I never
(have been to abroad) have been to abroad and I want to get married abroad
Where (do you) do you want to get married?

24 M: (Confirms in Japanese)

Both laugh

25 M: /(I want to) I want to get marry in Japan/ (1AS 7 3.88)

26 P: In Japan

27 M: /Yukan ryoko wa/

28 P: Shinkan ryoko gomen

**29 M: /Honeymoon is (P: Un) I want to go abroad/Especially I want to go
England/ (2AS 7+6 8.39)**

30 P: England

**31 M: /Because (I have never) I have never been to England / And I want to go
England (1 AS 7+6 6.84)**

32 P: Ah (my sister is) my sister live in England today (She is) she is scone is really
delicious (both laugh + slight pause 2.63) Ah England is maybe good place (I
haven't never gone I have never I have been) I have never been to there Ah
what do you look for in a person?

33 M: /How long?/ (1AS 2 2.88)

34 P: What?

35 M: /Ah ah/

36 P: (inaudible Japanese) (three) three qualities) Do I use if there is Japanese

**37 M: /Eh and ah first is his character (P: character) whether he is funny or not/
(1AS 11 8.37)**

38 P: Laughs

39 M: /(I) I don't want to married (si silence) silence man/ (1AS 8 3.61)

40 P: Silent man no hito

41 M: /Un and second is money/ (1AS 4 1.89)

42 P: Money

43 M: /Money/Because poor is very hard to live together and (thi) third is he's tall/ (1AS 14 14.63)

44 P: Tall

45 M: /Tall/

46 P: Oh

47 M: /(I I don't want to) I don't want to the man who is (taldre) taller than I especially his tall over hundred seventy-five (P: ah) I want/ (But but if I if I find there 2.78) if I fall in love that man so he is smaller than I maybe I don't care/

48 P: Care

49 M: /(But) but (my wish) it's my wish/ So what is your three qualities?/ (4AS 20+18+5+6 38.48)

50 P: First first 2.52 mm kindness because I think kindness is very very important eh second eh 3.05 hu humor humor

51 M: /Eh/ laughs

52 P: I love I love a man who is in who is funny funny third life's stability Antei

53 M: /Ah/

54 P: Life's stability because money is important important/ But love is important important which do want to which do you want to get eh do small or big marriage

55 M: /Ah I want a small marriage/ (1AS 5 3.39)

56 P: Small marriage th that's all girl that's all girl that girl small too

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.6: Miho's Third Performance

Miho: M

Partner: P

**1 M: / (Do do you ah) which do you want to (marriage) marry (Japanese man)
Japanese person or (foreigner) foreign person / (1AS 11 11.57)**

2 P: Japanese person because

3 M: /Ah why?/ (1AS 1 .20)

4 P: Ah I think ah the custom or mm the custom is different from Japanese and
(6.41) I could marriage with the man who can speak Japanese

5 M: /Ah/

6 P: How about you?

**7 M: / (I think I wan ah) I want to marry the person (who can speak English ah)
who can speak Japanese so even if he is a foreigner so he can speak
Japanese it's okay for me/ (1AS 27 16.41)**

Shared pause 5.19

**8 M: /So ah different culture is difficult but it's the same between the Japanese
and Japanese/ (1AS 15 10.29)**

Both laugh 6.78

9 P: Ah do you want to a small or big marriage

10 M: /Ah (I want to) I want to small marriage/ (1AS 5 2.88)

11 P: Why?

**12 M: /Because (small marriage is 2.85) small marriage cost a less money /And
(2.91 tsutashimi ga aru friendly) a small marriage (will be) will be
friendly/ (1.77) And ah I think a big marriage is very boring and**

sometimes it seems very very funny so (nanka yosokono)/ How about you?/ (4AS 7+7+15+3 45.29)

13 P: I also want to a small marriage with only a few close friends /I become nervous when there are many people and I think eh ah sometimes a big wedding party is so um so funny too I think so

14 M: /(What) what is three qualities (you you) you wanted your husband?/ (1AS 8 9.15)

15 P: At first characteristics and ah appearance and a little money

16 M: /Ah/

17 P: How about you?

18 M /Eh (mitsu) character money appearance/ (1AS 3 7.08)

19 P: Ah

20 M:/ first is character (whether he) (I I want) I want to marry the person who is very funny/ (1AS 13)

21 P: Oh

22 M: /And second is money and third is tall/Ah but (tall is amari wakanai demo) tall is (my) my wish ah (maybe that I) if I fall in love person and he is smaller than I maybe I don't care/But (but I we) (I I want marry) I want to (marry the) marry the person who is (tall tall) taller than I (as) as possible/ (3AS 8+21+14 47.61)

Both pause 3.49

23 P: Me too I also like taller man because I am very small

24 M: /Ah/

25 P: So How long should know before you marriage?

26 M: /Ah I think (12.00) over (over fou) four months (1AS 5 25.28)

Shared pause 2.89

27 M: /It's very difficult for me/So how about you?/ (2AS 6+4 5.04)

28 P: At least three months

29 M: /three three months ah/

30 P: Three months so I don't want to do arrange marriage

31 M: /Un if I (don't find) can't find the person who (who who) I married/ (2.27)

that time I will do the arranged marriage (2AS 10+8 14.85)

