Exploring the Nature of Dyadic Interactions between Japanese EFL Learners: Does It Play a Role in Language Uptake?
Exploring the Nature of Dyadic Interactions between Japanese EFL Learners: Does It Play a Role in Language Uptake?

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate Course at
Hyogo University of Teacher Education

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of School Education

by
Mayumi Matoba
(Student Number: M04190G)
December 2005
Acknowledgements

On completing this thesis, I struggle to find the words to express my deep gratitude towards the people who helped me and provided encouragement, but I will attempt to show my sincere appreciation.

First and foremost, I would like to express sincere gratitude to Associate Professor Tatsuhiro Yoshida, my seminar supervisor, for his valuable knowledge and comments at every stage of this study. I could not have completed this thesis without his guidance. He is not only a brilliant researcher, but also an amazing person. He has been like a counselor and always gave me his precious time to listen to me. I was very lucky to have this opportunity to work with him. He didn’t push his sociocultural research area, but instead he listened and guided me along the road to complete this master thesis. Even after completing my research, I can see that some of his research techniques and perspective have become my own.

I would also like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my chief supervisor, Professor Toshihiko Yamaoka, who gave me warm guidance and sincere encouragement. I have learned a lot from his SLA lectures, which created the foundation of this research. I am also grateful to other teaching staff in the Department of English Language at Hyogo University of Teacher Education who provided me with invaluable and specialized advice.

My thanks are extended to the colleagues in my seminar for their helpful guidance and heartfelt kindness. I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Sadaaki Togawa, Mr. Hidemoto Murofushi, Ms. Akane Fukushige, Ms. Keiko Yasukawa, Mr. Mark Taylor, Mr. Zeng Gang, Mr. Takuya Fukuoka, Ms. Yuan Yuan. The atmosphere of the seminar was always comfortable with aroma of coffee made by Mr.
Yoshida meanwhile the discussions were always academic and helped my thesis in several ways. I appreciate that I could get a chance to see them all and have such wonderful discussions with them.

I also wish to express my thanks to all stuff at Arai Junior High School who helped me on this research project, especially, Mr. Daniel Moden and Ms. Alexis Miller. I also appreciate the students who volunteered for this study, as they sacrificed time in their busy life for my research. Without their effort, assistance and big smiles, I could not have completed this project.

I could also never forget to thank the people who were always beside me: Ms. Rieko Tokunaga, Mr. Munehito Hara and other members in the same grade who supported and encouraged me all the time. I also give my gratitude to my senior colleagues of HOPE (High School Oral Proficiency Examination) projects, who gave me technical assistance and warm encouragement, and the members of Action Research Circle, especially Ms. Emiko Izumi, who directed me towards the research and gave me inestimable opportunities.

Last, but not least, I would like to express my deep appreciation to my family, who helped and encouraged me a lot throughout these past two years: my husband, Satoshi; my daughters, Karen and Anna; my mother-in-law, Kimiko; and my parents, Youichi and Fumie.

Mayumi Matoba
Yashiro, Hyogo
December 2005
Abstract

This study investigates the process in which Japanese learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) get involved in dyadic interactions during speaking tasks and the ways that the students mutually provide scaffoldings necessary for their subsequent tasks. Based on a sociocultural approach to language learning, this study sets essentially two specific purposes: to identify salient features of student interactions, and to find the relationship between these distinct patterns of dyadic interactions and language uptake.

Assigning students to work on a task in pairs or small groups is a common teaching strategy in the language classroom. Although little attention had been given to the nature of group or pair interactions, it recently attracted many researchers investigating peer-to-peer or collective learning in different classroom situations; however, the learners who participated in most of the studies were mainly adult ESL learners. As a teacher at a junior high school level, I believe that it is also worth examining the dyadic interactions between young Japanese EFL learners in the hope that the research findings obtained from the present study will account for a learning setting which is different from those in the previous studies.

The study investigated the performance of eight pairs of Japanese junior high school students on a speaking task (story-telling). Each student was instructed to make a one-minute story, individually looking at a picture prompt. The story-telling was audio-recorded. The students, then, individually listened to their own recorded performance for three minutes. Then they were paired with their partners and worked together for 10 minutes, talking with each other mostly in their L1 to revise their performance. This activity is called Revision Talk: the students
revised their story-telling by correcting errors they made, asking his/her partner for things they wanted to express in English. Immediately after the Revision Talk, they individually repeated the story-telling task. This cycle, including the first story-telling, Revision Talk, and the second story-telling, was administered in three different sessions, with each session held once a week.

The data collected for analysis consisted of the audio-recorded story-telling, the audio-recorded conversation during Revision Talk, and post-task reflection written by the students after each session. The analysis consisted of two stages. The first stage examined whether the distinct patterns of dyadic interactions were identified in their Revision Talk. The conversations recorded during Revision Talk were analyzed with reference to the conversation in which the paired students revised their previous task performance and prepared for the subsequent task performance. The second stage of the analysis investigated the relationships between the nature of dyadic interactions during Revision Talk and the students' language uptake observed in the second story-telling. In order to do so, language related episodes (LREs) were first identified in Revision Talk and examined to show how they would affect the subsequent task performance. Swain and Lapkin (1995, 1998) define that LREs are instances of collaborative dialogue in which students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or perform other or self-correction of their language production. In order to provide additional evidence, the researcher's observation notes and the students' post-task reflection were also analyzed. The first analysis showed that several distinct patterns of dyadic interactions were formed in the pairs (i.e., collaborative, expert/novice, dominant/dominant, and passive/passive). These patterns were distinguished in terms of equality and mutuality of the dyads. Equality refers to the degree of
control or authority over the task. Mutuality refers to the level of engagement with each other's contribution. I confirmed that a unique dyad was also identified for the Japanese young learners: passive/passive, which was different from the previous studies (e.g., Storch, 2002).

The findings of the second stage of the analysis suggested that certain patterns of dyadic interaction produced more effective results in the subsequent language learning; the collaborative dyads contained the strongest links between the students' oral performance and their LREs. The expert/novice dyads also made use of the LREs that they generated for their subsequent story-telling. More importantly, the trace of dyadic interactions on the three task sessions exhibited that most of the dyads displayed dynamic patterns, and converged toward more collaborative dyads over time.