Shared pause 3.66

32 M: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .50)

33 P: I don't want to do arrange marriage because I can't talk with the man whom I don't know

Shared pause 11.09

34 P: When do you think the best times is?

35 M: /Ah I want to marry between twenty-four and thirty/But last month (I did (inaudible) I) I did (10.41 fortunate for fortunate telling telling fortunate) fortune telling with my friend /So (in so) the fortunate telling say (I I will marry) I will marry when I am twenty-three (laughs) but I think twenty-three is (too) too young to marry/ (3AS 8+10+23 57.02) /So when do you want to marry?/ (1AS 7 2.16)

36 P: I want to (marry) marry at twenty-five or so

37 M: /Twenty-five/

38 P: I want to work until marriage

39 M: /Yes and after marriage (I want to marry) ah I want to (wo work for work) work ah until (I) I am retired/ (1AS 12 13.98)

Shared pause 5.28

40 M: /So (you) you stop working when you married (wil would you) do you
(ka)/ (1AS 10 10.27)

41 P: Un yes if possible I want to stop working after marriage ah but if I get got a
get a job that I want to do

Shared pause 8.45

42 P: If I get a job that I don't want to do I want to housewife (laughs)

43 M: /So my mother is a housewife but she said housewife is very boring so now
(so she) she (do) does a part-time job/ She said it is fun its very fun (2AS
19+5 23.45)

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.7: Naoko's First Performance

Naoko: N

Partner: P

1 M: /(What do what do you do) what would be your ideal wedding honeymoon ?/
So (do do) do you want a small or big wedding?/ (2AS 7+9 8.89)

2 N: /I want to have a big wedding party/ (1AS 8 3.23)

3 M: /Ah (both laugh) (Wh) why?/ (1AS 1 2.56)

4 N: /Because I want to invite many friends/ (1AS 7 5.97)

5 M: /Ah/

6 N: /And (I cel) I want to be celebrated by many people (1AS 9 6.41)

7 M: /Un/

8 N: /And I want to honeymoon to all Europe/ (1AS 8 4.75)

9 M: /All Europe (laughs)/

10 N: /Yes especially I want to go Denmark/ (1AS 7 1.96)

11 M: /Ah/

12 N: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .74)

13 M: /Ah I want to a small wedding/ (1AS 6 3.06)

14 N: /Oh/

15 M: /Because a big wedding (1.27) take a lot of money / and sometimes a big wedding (ah 2.60) (is) is very boring (1.44)/ so it takes a longtime (N: un un) and (1.24) the (1.31) dish (is) sometimes is good but sometimes it's very bad (N: un un)/ (and honeymoon) and a (small) small wedding is (nan to uttura nan ka tsutashimi ga aru) -

16 N: /Un un/

17 M: /(so) so kindly -

18 N: /Kindly/

19 M: - (kindly ja nai) friendly -

20 N: /Friendly/

21 M: - friendly/ (4AS 9+8+17+8 46.94)

22 N: /Okay/

23 M: /And honeymoon so I want to go England/ (1AS 8 4.11)

24 N: /England/

25 M: /England and (I want to (**N: nani**) sightseeing I want to sigh) I want to go sightseeing around England/ (1AS 9 12.02)

26 N: /England/

27 M: /Un/

28 N: /How long do you (M: Ah) want to honeymoon?/ (1AS 7 1.81)

29 M: /Ah ah (about a week) about a week/ How long did you want to honeymoon?/ (2AS 3+7 5.62)

- 30 N:** /If I want to go all Europe (M: Un) about one month/ (1AS 10 8.13)
- 31 M: /What?/ (1AS 1 .2)
- 32 N:** /Two weeks/ (1AS 2 .71)
- 33 M: /Two weeks ah/
- 34 N:** /Two weeks/But (I don't) if I only go to Denmark (M: Ah) I want to a week/ (1AS 12 5.49)
- 35 M: /Ah naru hodo(I see)/
- Shared pause 5.16
- 36 N:** /If (you want to) you find a partner what character do you want?/ (1AS 10 10.62)
- 37 M: /Ah (Thre) three qualities?/ (1AS 2 1.34)
- 38 N:** /Three qualities/ (1AS 2 .40)
- 39 M: /(Ehh ch ch character) his character ah and what is the most important things is (he is 2.06 whe ah) Whether he is funny or not (laughs)/ (1AS 16 14.84)
- 40 N:** /Ahh/
- 41 M: /And second is money/ (1AS 4 3.17)
- 42 N:** /Yeah/
- 43 M: /If he is very poor I don't marry him/ (1AS 10 4.52)
- 44 N:** /Mmm/
- 45 M: /And second is (3.56 ah) he's tall/ (1AS 6 6.07)
- 46 N:** /Tall/
- 47 M: /(laughs) Tall/So I don't want to marry the man who is smaller than I/ (1AS 14 6.31)
- 48 N:** /Ah yeah me too/So (so how) how tall do you want to him?/ (1AS 8 1.95)

49 M: /Ah/ 6.66 (thinking pause) Eh over (N: Over) eh over hundred seventy-five centimeter/ (1AS 5 5.02)

50 N: /Me too/

(Both laugh)

51 M: /(What) what is your three qualities?/ (1AS 5 3.84)

52 N: /Un first is he has economic power/ (1AS 6 3.52)

53 M: /Oh (laughs)/

54 N: /Because whether he is a good person (3.65 um) /he (he) don't have money (we we could (2.22) we could live) we couldn't live/ (2AS 7+9 18.61)