The findings in this study were explained by reference to Vygotsky's theories of cognitive development, Donato's collective scaffoldings, and so on. By investigating learners' voices in the task activities, I gained a lot of important pedagogic implications. Most of all, I would like to predicate that students have strong possibilities to learn by themselves when they work in collaborative relationships. Students in this study learned by themselves through five mediating strategies: use of symbols and external resources, use of the L1, scaffolded assistance, deploying interlanguage knowledge, and externalizing private speech (Villamil and Guerrero, 1996). Teachers should assume that students' potentials to learn by themselves expand their learning opportunities, and provide not only teacher mediation but also other mediations mentioned earlier.
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INTRODUCTION

The original purpose of the present study was to investigate how Japanese learners' oral task performance would be improved by having them reflect their performance immediately after the activity. Therefore, the study was first designed based on a series of task-based research previously done from psycholinguistic perspectives. There is a good deal of discussion in the task-based research which mainly examines qualitative aspects of learners’ utterances. The theoretical interests lie in the examination of the language itself, putting the social matters aside. I followed the research framework, focusing on the learner language; however, while I was collecting and analyzing the data from the participants, I recognized how the social interactions during language learning strongly affected learners' performance. The reorientation of the research framework guided me to explore the sociocultural aspects of language learning. In the following part of this introduction, I will describe how the original research framework has been transformed.

Task-based Research from Psycholinguistic View

One of the central issues observed by psycholinguistic researchers was the relationship between the output learners produce and their language development. This is known as processing theories of language development which “highlight the multi-level nature of second language development, and in particular the cognitive processing demands on developing the ability to use a second language.” (Bygate, 2001; 24) Based on his theory, a lot of studies were conducted, in which learners were given oral task activities under different experimental conditions
and their performance was recorded and quantified according to three indices: accuracy, fluency and complexity. They were measured by several analytical units such as AS-unit, T-unit, and Communication unit. The experimental conditions, or independent variables, which were manipulated in the previous studies were mainly “task repetition” (Bygate, 1996, 2001) and “planning time” (Foster & Skehan, 1996, 1999; Crooks, 1989; Ellis, 1987; etc.). These were also the factors of great concern for the original version of my study. Therefore, I focused on task repetition and planning time.

In the previous research, some of the effects of task repetition were interpreted as “rehearsal effect” (Crooks, 1989; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Wigglesworth, 1997), “topic familiarity” (Plough & Gass, 1993) and “recycling” of the task (Ellis, 1987). Essentially, these have the same underlying assumptions that a speaker is familiar with a topic and with how to segment the topic conceptually for speech production. Hence, their main task on the repeated performance is finding appropriate formulations and articulations of the language. Attention can be focused on the selection and construction of language.

Planning can be further classified into “focus on planning” and “source of planning.” Focus on planning is a matter of how and when planning time is given to learners (i.e., pre-task planning and within-task planning) (see Figure 1). Source of planning means who or with whom planning time is used, and it includes solitary planning, in which each individual learner plans by himself/herself and “collaborative planning,” in which learners plan in collective ways by talking together about the task at hand. The effects of planning suggest that providing learners with planning opportunities should have a beneficial effect on language development. Planned second discourse should push learners to extend what
they are capable of saying.

\[\text{Rehearsal} \quad \text{Pre-task Planning} \quad \text{Strategic Planning} \quad \text{Pressured} \quad \text{Unpressured}\]

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Types of task-based planning (Ellis, 2005, p. 4)}
\end{figure}

The Original Design of This Study

Based on those series of task-based studies, the present study was originally designed to explore how task repetition and pre-task planning would affect students' speaking performance. Thirty Japanese junior high school students joined the study. All the participants were required to accomplish story-telling tasks with a picture prompt\(^1\) individually. The picture prompts used are shown in Appendix A. Their story-telling was audio-recorded and each participant individually listened to his/her own performance for three minutes. Immediately after listening to their recordings, they evaluate their performance and think about how it could be improved by using various resources, including their worksheets and dictionaries for ten minutes. It was called “Strategic planning” (Ellis, 2005). Subsequently, the students once again create a story with the same picture. In this strategic planning time, effects of the source of planning (i.e. with

---

\(^1\) The pictures used in this study were originally prepared by the author using visuals contained in the textbooks for JHS students. These picture prompts were carefully designed so that the students would be able to depict by using grammatical and lexical knowledge they had learned by the moment.
whom planning time is used) was also investigated. Sixteen participants out of 30 were made into eight pairs and talked together about what they did and would do in the second performance (Pair Group). Another seven students did the same activity individually (Solitary Group). Instead of verbalizing thoughts on their first performance, they wrote them down on sheets of paper, which were later collected for analysis. A Control Group was also formed to compare the effects of strategic planning which would affect students' performance in the other two groups. The participants in the control group did not have the strategic planning time but instead they created the second story immediately after the first one.

The procedure of the tasks is visually described as in Figure 2.

![Figure 2](image)

The task procedure of this study

The students' speaking performances in the three groups were then analyzed based on the three indices (i.e., accuracy, fluency and complexity).

However, since the participants were English language beginners (about 1.5 years of learning experience), it was decided that complexity would not be appropriate and thus, it was omitted from the study. Accuracy was mainly calculated by counting the number of errors made, and fluency was calculated by
the number of pruned words, clauses and so on.

By reviewing the previous studies, the following assumptions were originally made about the students' performance on the task:

1. All of the students would improve their task performance at the second task (task repetition effects).
2. Students in the Pair Group would improve fluency of their performance more than the other two groups (the effects of source of planning).
3. Students in the Solitary Group would improve accuracy of their performance more than the other group (planning time effects).

As for the effects of task repetition, all of the learners would become familiar with the topic and more attention would be focused on performance itself. As for the second assumption, the students who are given the opportunity to talk about the subsequent task with peers would be better able to elaborate on the content of the story. On the other hand, the participants in the Solitary Group will spend more time on examining the accuracy of their first performance.

Transformation of Theoretical Perspectives

The results of the study indicated that the learners in the Pair Group produced the highest fluency; that is, the average number of words produced was the largest in the second performance by the Pair Group students. As I closely looked at students conversations during their dyadic interaction, however, I realized some important aspects of learner performance that had been neglected, and some pedagogical, rather than theoretical, questions were raised. These questions were brought about due to the fact that I am a teacher and a researcher.
First, the accuracy of their speaking performance was calculated by counting the errors that the students made. This was an appropriate procedure from the view of traditional task-based research, but at the same time, it prevented me from evaluating positive aspects of the student learning. As a teacher/researcher, I wanted to focus more on the improvement of learning than on the errors. Another question, similar to the previous one, was concerned with individual differences among the learners and their progress from the first speaking performance to the second. Since the effects of each independent variable were measured by comparing the average scores of the three groups, the individual differences among the learners were masked. These individual differences and their improvement from the first speaking performance to the second may become critical factors, which would affect actual teaching and learning in the classroom. These were aspects I wanted to explore more as a teacher/researcher.

To solve these practical puzzles and questions which were brought about by the limitation of quantitative research, I began to reconsider the research framework. I found that the sociocultural approach to language learning would allow me to shed light not only on the outcome of learners' performance but also on the learning process of dyadic interactions. Through a micro-genetic (detailed) examination of dyad interaction, I investigated how learners learn from peers, what kind of peer dynamic occurs and how learners develop and grow.

Interestingly, the similar transformations of research framework can be found in the studies done by scholars working within a sociocultural theoretical perspective (e.g., Storch, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2004; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). That is, most of the research since the early 1980s on group and more commonly on pair work in L2 contexts as a psycholinguistical perspective has
tended to investigate learner interactions in terms of negotiation of meaning where they lacked attention to the group or pair relationship. However, sociocultural theorists argue that analyzing a learner’s oral communication in order to identify types of interaction and to see interaction only in terms of an attempt to negotiate meaning represents a fairly limited view of the role of language in human interactions. Storch (2001) argues,

... a number of researchers in both L1 and L2 are calling for an investigation into the nature of interactions in group and pair work: research which moves beyond a mere count of an inventory of utterances or of inventory of negotiations. (p.30)

Now I will go back to my research design. The students in the Pair Group in our research have reflection time with their peers. The oral communication aspect of the reflection time, in which the students revise their previous task performance and orchestrate the subsequent task performance as dyadic interaction is called “Revision Talk” and it became the main data to be analyzed in my research. My research interest now moves beyond a mere count of an inventory of utterances or of inventory of negotiations; rather, my focus become the nature of the dyadic interaction in the pairs which practitioners usually miss in language classrooms but need to know in order to conduct effective collective activities in the language lessons.

Before turning to a closer examination of our research, to clarify our theoretical background, I start the following chapter with a review of related studies. In chapter 2, the present research on dyadic interaction is presented. In Chapters 3 and 4, analyses of the data collected are demonstrated. Finally, the study is concluded with some issues raised from the data obtained in my research in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 1
A REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

In this chapter, previous studies which investigated peer-to-peer interaction from sociocultural theoretical perspectives will be reviewed. Sociocultural theory has its roots in the work of a developmental psychologist, Vygotsky. In the following part, I will focus on one of his most famous theories, "zone of proximal development (referred to as ZPD)" and the studies which examined the function of ZPD in language learning. ZPD is defined as follows,

It is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)

Vygotsky examined the expert/novice relationship (e.g., adult–child, teacher–student and so on) and emphasized the function of language because it is understood as an important mediating tool. As following his view, Lantolf & Appel (1994) stated that "it is not the carrying out of a specific task that is the important feature of "interpersonal" activity, but the higher cognitive process that emerges as a result of the interaction." Within recent SLA theories conducted within sociocultural contexts, the interest of sociocultural theorists has not been confined to expert/novice relationships, but quite a few researchers argue the role of ZPD within peer-peer relationships. Their main research question is how higher forms of human mental activity are mediated through language. Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller (2002) sums up the discussion very efficiently below,

The main premise of a sociocultural theory of mind is that cognitive functions such as attention, problem solving and voluntary memory are mediated
mental activities. The sources of these cognitive functions are social. That is, activities which are external to the learner but in which he or she participates (interpsychological) are transformed into mental ones (intrapsychological) . . . . The process of internalization is mediated by semiotic tools, language being one of the most important. (Italics added) (p.172)

Hence, I will begin by focusing on peer mediation as a mental activity and cognitive function. Then I will review previous studies intimately related to the present study. Specifically, I will concentrate on the nature of dyadic interaction. Lastly, since the participants in this study talked about language (e.g., grammar, lexical, pragmatic and so on) during the dyadic interactions, I will examine how language mediates the learners’ interaction. The talk is called “metatalk” (by Brooks and Donato, 1994), which mediates second language learning, according to Vygotskian theory. In the last part of that section, I will introduce language related episodes (LREs, hereafter) (Swain & Lapkin, 1995, 1998) which will help us understand relationships between metatalk in dyadic interaction and subsequent task performance. The learners in this study mostly used their first language (L1), Japanese, instead of their target language (TL) (i.e., English) to metatalk. Advantages and disadvantages of the use of L1 during peer-to-peer interaction have been recently discussed in the literature; however, L1 use by the participants of the present study can be considered as one of the cognitive resources which help them metatalk. I will comment on it by using related studies.

1.1 Peer Mediation

Although it might be appropriate to briefly consider what is meant by mediation and mediated learning from sociocultural perspective theory, the notion is too extensive to explain here. I would therefore like to refer to Lantolf's (2000)
summary of mediation instead. He divided mediation into three general categories: mediation by others in social interaction, mediation by the self through private speech, and mediation by artifacts. Lantolf (2000) says, “not only does our mental activity determine the nature of our social world, but this world of human relationships and artifacts also determines to a large extent how we regulate our mental processes” (p. 79). Of the three domains of mediation to be considered, a vast amount of the research carried out on mediated learning and teaching focus on social mediation.

Premising those overlap, Lantolf identified three strands within social mediation research: experts and novices, comparative study of different mediating behaviors across classroom settings, and peer mediation. As one of the purposes of the present study is to demonstrate that learners would be able to scaffold each other effectively through the use of a variety of interactive strategies, peer-mediated language learning is of the greatest concern in this study. Lantolf (2000b) suggests that dialogic mediation among peers is likely to be more effective than the monologic mediation displayed by the teachers. Also in the peer mediated research, van Lier (2000) shows that learners are often able to utilize the “affordances.” Swain and Lapkin (1998) show that “occasions for learning” was available by their colleagues in ways that are unavailable in expert-novice interactions. In regard to this point, Lantolf (2000b) remarks,

Peer-mediated language learning has attracted the attention of a number of sociocultural researchers. This research has demonstrated that learners are able to scaffold each other quite effectively through use of a variety of interactive strategies that appear to be sensitive to the ZPD. An important implication of this work is that learning can emerge in the absence of a recognized expert. Expertise can be collaboratively constructed in the talk that occurs among learners who share the goal of working out a linguistically-based solution to a problem. (p. 84)
1.2 Collective Activity