55 M: /Ah/

56 N: /Second is honesty/ (I don't) I don't like who lie (who 2.26 lie)/ (2AS 3+6 9.30)

57 M: /Ah/

58 N: /Un/ And third is kind/ (1AS 4 2.73)

59 M: /Kind/

60 N: /Kind//He is kind/ (1AS 3 .81)

61 M: /Ah/

Shared pause 3.78

62 N: /But most important is character (au kado ka maybe) (1AS 5 6.84)

Shared pause 9.19

63 N: /Do you want to do arranged marriage?/ (1AS 7 3.13)

64 M: /Arranged ah it's a very difficult question/ (eh because) So (if 4.99 if if it seems) it seems to be impossible for me (to 1.40 to) to get married (N: laughs) / because (N: Ah) that time (I I don't)I don't have boyfriend ah so (maybe I) that time maybe I will do arranged marriage / But I don't want to do arranged

marriage dekiru dake (b uh huh) as much as as long as shiranai/ (3AS 7+28+9
52.41)

Shared pause 3.28

65 M: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .60)

66 N: /I would arranged marriage if I couldn't find a partner/ (1AS 11 6.02)

Both laugh

**67 N: /And (around around whe) before I will be (thir) thirty years old I
couldn't find partner I would arranged marriage/**

68 M: /Ah/

**69 N: /Maybe (1.97) if (1.54) I could find a partner that time / (2.65) (I) I never
find a partner any longer/ (3AS 17+9+7 32.29)**

70 M: /I see/

Shared pause 3.37

**71 N: /So but some person told me arranged married couple can fall in love
each other before marriage. / (M: Oh)/ That is good point I think/ (2AS
17+6 15.25)**

72 M: /Ah/

**73 N: /If (eto before eto they they have the) they have had long time each other
before marriage after marriage they will become (Japanese)/ (1AS 15
21.72)**

74 M: /Ah (could you) would you marry the person who is ten years older than you?/
(1AS 12 8.86)

**75 N: /Yes (both laughs) (yes because because) because if (I) I fall in love with
him (the age is not) I don't mind age/ (1AS 14 12.76)**

76 M: /Ah/

**77 N: /Different point is whether I love him or not / So the person who (I) I love
is (twen) twenty years older than (I) I would married him/ (2AS 9+16
21.67)**

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.8: Naoko's Second Performance

Naoko: N

Partner: P

1 N: /(Do) do you want to have a big party or small party?/ (1AS 11 3.32)

2 P: I want to small party

3 N: /Small party why?/ (1AS 3 .45)

4 P: Ah because mm I don't like talking with many people

5 N: /Un/

6 P: Ah (I) (nanto yu no)I become nervous

7 N: /Un/

8 P: When there are many so many people/So I want to marriage with ah only a
few close friends/ if possible I wa I would like to marry ah I would like to
celebrate a marriage abroad

9 N: /Oh oh where do you want to go?/ (1AS 6 1.11)

10 P: Australia or hmm Hawaii toka

11 N: /Hawaii/

12 P: How about you do want to small marriage or

**13 N: /I want a big party/ (P: Oh)/ Because I want to be celebrated many many
friends/**

14 P: Ah

**15 N: /I enjoy party/But if (I) I have good big party (costs) it costs (its 3.20)
matters/ (4AS 5+8+3+10 25.18)**

Shared pause 6.19

16 P: Can can you celebrate with ten years older man

**17 N: /Yes yes cause I think the age is not important /The important point is
whether I love him or not/can you can you do it?/ (3AS 9+10+4 12.90)**

18 P: /Yes I also can celebrate with ten years older man but twenty years older mm
is not me/ (1AS 17 18.90)

Shared pause 4.34

19 P: /Have you ever do done arranged marriage?

20 N: /No no/ (1AS 1 .20)

21 P: Do you want to do?/

**22 N: /Un (When) when (I I am) I will be thirty then I couldn't find a partner I
will do arranged marriage/**

23 P: Ah

**24 N: /How about you do you want to do arranged marriage?/ (3AS 17+10
21.16)**

25 P: I I don't want to do arranged marriage because I can't talk with a man who I
don't know so I don't know I don't want to do but also laughs I be 30 years
old

26 N: /30 years old/

Both laugh

27 N: /What is three qualities?/ (1AS 4 1.51)

28 P: Ah first characteristics and ah appearance and a little money

29 N: /Money/

30 P: Money how about you?

31 N: /First economic power and honestly and kind (1AS 7 7.47)

32 P: Where do want to (go to) ah go as a honeymoon?

**33 N: /Honeymoon I want to go all Europe (2.50) (P: Oh) especially Denmark/
(1AS 9 6.59)**

34 P: Denmark

35 N: /(My) my major is Denmark/ (1AS 4 1.92)

Shared pause 3.47

36 N: /(Do) where do you want to go honeymoon/ (1AS 7 3.09)

37 P: Mm I want to go to France

38 N: /France/

Shared pause 3.77

39 P: Now also I also want to go to France but my major is Russian

Shared pause 7.44

**40 N: /Do you want to (marry with) marry (foreign people) foreign person?/
(1AS 7 4.16)**

41 P: Ah I think I can't because 13.83 custom uh habit is different from (4.41) so I
think I can't How about you?

**42 N: /I think it's very (diff) difficult (P: Ah) (but) but (I want) if I have a
chance I want to marry foreign people because I can improve my
language skill (P: laughs) and (know I can know) I can know different
cultures/ (1AS 31 21.54)**