Donato (1988) is the first researcher who examined the pattern of the second language (L2) learners' dyadic interaction. He characterized the way the dyad worked and investigated whether there were links between the ways the dyads interacted and the quality of learners' performances. He observed the process of structuring joint communicative events which would provide important insights into the development of linguistic competence, and moreover, provided new insights into the nature of peer mediation. Storch (2002) sums up Donato's research by saying,

Donato found marked differences in terms of group relations, ranging from collective to loosely knit groups. Furthermore, there were instances in the collective groups where learners provided each other with resolutions to language related issues. Donato labelled such instances 'collective scaffolding' and noted that such instances were relatively rare in the loosely knit groups. (p.307)

Donato highlighted a very crucial point—the need to consider the nature of group or pair functioning in any study which investigates learner interaction. "Collective scaffolding" (Donato, 1998) has also indicated that not only is the novice helped in the task at hand, but also the novice is also enabled to perform the task independently. This study influenced the subsequent research investigating the nature of dyadic interaction.

1.3 The Nature of Dyadic Interaction

As I mentioned above, though little attention had been given to the nature of dyadic interaction before Donato's research, it attracted many researchers in more recent years. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) commented, "since the relationship between the participants is of vital importance in any sociocultural analysis, the
analyst should determine as far as possible what the nature of this relationship is” (p. 238).

Storch (2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2004) has conducted a series of studies on the nature of dyadic interaction in an adult ESL classroom. Although her previous research interests were on the development of students’ grammatical accuracy, she recently focused on investigating the dyadic interaction. She not only illustrated quantitative differences in the nature of dyadic interactions, but more importantly, she showed that these differences should not be ignored in research on learner interactions. Her recent studies also built on Donato’s study (1988), and she found four distinct patterns of dyadic interaction in adult ESL classrooms (Storch, 2002a). They are “collaborative,” “dominant/dominant,” “dominant/passive,” and “expert/novice.” These relationships were distinguished according to two indexes: “equality” and “mutuality,” details of which are described below.

Equality refers to the degree of control or authority over the task and describes more than merely an equal distribution of turns or equal contributions but an equal degree of control over the direction of a task.

- High equality is evident in interactions where both participants take directions from each other.

Mutuality refers to the level of engagement with each other’s contribution.

- High mutuality describes interactions that are rich in reciprocal feedback and a sharing of ideas. (p. 127) [bold added]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Mutuality</th>
<th>Low Mutuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Expert/Novice</td>
<td>3 Dominant/Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Collaborative</td>
<td>High Equality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. A model of dyadic interaction (Storch, 2002a, p. 128)
Graphically, the four distinct patterns of dyadic interaction can be represented by the four quadrants, which are formed by two intersecting axes, as shown in Figure 3. Storch (2002a) adds some comments and explanations on each axis and quadrant:

Each of these axes should be thought of as a continuum. The horizontal axis, representing equality, ranges from low to high equality. The vertical axis representing the notion of mutuality, ranges from low to high mutuality. Furthermore, because the two axes represent continua, the intersection point represents a moderate level rather than zero. (p. 127)

**Quadrant 1: Collaborative** describes a pair working together on all parts of the task and where learners are willing to offer and engage with each other's ideas, thus creating and maintaining in a "joint problem space" (Ibrasley and Roschelle, 1993). During these negotiations, alternative views are offered and discussed, leading to resolutions that seem acceptable to both participants.

**Quadrant 2: Dominant/Dominant** describes although both participants contribute to the task. There is inability or unwillingness to fully engage with each other's contribution. The discourse is marked by a high level of disagreements and inability to reach consensus. That is, participants may contribute equally to the task, but there may be very little engagement with each other's contribution.

**Quadrant 3: Dominant/Passive** describes little negotiation because the dominant participant takes an authoritarian stance and seems to appropriate the task, on the contrary, the other participant seems to adopt a more passive, subservient role.

**Quadrant 4: Expert/Novice** describes one of the participants acts as an expert who actively encourages the other participant (the novice) to participate in the task. (pp. 127–129)  [bolds added]

Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) states "although Storch's study focused on adult peers, we feel that the categories of role relationships are useful for describing patterns of interaction in other learning context as well" (p. 239). I also think these categories developed in her research are effective and useful to the micro-genetic (detailed) analysis of my study, in which the participants are Japanese junior high school students. Therefore, in order to find distinct patterns of students' interactions, I will observe their interactions using Storch's categories. Following these previous studies I will also examine the relationship between the
distinct patterns of dyadic interaction and language learning uptake in the subsequent tasks through LREs. LREs are the talk which supports the process of internalization (Lantolf, 2000) which occurs while learners are engaged in problem-solving and knowledge-building activities. In the following section, I will describe LREs in more detail.

1.4 Language-Related Episodes (LREs)

The term, LREs, is used as a unit of analysis by Swain & Lapkin (1995, 1998). They found that LREs served as workable sorts for the building of a cognitive process because knowledge was created by the group and internalized by the individuals through collaborative problem solving. Swain, Brook and Tocalli-Beller (2002) explain that

LREs are instances of collaborative dialogue in which students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or other- or self-correct their language production. . . . (they) argued that LREs provide opportunities for language learning, and were able to demonstrate, using pre- and post-test data, that some LREs were in fact the site of learning. (p. 173)

As a research purpose, they found that attending to the talk generated by learners during dyadic interaction (peer mediation) allows researchers to have access to some of the specific cognitive process learners deploy to learn a language.

Participants in my research were also given the opportunity to talk about language and this allowed me to access learners' cognitive development. I call it Revision Talk originally used in Young & Miller (2004), although the role of revision during the talk had been already argued by other researchers (e.g., de Guerrero & Villamil, 1994, 1999, 2000, etc.). The term originally indicates that the L2 talk in which learners rethink the previous task and prepare for the
subsequent task. In this research, however, since the participants are eighth grade students at a Japanese junior high school, they use Japanese as their L1 in Revision Talk. It might make little sense to allow students to use the L1 for all communicative functions. However, recent studies indicate that the L1 plays a key role in helping learners to mediate each other and themselves in the appropriation of another language. I will briefly present some related studies.

1.5 Mediation Through the L1

As a final topic of peer mediation in Lantolf (2000), he points out, "what has become a controversial issue, not only within the sociocultural but also within general literature on second language pedagogy, [would be] the role of L1 in promoting or inhibiting the learning of a second language" (p. 86). I agree that L1 use is a controversial issue. However, since "the talk that occurs during tasks is not only just about encoding and decoding messages of the topic" (Brooks and Donato, 1994, p. 271) and "students also use language to determine precisely what the task is about and to navigate themselves and each other through it" (Lantolf, 2000), the role of L1 use is much more effective, especially for lower proficiency students who have just started learning the foreign language. There is some literature which documents the L1 use as metatalk in which researchers show that the L1 "provides an opportunity for L2 acquisition to take place" (Anton and DiCamilla, 1998, p. 322), and argue that the L1 use helps learners to understand the nature of the task, to attend to linguistic form, to solve lexical problems, and to establish the "tone and nature of their collaboration" (Swain & Lapkin, 1998). In the following chapter, I will explain the present study more closely.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH

In the previous chapter, I described how the present study, which was originally designed as a task-based language learning, was shifted from a quantitative study to a qualitative one, which was motivated by the research conducted based on sociocultural theory of language learning. Chapter 1 presented a review of literature on sociocultural approach to language learning, specifically focusing on dyadic interaction among language learners. In this chapter, I will now depict the details of the present study which investigated peer-to-peer interactions between Japanese junior high school students learning English.

2.1 Research Purpose and Questions

In this section, I would like to begin with a quote from Swain & Lapkin (1998) to make the underlying concepts, research purposes, and questions of the present study clearer.

... language use is both communication and cognitive activity. Language is simultaneously a means of communication and tool for thinking. Dialogue provides both the occasion and both for language learning and evidence for it. Language is both process and product. (p. 320)

This excerpt suggests that language learning should be investigated not only by examining the outcome of learners' performance but also by looking into peer dialogue which occurs between two learners as they attempt to reflect on their performance, notice the gap between their interlanguage and actual performances, solve linguistic problems, raise their awareness of the new possibilities and
reconstruct their performance. Another issue I would like to discuss in my research is the nature of dyadic interactions. In Chapter 1, I presented Storch's study (2002) which identified the four distinct patterns of dyadic interaction, as briefly reviewed. Storch examined opportunities for learning that members of a pair construct through their interaction, and then presented evidence of students utilizing these opportunities in a subsequent task. She calls it "transfer of knowledge." Although the theoretical and methodological background of the present study is essentially based on Storch's, I have to point out that the significant differences between Storch's and the present study lies in the participants' proficiency and cultural background. The participants in her study were adult ESL students learning at an Australian university who came from a range of cultural backgrounds. On the other hand, the participants in my study were teenagers who had been learning English as a foreign language for less than two years and had a nearly homogeneous cultural background. These differences may cause difficulties in conducting micro-genetic analysis of learner's performance. In addition, since they were beginners and young learners, their psychological states in the research setting and their perceptions of the tasks might be less stable. This variable would affect data gathering processes. Also, since they were from similar cultural backgrounds, their dyadic interactions might indicate patterns which are different from Storch's. Therefore, the key questions of this research are:

1. Are there any distinct patterns of dyadic interactions of Japanese JHS students? If so, what kind of patterns would be observed? What are the characteristics of each pattern?

2. Are there any links between task performances and their Revision Talk?
Do particular patterns of dyadic interactions affect the subsequent task performance? If so, which kinds of patterns are effective in language learning?

2.2 The Study

2.2.1 Participants

As was described in Introduction, thirty junior high school students participated in the present study. Due to the reorientation of the research purposes, however, only the sixteen, originally grouped into Pair Group, will be the participants of this present study (see Introduction). They were eighth graders at a public junior high school located in a western part of Japan. The school is relatively small and consists of approximately four hundred students in all. Fourteen female and two male students volunteered to participate in the study. It had been about one year and eight months since they started learning English at that JHS. The results of the questionnaires (Appendix B), which had been given to the students before the study began, indicated that all of the participants, although they voluntarily joined the study, did not necessarily showed stronger preferences for English as a school subject (Appendix B). The result of the J.A.C.E. Test\(^2\) taken by the students before this research showed that the students’ linguistic proficiencies of English varied.

A series of sessions were conducted after school as extracurricular lessons from January to February 2005 and the participants were told that none of the results would affect their regular academic grades. The students knew each

\(^2\) J.A.C.E. Test (Junior Assessment of Communicative English) accomplished by ELPA (Association for English Language Proficiency Assessment) is consist of three parts: (1) lexis and grammar (2) reading (3) listening.
other very well, although they belonged to different homeroom classes. The 16 students were paired; they determined their partners by themselves. Therefore, I can say that their pair relationships were very close. Appendix C shows a brief description and proficiency levels of each dyad, which was made based on the results of the pre-research questionnaire, the J.A.C.E. Test, and the researcher's notes and diary.

2.2.2 Training Sessions

The task in this study was “Story Telling,” in which each of the students was presented one of the picture prompts (Appendix A) and asked to individually make a story for one minute. Before the task sessions began, the training sessions were administered for three days, so that the students would get used to the tasks. In the training sessions, they were told that the purpose of the task was to improve their oral English ability, especially the ability of making coherent stories by using their knowledge as opposed to merely describing pictures by just listing as many items as possible. Though they were doing the task independently, the students were instructed to make stories which would be understood by other students. In order to raise their awareness toward story-telling, several worksheets were prepared and used (Appendix D). Also some tips for making a good story were instructed; for example, to describe the context first (e.g., situation, location and so on), then to consider a coherent story of the two pictures, and, to create a story by focusing on more details (e.g., behavior of characters, relationships among them, feelings and so on). These instructions given to the students are shown in Appendix D. The student also learned how to use the recording equipment. Most importantly, they experienced Revision Talk, in which they examined their
recording, detected their errors and became aware of the new grammatical or lexical possibilities which could be used in the subsequent performance.

### 2.2.3 Study Sessions

Following the training sessions, the study sessions were conducted. In each study session, the students individually worked on the story-telling task for one minute, which was followed by listening time for three minutes and 10 minutes for revising the first performance. Subsequently, they repeated the same story-telling task. This cycle was repeated three times with each session held once a week. The figure below illustrates this task cycle.

![Task Procedure Diagram](image)

*Figure 4. Task procedure of pair group*

### 2.3 Data Collection

The main data source of this research is primarily Revision Talk done in pairs and the recordings of students’ story-telling tasks. Some of the students
were also video-recorded to observe their attitudes or gestures which may visually indicate different aspects of their performance. In addition, I recorded on-line observation notes during the sessions and wrote a journal after each task cycle. Revision Talk and the task performance were transcribed immediately after each task cycle for further analysis.