Shared pause 4.08

43 N: /(That that is) maybe that is interesting/ (1AS 4 3.92)

44 P: Ah

Shared pause 7.45

45 P: When when do you want to marriage?

46 N: /When?/

47 P: Best time?

48 N: /When when best time/ I think (mm ah) around twenty-five/ (1AS 5 5.72)

49 P: Eh Twenty-five

50 N: /Twenty-five/

51 P: Me too I think Ah what what (one word inaudible)will you do until twenty-five years old

52 N: /**(Work working) working and find a partner** (P: laughs find a partner) **and (have) have time with him/** (1AS 10 9.13)

53 P: After you marriage do you want to work or retire?

54 N: /**(Tr truly) to tell you the truth I want to be a housewife only housewife (but) but now (we) we can't live husband to marry (laughs) I think/.** (1AS 24 16.66)

Shared pause 4.27

55 N: /**How about you/** (1AS 3 .20)

56 P: /Ah I want to work after marriage but if I get a job that I really want to do but I get a job that I didn't so want to do then I want to be housewife

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.9: Naoko's Third Performance

Naoko: N

Partner: P

1 N: /**Do you want to have a big party or small party/** (1AS 11 2.88)

2 P: I want to big party

3 N: /Oh Why?/ (1AS 1 .4)

4 P: I want a big party marriage is one time

5 N: /One time?/ (1AS 2 .28)

6 P: Only one one time one chance

7 N: /Uh huh/

Both laugh

8 N: /**(I) I want to do big big (marriage) big party/One time in a life time / (2AS 6+6 8.03)**

9 P: One time do want to do small one?

10 N: /**(laughing) I want to big party too (1AS 6 1.31)**

Both laugh

11 P: That's true girl

12 N: /**Wants small small party yeah yeah/ (1AS 3 1.75)**

13 P: Wants wants small party

14 N: /**Yeah yeah I think small party is good/ (1AS 6 1.32)**

15 P: Un un but (marriage) in big marriage there are good delicious dinner ah and big cake

16 N: /**beautiful buffet/ (1AS 2 .20)**

Both laugh

17 P: Beautiful (laughing) many time

18 N: /**(Laughing) Costume change/ (1AS 2 .41)**

19 P: Costume change but eh maybe I I get married ten eh ten two times

20 N: /**Two times/**

21 P: Two times

22 N: / (Laughing) Which I think (I) I will divorce at least (one) one time/ (1AS 10 5.93)

23 P: I agree recently there are many divorce

24 N: /Divorce/

Both laugh

25 P: But if possible I I I I have I finished marriage one time I have I want to have one time wedding party (laughs) if I can maybe if I get divorced party I don't I won't I won't party again

26 N: /Un Un second time (is) (1.64) is small party (P: small party) but don't have a party/ (1AS 11 5.95)

27 P: Don't have a party

28 N: / (Both laughing) Only hand paper/ (1AS 3 1.30)

29 P: (What) what do you look for in a partner three

30 N: /Three/

31 P: Yes

32 N: /First (eto 2.13) is economic power/ (1AS 4 3.49)

33 P: (Laughing) Economic power

34 N: /Second is honesty/ (1AS 3 1.18)

35 P: Oh honesty

36 N: /Third (kind) (P: Kind) kindness/ (1AS 2 1.81)

37 P: Kindness very important

38 N: /Very important but (financial) eh economic power is most important/ (1AS 7 2.97)

39 P: You are economical

40 N: /Economical?/Maybe economical/ (1AS 1 .40)

41 P: Economical

42 P: Eh you are realistic

43 N: /Real real realistic?/

44 P: Genjistuteki

45 N: /How about you?/ (1AS 3 .40)

46 P: Ah I I think ah once once

47 N: /Once?/ (1AS 1 .20)

48 P: First first first first first kindness second humor third eh economic power

49 N: /Economic power/ (Do do you min min) don't you mind his appearance?/

(1AS 6 4.51)

50 P: Ah

51 N: /Tall?/ (1AS 1 .20)

52 P: Ah I don't I mind only age

53 N: /Age oh/Ah can you ah can you marry with ten years older than you?/

(1AS 9 4.84)

54 P: I little mind appearance

55 N: /Appearance/

Both laugh

56 P: If is if it is horrible I can't get married eh would like would looks eh how what
do you think what do you think how do you think? How are you?

Both laugh

**57 N: /(I I I don't) I don't mind appearance because (I my my type) my
appearance type is different from (1.94 no) normal girls/ (So who who I)
oh nice man is bad another girl don't like him/ (2AS 14+10 23.44)**

58 P: Oh I I I I am said I am often said your bad sense of choosing man

59 N: /Ah/

60 P: But I think he is best

**61 N: /Un un (I) I like dame yo (who who I liked) who I liked is usually dame/
(1AS 7 11.96)**

62 P: Usually dame yo

63 N: /Usually/

64 P: Specially if the man is specially eh isn't especially bad I think he is good
appearance is not important but humor is very good