As I noted earlier, the students were given the pre-research questionnaire and the J.A.C.E. Test before joining this study. Reflection sheets were given to the students, who wrote down their self-assessment of the task performance or collaborative pair work not only after each training sessions but also during or after the task cycle.
CHAPTER 3
DATA ANALYSIS 1
Patterns of Dyadic Interaction

In Chapters 3 and 4, the dyadic interactions between the learners will be analyzed. The analysis consists of two stages. The first stage, which is discussed in this chapter, focuses on the patterns of dyadic interaction. The second stage, which is shown in the following chapter, will investigate the relationship between the nature of dyadic interactions and students' language "uptake." The data of the first analysis stage consists largely of pair interactions recorded during Revision Talk, in which students in pairs revised their previous task performance and prepared for the subsequent task performance. I will follow Storch's qualitative approach to data analysis as described in the earlier chapters.

3.1 Patterns of Dyadic Interaction

In one of the series of her study, Storch finds four distinct patterns of the nature of dyadic interactions: collaborative, dominant/dominant, dominant/passive, and expert/novice, which are distinguishable in terms of two indexes: “equality of contributions” and “mutuality of engagement.” In the following part, by analysing Revision Talk, I will examine whether dyadic interactions between the Japanese learners show any distinct patterns.

3.1.1 Collaborative Dyad

The most striking nature of collaborative dyad in Storch's study is
"joint-construction utterances," in which one of the learners incorporates, repeats, completes or extends the other peer utterances. Then they ask and answer each other. They also give negative (or collective) feedback in the form of peer repair or recasting as well as positive feedback in the form of confirmation. In the present study, Dyad E is considered to be a collaborative dyad.

Dyad E: Mari & Nanako

Excerpt 1 illustrates collaborative interaction found in Revision Talk of Dyad E. Mari and Nanako jointly contributed to the reconstruction of the sentences from the first task performance to the subsequent task. In their Revision Talk, their voice sounded cheerful with full of laughter, and they continued to show the collaborative nature throughout the tasks. On Day 1, they talked about how to make the plot of the story (Excerpt 1), but gradually this disposition moved toward talking about grammatical constructions, choice of lexis, or pragmatic usages (Excerpt 2).

Excerpt 1. Dyad E: Day 1 Joint-construction 1 (Making Stories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 N</td>
<td>kanojo no chikaku ni wa nan toka ga ari masu toka. (How about this? There is something near her.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 M</td>
<td>ja n She is nani? cushion? (Well, She is what? Cushion?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 N</td>
<td>There is a chair? (Why don't you use ‘there is’?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 M</td>
<td>aa sou ka. (laughter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 N</td>
<td>kanojo no chikaku ni wa...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 M</td>
<td>aa kanojo no chikaku ni wa...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 N</td>
<td>bed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 M</td>
<td>un.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 N</td>
<td>bed ga ari masu. Bed no u ni wa... (There is a bed. On the bed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 M</td>
<td>aa. kanojo wa suisougaku bu desu. (Ah, she is in the music club.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 N</td>
<td>Ha ha... aa sou ka (Ha ha... (laughter) I see.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 M</td>
<td>(kanojo wa suisougaku bu desu) (she is in the music club.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 N</td>
<td>(kanojo wa suisougaku bu desu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 M</td>
<td>kanojo wa (She is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 N</td>
<td>gakki wa? (furu-to desu.) (What instrument? (flute))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 M</td>
<td>(furu-to) wo fuite imasu. play the (playing the (flute). play the)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(translation mine)

---

3 Initials denote the participants' pseudonyms. Line numbers shown correspond to line numbers in the original transcripts on each day. The following symbols were used in transcribing the pair talk: the round brackets ( ) indicate translation into English; the three periods ... indicate a short pause; the square brackets [ ] indicate the beginning and end of overlapping talk; italics in their Revision Talk in L1 indicate English; bolds in translation section indicate the original English in Revision Talk. Additional comments are enclosed in the double brackets ([ ]).
The students incorporated each other's utterances, repeated each other's utterances and extended them (Lines 48 and 57), or simply completed each other's utterances (Line 51). The following features were observed: peer repair (or recasting) (Line 42) as negative feedback, confirmation (Line 43, 50, 53), requests (Lines 40–42, 48–49, 57), and provision of information (Lines 52, 57). One of their unique collaborative features is that they coincidentally talked about the same thing at the same time (Lines 54–55, 57–58). It showed that they had parallel cognitive functions, and their mutuality was strikingly high.

Based on the analysis above, I consider that their talk shows a collaborative pattern of interaction that was high on equality and mutuality. To further illustrate the development of the dyad interaction by the students, I will analyze the Revision Talk observed on Day 3 and show how they shifted their focus from the story's plot to the story's grammatical constructions and lexical choices.

Excerpt 2. Dyad E: Day 3 Joint-construction 2 (Syntax, Lexis, and Pragmaticality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>de tokelite dou yatte ie ba yokatta n ka wasure te mota.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>It's it's seven...sanjyu...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>thirteen...n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>thirteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>thirty'ka,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>It's seven thirty now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>a sou ka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>kare wa ima oki masi ta. He is getting up now...ja kare wa hikouki ga sukidesu, de ii?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>un.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>da, kara hikouki no posuta ga kabe ni ha tte ari ma sta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>kore posuta nan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>e ka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'plane'tte dou kaku n ya tta ka? kou?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,2,3,4, kore hantai demo ee ka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>dakara hikouki no houki no, aa there is ka, there is plane's picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>plane's ka na?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'plane'tte dou kaku n?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>pu'ra'ne (P'LA'NE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>kore de ou toru?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>There is a...a'ira n no?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>aa, homma ya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lines 19–25 show metatalk about lexical choice. They decided to use “thirty” instead of “thirteen,” and they decided to use either “poster” or “picture” in Lines 28–30. They also show metatalk about the indefinite article, “a,” in Lines 45–46. The shift of their talk from plotting the stories to lexical items and grammar clearly indicates that they had been developing to contribute collaboratively not only in terms of language learning but also in terms of peer-mediation strategies.

3.1.2 Expert/Novice Dyad

In Storch’s study, the category expert/novice represents low equality but high mutuality. That is, in this pattern of interaction, although one learner seems to take more control over the task, he/she acts as an expert who actively encourages the other learner (the novice) to participate in the task. More specifically, in the expert learner’s talk, a provision of assistance and explanation to help the novice learner are often seen, and the novice learner often confirms or repeats the expert’s talk. The expert leads the task, provides assistance and invites contribution from the novice learner. This feature is unlike the dominant/passive dyad; however, since the role of the expert is very fluid, the relationship of expert/novice can occasionally be similar to the dominant/passive dyad. This is observed more often in young learners’ peer relationships.

The difference between an expert learner and a dominant one is that the former does not impose his/her ideas but rather tries to provide assistance. Since young learners are not always well-motivated and are likely to be affected by factors outside the classroom, even those learners who are proficient enough to play expert roles could easily become dominant learners.
Dyad A: Michiko & Yuki

Dyad A has the features of an expert/novice pattern in my study. Although showing some possibilities of being a dominant learner, the expert learner in this study, Michiko, showed being excellent collective scaffolding during this study. Interestingly, the scaffolding made by Michiko gradually shifted from explicit to implicit, whether consciously or not. I suggest that because all people are scaffolded by expert people (i.e., parents, teachers and so on) while growing up, we might naturally understand how to scaffold other people. Especially for young learners who are in their adolescence, it might be interesting or stimulating to be able to scaffold or assist the novice people, because they have experienced to have scaffoldings from others under various circumstances. As a good expert learner Michiko was valuable to Yuki. Now I will show the feature of expert/novice observed in Dyad A (Excerpt 3) and the shift of their scaffolding from explicit to implicit (Excerpt 4).

Excerpt 3. Dyad A: Day 1 Explicit Scaffolding (Say in Japanese.)

12 Y aaa nan ka she... nan toka tte iita katte n. (Ah, let me see, she... something. I want to say.)
13 M sou sou sou (go on.)
14 Y no na... nan te i e ba ii n yaro na? (Well, I don't know what to say.)
15 M nihongo de itte. (Say in Japanese.)
16 Y ee to, "tanosinde ima su" (Well, "to be enjoying")
17 M She looks very happy, to ka? (She looks happy, Yeah?)
18 Y da kara, ongaku wo ki iie... (because of listening to music.)
19 M Su ayo ni ongaku wo ki ite imasu tte sore kara She looks happy, ni sure ba e ee nen. (Say 'She is listening music' first. Then 'She looks very happy.')
20 Y aa. She is na n yatta kle? Kiite imasu tte? (Ah, What do you say 'She is listening'?)
21 M listen (listen)
22 Y listen to music (listen to music) (translation mine)

It is obvious that Michiko played the role of expert and led the task, but she did not impose her opinion on her partner. Instead, she tried to provide explanations (Lines 17, 19, 21) and invited Yuki's participation (Lines 13, 15). Yuki's speech shows some features of the novice learners: confirming and
repeating the suggestions made by the expert in Yuki’s speech (Line 22).

This dyadic interaction was on the first day, before they got used to the task. In Line 12, Yuki wanted to ask Michiko what to say, but she did not know how to ask. Michiko, then, gave a suggestion, “Say in Japanese” (Line 15), which became good guidance. This interaction is seeking to involve the novice and inviting the learners’ contribution (Storch, 2002). In Excerpt 3, the expert student directly gave answers to the novice student’s questions; however, the way Michiko provided the scaffolding for Yuki changed from explicit (provision of answers) to implicit (provision of clues).

Excerpt 4. Dyad A: Day 2 Implicit Scaffolding (Say in English.)

```
23 M sou yatta ra ~jin. ~jin te.  (Then, how about using the nationality?)
24 Y kotti, nihon jin. kotti ei igi.  (This-Japanese, this Eng.)
25 M eigo de itte.  (Say in English.)
26 Y eeto eeto. She  (Well, well she)
27 M namee manee.  (name, name)
28 Y {Emi}⋅⋅⋅  (Emi.)
29 M ee. tyou matte.  (Wait, wait a moment.)
30 Y Kumi eeto Kumi from  (Kumi, well, Kumi from)
31 M e?  (Pardon?)
32 Y Kumi eeto  (Kumi, well...)
33 M Bideoushi.  (Be Verb.)
34 Y Kumi is from Japanese.  (Kumi is from Japanese.)
35 M Japanese?  (Japanese?)
36 Y Japan  (Japan)
37 M un. Kumi is from Japan. na.  (Yes. Kumi is from Japan. OK?)
38 Y de kotti wa?  (Then how about this?)
39 Y Emily is ee dou shiyou? eeto from America.  (Emily is, well, what shall I do? Well, from America.)
40 M sou sou sou  
.................................  (pleasantly) very good.
.................................
46 M sousousou. yukkuri kangae tara dekiri yaro? oboe tokana akande sore. 
.................................  (That's right. You can do it if you think slowly. You should remember that. Go for it.)
48 M sou sou sou  
.........................
56 Y daibu dekiru you ni na tta ya n.  (That's right.)
89 M sou sou sou  (I can do it much better than before.)
90 Y gasei dekiru you ni na tta ya n.  (translation mine)
```

Excerpt 4 shows Michiko’s implicit collective scaffolding. In Lines 24–25, Michiko told Yuki, who did not understand how to make a story, “Say in English,” and Michiko invited the novice student’s contribution to the task. After this comment, Michiko did not give any explicit answers or lexical advice, but rather
provided Yuki some opportunities to think by herself. Michiko was more likely to just wait or give hints and countersignals, which indicated a mistake made by her partner, Yuki (Lines 27, 29, 31). In Line 33, Michiko gave Yuki advice on grammar, because Yuki often made major mistakes, such as lacking the verb “to be,” when she made English sentences. Although pointing out this kind of error three times in the Revision Talk of Day 2, Michiko never gave explicit answers to Yuki. This way of error correction might have guided Yuki to be an autonomous student. Interestingly, Michiko’s way of indicating Yuki’s error was also implicit in that she did not say right or wrong, but rather reprised the error. Through this interaction, Yuki became able to notice and correct her own mistakes (Line 36). In addition, Michiko completed the sentence for Yuki (Line 37) and gave her a chance to practice the expression (Line 38). Another feature of their expert/novice pattern in their Revision Talk was shown in Lines 40, 56, and 89. The expression, “sou sou sou,” means confirmation or admiration of Yuki’s contribution. It was seen seven times in their Revision Talk in Day 2. Line 56, strikingly showed Michiko’s cognition as the expert in their dyadic interaction, in which she admitted, confirmed, and encouraged the novice’s contribution. These were cordial enough to lead Yuki to become aware of the grammatical errors by herself. In Line 90, the novice learner, Yuki, admired herself. I am not sure whether this talk might represent true confidence or merely consideration for the expert learner. Nevertheless, this was an amazing episode for me, because she had noted, “I did not speak any English sentences at all,” in her reflection sheet collected after the last training session, and actually, it was hard for her to make sentences in English. More or less, it was clear that she might be able to gain a lot of new knowledge and strategies through this Revision Talk with expert student, Michiko.
3.1.3 Dominant/Dominant Dyad