65 N: /Important?/ (1AS 1 .20)

66 P: Important very important if the man is silent it is (owari)

67 N: /Its finished/ (1AS 2 .40)

68 P: Where do you want to get married?

69 N: /Ah (In) in Japan/ (1AS 2 .99)

70 P: In Japan

71 N: /In Japan/But I want to honeymoon to abroad/ (1AS 7 2.74)

72 P: Abroad what country?

73 N: /Europe and especially Denmark/ (1AS 4 2.84)

74 P: Denmark

75 N: /Denmark/

76 P: What do you major in Denmark?

**77 N: /Yeah I major in Denmark / (Do) do you want to have party in Japan or
abroad?/ (1AS 5 1.40) (1AS 10 4.17)**

78 P: Ah I want to get married in Japan but honeymoon honeymoon go to Italy

79 N: /Oh Italy/Your major is Italian?/ (1AS 4 1.88)

80 P: No no (laughing) but I major in I don't major in Italy Italian but I like Italy
Italian dinner is very good (inaudible) is very good and cheap (2AS 10+7
22.68)

81 N: /(Do) do you want to marry Italian man?/ (1AS 7 4.09)****

82 P: Ah a longtime ago I thought so but today now now I want to Japanese I want
to get married Japanese man once

Both laugh

83 N: /(That's that's point) ah that is very important point/ (1AS 5 3.87)****

84 P: I think marriage is complicated

85 N: /I think so too/

86 P: Future is not real realistic but my friends want to get married early early

87 N: /Early/

88 P: Un they they have a good boyfriend

89 N: /Ah/ /Do you have a boyfriend now?/ (1AS 6 1.45)

90 P: To slow slow

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.10: Rie's First Performance

Rie: R

Partner: P

1 P: Shabernikui (difficult to talk about)

2 R: /First of all have ever stolen anything?/ (1AS 7 3.81)

3 P: No nothing I say no

**4 R: /Ah so it's lucky me too/ (I haven't) I haven't been stolen anything before
(2AS 6+7 9.32)**

5 P: Before?

6 R: /Yes before (A oh) I'm lucky (1.99)/ So how about on the train?/ Um Do you use train to come this university?/ (1AS 5 2.00) (2AS 6+8 9.62)

7 P: No I use my bicycle I ride my bicycle

8 R: /So near from school?/ (1AS 4 2.69)

9 P: Yeah

Both laugh

10 R: /Ah (I use train) I use train to come here and when I was a high school student I also used train (P: ah) but nothing happened (1AS 21 13.99)

Both laugh

11 R: /Good/ (1AS 1 .2)

12 P: Yes I don't feel comfortable in a crowded train (R: Mm yeah) lots of people and we can't tell what is what's gonna happen like someone could touch you and

13 R: /Mm more than that (I am 3.32) I'm anxious to be stolen something from bag pocket/ (1AS 13 18.07)

Shared pause (both laugh)

14 R: /So when I got on the crowded train I always look around (1AS 12 10.01)

15 P: /Yeah/

Shared pause

16 R: /And protect my bag/ (1AS 4 1.21)

17 P: Ah I do too

18 R: /So what about your town? Is it safe area?/ (2AS 5+4 5.38)

19 P: Ah I guess hometown so I'm from Wakayama and its quite country so it's not dangerous as Osaka

20 R: /And I'm from Kyoto but (I) I live in not city area but (mm) country area/
So when the sunsets (uh) there is very dark/And when I go back to home
from the near station I use bike/But I (have to) have to go through no
lights path (mm) to get home/ So I think it's dangerous because very dark
and light is only my bicycle light/ (5AS 15+8+14+12+16 1.06 minutes)

Shared pause 14.50

21 P: Have you seen any crimes?

22 R: /No/ (1AS 1 .2)

23 P: Me either but one of my friends uh had her house robbed

24 R: /Really/

25 P: She lives in Gein

26 R: /Oh ah (in) University student and her apartment/ (1AS 5 7.14)

27 P: Yeah she lives in the first floor (b oh) even she had her house locked somehow
the thief get in and stole her computers and some money

28 R: /How can the thief get in from window (or 3.90) or broke the lock?/ (1AS
12 9.30)

29 P: She didn't tell me about that but I guess by the window

30 R: /Oh oh very dangerous/ (1AS 2 1.60)

Shared pause

31 R: /(I don't know) I don't know any crimes/ Ah my neighbor was stolen her
bike/ (P: Uh huh) /In front of her house/Ah not locked (2AS 6+6+5 12.05)
(1AS 2 .47)

32 P: Ah unlocked

33 N: /So someone took it/ (1AS 4 4.63)

34 P: /Ah so bad/

- 35 R:** /Mm so (maybe) maybe he or she wanted to ride bike to (go) go somewhere/Ah my sister (laughs) (all) was also stolen her bike/ (1AS 12 6.68) (1AS 7 7.91)
- 36 P: Really?
- 37 R:** /When she went to bowling/ (P: Uh huh)/And (she was also ah) she also didn't lock (laughs)/ And it was (new a new) new (bi) bike so she was very shocked and my (laughs repeats) my mother (1.81) a little bit angry because very new (laughing) (A uh huh) so (why) why didn't you get lock/ (3AS 5+6+28 35.96)
- 38 P: Uh huh
- 39 R:** /Mm so/
- 40 P: She forgot?
- 41 R:** /Yeah and (we we) we searched and we finally found it (P: Oh) (at) at station (1AS 11 14.70)
- 42 P: Good
- 43 R:** /My mother thought (maybe the bike is ah) maybe the bike was at near Gasco (shopping) shopping mall or the station/ And (we) we searched (this) these two areas and we find it at the station/ (It) it was locked (3AS 15+13+3 30.77)
- 44 P: Uh huh and where was the key?
- 45 R:** /Um when we find it we moved the bike and I and my sister waited at the station and my parents went back to home and get her spare key (P: Uh huh) and came back (1AS 32 19.13)
- 46 P: The person who stole your sister's bike had another key?
- 47 R:** Yeah (laughs)

48 P: He he just

49 R: /But he or she (2.22) won't be able to use it because he or she don't know where the bike is now (laughs)/ (1AS 23 11.51)

Shared pause

50 R: /And not crime but my sister saw (3.25) a stranger measured our house/ (1AS 12 11.30)

51 P: What?

52 R: /I didn't watch it (by) but my sister (mm) when she was at home alone and locked and she was on the second floor (laughs)/ Opened the curtain and so a stranger measured (2.53) front of our house/ He measured and (went) disappeared (3AS 23+12+4 37.26)

53 P: Ah

55 R: /But after it nothing happened/ (1AS 5 2.20)

56 P: Maybe he was from some ah chintai

57 R: /Yeah I thought so but nothing happened/ How about Osaka (you) you have been in Osaka or big man or more?/ Have you ever been to Umeda or Shinsaibashi?/ (3AS 7+12+8 21.78)

58 P: Yes

59 R: /I think these area (is very) are very dangerous/ (1AS 7 3.06)

60 P: Yes

61 R: /It was first time to go to Shinsaibashi (ah) last may/ I was very surprised/ (2AS 8+4 9.56)

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.11: Rie's Second Performance

Rie: N

Partner: P

1 P: Good morning do what do you think of Japan's safety?

2 R: /Japan's safety?/ (1AS 2 .69)

3 P: From crime?

4 R: /Safety?/ (1AS 1 .20)

5 P: Recently do you feel safe or nothing?

6 R: /Not safe/ (1AS 2 .30)

7 P: Not safe

8 R: /Of course because a girl kidnapped (and killed) was killed/Recently (1.19) such crimes are increasing/ And I have a little brother so (1.70) I'm anxious (2.14) about it/ (3AS 8+5+10 25.66)

9 P: I think that it japan is not safe especially for children (R: Mm) recently because there are many crimes involved in children childrens are are often involved in the crime so um it is not safe

10 R: /But I've heard that in America (ah 2.58) there are many such crimes (4.28 before from from um) from before mm/ (1AS 14 23.05)

11 P: Going to school? Eh before

12 R: /(I) I don't know but mm (my) one of my friends (2.00) now is studying abroad and she lives in America/And (3.76) it is very common to meet strangers everyday in day not only in night (2AS 18+15 29.86)

13 P: Ah day time?

Both laugh

14 P: In japan at least day time (R: Mm) is are more safe than at night but always they feel not safe?

15 R: / (He) she meets some strangers everyday/ (1AS 5 3.82)

16 P: Ah (laughs) it's very scary thing ah

17 R: /Mm so now (she) she doesn't walk to school (she um) her boyfriend drives her/ (1AS 12 11.34)

18 P: She asks her boyfriend to pickup?

19 R: /No no she asked but she said (P: Ah)/ (1AS 6 2.85)

Shared pause 10.53

20 P: In Japan many students walk to school (R: Mm) or some of them take a bus or the train (R: Mm) but almost people walk to the school but in a America there school buses (R: mm) so I thought it is its is more safe in America (R: Mm) but (laughs) your friends experiences is very from my my thoughts so so I was I was very surprised

21 R: /Did you use train to get to high school or junior high school?/ (1AS 13 8.85)

22 P: Yes I took train trains to go to the high school

23 R: /What what was it?/ (1AS 3 2.09)

24 P: It it's kind of private railway and not not not ah for school private it is there is two high schools near the line (R: Mm) so um at the morning in the morning and in the afternoon there are many students so it is more safe than the other lines

Both laugh

25 P: Ah how about do you getting train?

26 R: /Yeah I took trains to get my high school and now (P: Uh huh) (I) I use JR/ But until now (I) I haven't experienced any crimes (P: Really!) on the train/ (2AS 14+11 22.22)

Both laugh

27 P: I I was involved in a chikan (groping) three times maybe at my hometown My hometown in is in in a city so there are many people and many people take train and people take train so in especially in the early morning and in the evening there are many many man men on the train and very crowded and in the crowded there are many chikan so I was involved

28 R: /Oh in the morning when I get on the train (un 5.72) that is crowded/ But I always want to protect my bag not to be stolen (any) something so just do it/ (2AS 12+18 22.63)

29 P: Ah can you move in a crowded train? For example ah can't hold the back pack from from (R: Yes yes) your bag to to nani nani

Both laugh

30 R: /Bag/

31 P: Ushiro kara mae

32 R: /Yes but now (2.24 I'm) I get local train not express train (P: Mm mm) / So now everyday I can sit on/ (2AS 10+7 16.72)

33 P: Ah we we can't sit on in in the city (R: So) train because there are many commuters in the train so the stop station and that that stations passengers are very (inaudible) I'm not that that station we can't couldn't sit down on the train/

34 R: /Oh/

Shared pause

35 P: Its difficult to move in a city train very crowded so we can't move only a step do so if I was involved in a crime or something maybe un we can't move so he had we have to scream or something to ask some help we we can't runaway

Shared pause

36 R: /So mm what do you think about Osaka?/ (1AS 7 3.49)

(teacher ends task)

Appendix 1.12: Rie's Third Performance

Rie: N

Partner: P

1 R: /Do you live in Osaka?/ (1AS 5 .88)

2 P: Yeah

3 R: /Moved?/ (1AS 1 .24)

4 P: No ah not not in Osaka (laughs) but near I live in Hyogo Takarazuka

5 R: /Oh/

6 P: Takarazuka is the place

7 R: /Ah I went to Takarazuka by bike/ (1AS 6 2.56)

8 P: By bike oh

9 R: /So (I know as it) I know Takarazuka a little bit/ (1AS 7 4.39)

10 P: Where where did you go in Takarazuka?

11 R: /((Not um I) I through Takarazuka and went to Mukogawa (1AS 7 7.48)

12 P: Ah Mukogawa

13 R: /Mukogawa haiten/ (.43)

14 P: Haiten

15 R: /Senato JR/ (.40)

16 P: Oh I've never been there

17 R: /Very beautiful and seems very quiet and (ta) safe area isn't it/ (1AS 12
4.84)

18 P: Ah a few months ago I went to Mukogawa to hanabi to (R: Oh) and when we are dangerous

19 R: /*(laughs)* Why?/ (1AS 1 .47)

20 P: Cause (we're) we were drunk and we have fire (laughs) and yeah my friend some of my friends killed ants/

21 R: /*Ants*/

22 P: Killed ants

23 R: /*Really at night?*/ (1AS 3 1.56)

24 P: At night

25 R: /*Wow!*/

26 P: And we are shouting (laugh) at the river (both laugh) crazy

Both laugh

27 R: /*So (you didn't) you haven't experienced any crime in (your) your hometown?*/ (1AS 10 8.96)

28 P: My hometown?

29 R: /*Yeah*/

30 P: In my hometown no but mm in train ah chikan

31 R: /*Ah*/

32 P: Ah In my hometown there are many kuruma

33 R: /*Really?*/

34 P: How do you say in English car people people?

35 R: /*Who stole something?*/ (1AS 3 .66)

36 P: Who stole something from car many(laughs)

37 R: /*Many!/So your neighbors*(interrupted by P)/ (1AS 3 .97)

38 P: Yeah my neighbors or he so but in my car there is nothing to steal (laughs)

39 R: /That's lucky/

Shared pause

40 R: /So compared with your (ho) hometown in my hometown there is no
shajoarashi (car thief)/ (1AS 11 6.34)

41 P: Ah that's good where's your hometown?

42 R: /I'm from Kyoto/ (1AS 4 .58)

43 P: Kyoto

44 R: /But not in city area/ (1AS 5 1.66)

45 P: That's good

46 R: /Like country/ (1AS 2 .75)

47 P: I also live in country but many cars so thief in Japan

48 R: /But near my house there is some no light park/ (1AS 10 5.29)

49 P: No?

50 R: /No light/ (P: Mm)/ (So) so when night comes I have to (go through) go
through (no light) no light park to go back home / (1AS 2 .55) (1AS 16
16.34)

51 P: So It's dangerous so there is some chikan you have to care you have to be
careful to car

52 R: /Car?/ (1AS 1 .43)

53 P: Car ah there are no cars by you so traffic ah if you have crime but you'll
crashed by the car

54 R: /No/ (1AS 1 .41)

55 P: Okay hmm have you ever read the book ah nan dake (says title in Japanese)
you know that?

56 R: /No/ (1AS 1 .2)

57 P: You know?

58 R: /I know the title but I don't know the story/ (P: Mm) But he has twenty-three or twenty-four (face) faces/ (2AS 11+7 13.34)

59 P: Twenty-four characters

60 R: /Characters?/ (1AS 1 .3)

61 P: Ahh and he crime commit commit crimes and in the cold I forgot details there in the world there are like case there are case kind of like what do you think he ah a man killed something killed someone but he had twenty-four faces and ah one of the twenty faces commit this commit the crime but other twenty didn't do that

62 R: /Un once/ (P: interrupts)

63 P: We have to we have to make him ear make him earn

64 R: /Mm (do I believe) Do I believe (something) someone like (says name of character)/ (1AS 6 10.58)

65 P: Un

66 R: /Once I watched on TV such a man/ (1AS 8 3.96)

67 P: Un

68 R: /Un/ (he) he suddenly changed character/ (1AS 4 6.74)

69 P: Really how is that?

70 R: /He suddenly said a different name/ (1AS 6 4.69)

71 P: Mm

72 R: /Yeah I have watched on TV/ (1AS 6 2.20)

73 P: His his face changed?

74 R: /Yeah/ (1AS 1 .3)

Shared pause

**75 R: /Yeah a little bit change as the characters (changed) changed very strange
(laughs) not normal human/ (laughing) (1AS 14 12.67)**

76 P: Oh oh

**77 R: /So mm in the world there are some strange people like that/ (laughing)
(1AS 11 8.12)**

Shared pause 16.06

78 P: Mm sugi (next) do you know the kids is dead a girl recently in japan a girl
killed by a crazy and the guy pulled out her teeth

**79 R: /Eh really teeth!/
(1AS 11 8.12)**

80 P: Pu pulled out and throw throw away

81 R: /((Not) not seven year old girl in Nara?/ (1AS 7 3.84)

82 P: Ah yeah

83 R: /No?/ (1AS 1 .20)

84 P: I mean I mean she

**85 R: /Oh I didn't know she (was pull) had teeth were pulled out eh/ (I hope) I
hope the kidnappers (caught) is caught/ (2AS 10+6 18.64)**

(teacher ends task)

References

- Batstone, R. 2007. Reconceptualizing focus and form. In S. Fotos and H. Nassaji (eds), *Form-focused Instruction and Teacher Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berman, R. and Slobin, D. 1994. *Relating Events in Narrative: Crosslinguistic Developmental Study*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. and Finnegan, E. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R.K Johnson (ed), *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. 1989. Making sense: The interaction of linguistic expression and contextual information. *Applied Linguistics* 10: 97–108.
- Brown, G., Anderson, A., Shilock, R. and Yule, G. 1984. *Teaching Talk: Strategies for Production and Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bygate, M. 1996. Effects of task repetition: Appraising the development language of learners. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Bygate, M. 1999. Quality of language and purpose of task: Patterns of learners' language on two oral communication tasks. *Language Teaching Research* 3: 185–214.
- Bygate, M. 2001. Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan and M. Swain (eds), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bygate, M. and Samuda, V. 2005. Integrative planning through the use of task-repetition. In R. Ellis (ed), *Planning and Task Performance in a Second Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carter, R.A. and McCarthy, M.J. 2004. Talking, creating: Interactional language, creativity and context. *Applied Linguistics* 25: 62–88.
- Carter, R.A. and McCarthy, M.J. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English: Comprehensive Guide to Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, W. 1980. The deployment of consciousness in production of a narrative. In W. Chafe (ed), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Chafe, W. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Cowan, N. 2001. The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Science* 24: 87–185.
- Crookes, G. 1990. The utterance and other basic units for second language discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 11: 183–99.
- Ellis, R. (ed) 2005. *Planning and Task Performance in a Second Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ellis, R. and Barkhuizen, G. 2005. *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, P. 1996. Doing the task better: How planning time influences students' performance. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. London: Heinemann.
- Foster, P., Tonkyn, A. and Wigglesworth, G. 2000. Measuring spoken language: A unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics* 21: 354–75.
- Foster, P. 2001. Rules and Routines: A consideration of their role in the task-based language production of native and non-native speakers. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan and M. Swain (eds), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Foster, P. and Ohta, A. 2005. Negotiation of meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics* 26: 402–30.
- Goldman Eisler, F. 1968. *Psycholinguistics Experiments in Spontaneous Speech*. London: Academic Press.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and K. Morgan (eds), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hughes, R. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. London: Longman.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 2007. Learner perception of learning tasks. In K. Van den Branden, K. Van Gorp and M. Verhelst (eds), *Tasks in Action: Task-Based Language Education from a Classroom-based Perspective*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. 2008. *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M.H. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie and Tej K. Bhatia (eds), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. London: Academic Press.

- Lynch, T. and Maclean, J. 2000. Exploring the benefits of task repetition and recycling for classroom language learning. *Language Teaching Research* 4: 221–50.
- Lynch, T. and Maclean, J. 2001. Effects of immediate task repetition on learners' performance. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan and M. Swain (eds), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Maynard, S. 1989. *Japanese Conversation: Self-contextualization through Structure and Interactional Management*. New Jersey: Albex.
- McCarthy, M.J. 1998. *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, G. 1956. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review* 63: 81–97.
- Muranoi, H. 2007. Output practice in the L2 classroom. In R. DeKeyser (ed), *Practice in a Second Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nakahama, T., Tyler, A. and Van Lier, L. 2001. Negotiation of meaning in conversation and information gap activities. *TESOL Quarterly* 35: 377–406.
- Nattinger, J. and DeCarrico, J. 1992. *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ohta, S. 2001. *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pawley, A. and Syder, F. 2000. The one-clause-at-a-time hypothesis. In H. Riggenbach, *Perspectives on Fluency*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Robinson, P. 2001. Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interaction in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics* 21(1): 27–57.
- Samuda, V. and Bygate, M. 2008. *Tasks in Second Language Learning*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schleppegrell, M. 1992. Subordination and linguistic complexity. *Discourse Processes* 15: 117–31.
- Seedhouse, P. 1999. Task-based Interaction. *ELT Journal* 53: 149–56.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sinclair, J. and Mauranen, A. 2006. *Linear Unit Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Skehan, P. 1996. Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis (eds), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Skehan, P. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. 2001. Tasks and language performance assessment. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan and M. Swain (eds), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.

Skehan, P. and Foster, P. 2005. Strategic and on-line planning: The influence of surprise information and task time on second language performance. In R. Ellis (ed), *Planning and Task Performance in a Second Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tannen, D. 1985. *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Thornbury, S. and Slade, D. 2006. *Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Branden, K. 1997. Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning* 47: 589–636.

Van Lier, L. 1996. *Interaction in the Language Curriculum*. London: Longman.

Williams, J. 2005. Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (ed), *Handbook of Research In Second Language Teaching and Learning*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Willis, D. 2003. *Rules, Patterns and Words: Grammar and Lexis in English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D. and Willis, J. 2007. *Doing Task-based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willis, J. 1996. *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. London: Longman.

Wray, A. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.