"Disputational talk" is the distinct feature of dominant/dominant, in which we find negative feedback (e.g., pair repair or recast), disagreement, justification of their own talk, and imposition of their opinion; in other words, they have few joint-constructions of discourse, requests, or collaborative completions. I assume these features might not be so common in the dyadic interactions among Japanese learners because it may be difficult for the Japanese to be a dominant learner in the classroom, especially for young learners; Japanese culture emphasizes modesty and these sociocultural factors affect students' classroom behavior. Instead of imposing his/her opinion, they tend to talk around what they want to say, even when they exactly know the correct answers or what to say. Utterances often begin with "I'm not sure..." or "I don't know but...," for example.

The distinct features of dominant/dominant in this study might be a little different from Storch's, although her analysis largely helped me to distinguish the pattern of dominant/dominant features in this study. Here, I will introduce Dyad D as a dominant/dominant dyad not only to exemplify the features based on Storch, but to illustrate the particular features of the Japanese young learners in terms of cultural differences in Excerpts 5 and 6.

Dyad D: Yuko & Miki

As mentioned in the previous chapter, though Yuko and Miki belonged to the same sports club, their relationship was not necessarily good. This fact may have influenced their Revision Talk. Yuko seemed to dominate their interaction, even though she did not adopt an authoritative tone. Depending on Miki's answers to Yuko's comments, their Revision Talk sometimes sounded like collaborative interaction. These features are also shown in Excerpt 5.
Excerpt 5. Dyad D: Day 1  Disputational Talk 1 (Susan’s father/her father)

27 Y She likes (s...) (She likes...) 
28 M (you)de imasou wa nan te iu n? (What do you say "to be calling?) 
29 Y ee to calling (Well, calling) 
30 M Susan’s father (Susan’s father) 
31 Y her father (her father) 
32 M soi de iin ka. (Oh, OK. (some anger))) 
33 Y her father calling (her father calling) 
34 M is irun chau. (is we may need.) 
35 Y is irun ka. iru iru iru. (is we need it? yes, yes, yes.) 
36 M is calling (is calling) 
37 Y is calling Susan (is calling Susan) 
38 M Susan de iin ? zenchishi toka wa? (Can we use Susan? (How about pronoun?) 
39 Y her ...her father is calling (her ...her father is calling) 
40 M sore ga deta kou hen na. ‘Susan’s father’ demo eeka. (I can’t do it. I may be able to use ‘Susan’s father’.) 
41 Y kore nanji ya kore? (This. what time is this? (with pointing the picture card)) 
42 M juuji. It’s ten. yoru ka asa ka wakaran na. (ten o’clock. It’s ten. I don’t know in the morning or at night.) (translation mine)

Although both Yuko and Miki contributed to the task devoutly and their Revision Talk seemed collaborative, it was not jointly constructed. The reason might be, as I mentioned above, that they suggested their opinions via peer repair (Line 34) or unwillingly accepted or pretended to accept the negative peer feedback (Line 32) rather than imposing their opinions explicitly. However, their talk clearly showed dominant/dominant features. Lines 30–31 indicate Yuko’s recasting to Miki’s comment. It was not a big deal whether they used “her father” or “Susan’s father.” Apparently, Miki agreed with Yuko’s recasting (Line 32), though she might not have been satisfied with it. Later, she tried to justify her objection (Line 40), but it sounded like her self-talk and was completely ignored by Yuko. In Storch’s study, when each participant tried to emphasize his/her own opinion, he/she frequently use first and second person singular pronouns (e.g., “I think,” “I mean,” or “You didn’t”). In Japanese, as we often omit the subject, it is rare to find either first or second singular pronouns. Likewise, Miki omitted singular pronouns when she tried to justify using the word, “Susan,” in Line 40.
Obviously, however, she was not satisfied with the recasting by Yuko and therefore tried to impose her opinion by using invisible “I.” In addition, a salient feature of dominant/dominant in Dyad D was that the topics in their interaction changed quickly, without waiting to solve their linguistic problems. This might be another way to avoid imposing their own opinions or showing disagreement (Line 41). Another salient feature was disregard of their peer’s opinion (Line 39). However, the features of their Revision Talk changed step by step. They sporadically showed features of joint-construction, like collaborative dyads, but these features were so insecure that they disappeared suddenly and changed to dominant/dominant disputational talk again. The features were shown in all task sessions and will be exemplified in Excerpt 6.

Excerpt 6. Dyad D: Day 2 Disputational Talk 2 (Ended with some anger)

4 M Emily come to · · · ·
5 Y ai ni kima shita.
6 M ai ni kima shita?
7 Y met. met?
8 M kako kei.
9 Y ee nan yaro?.....de kore otousan ni shite mota.
10 M uchi mo shita de.

(Emily come to .....
(came to see.)
(came to see?)
(Met. met?)
(past tense)
(Well, what shall I say? I regard this man as a father.)
(Me, too.)

19 M un. kore wa nani shiton kana?
20 J kore wa mattotte irrasyai tte
21 M de syoukai shito n ne n. Kumi wa...
22 J Kumi wa Kumi wa nani wo shittota ka iwana hen yana. Kumi is...
23 M monogatari nan? sore ittayatu.
24 J are wa Kumi desu. kochiea wa Emily desu. futari wa tomodati desu. Kumi wa kawaii desu. Mary chau chau Emily wa kisei desu. tte itta.
25 M beautiful
26 J beautiful tte hen kana to omotte pretty ni sita. de Nice to meet you, she said ni sure ba een chau?
27 M nani sore? aa.

(What is this doing?)
(it's waiting and say 'welcome')
(then it introduces. Kumi is)
(Kumi is..., it's strange not to say what Kumi is doing. isn't it? Kumi is.)
(What are you talking about? Is that a story? (with strong parlance))
(That is Kumi. This is Emily. They are friends. Kumi is cute. Mary, no, no, Emily is cute.)
(beautiful)
(I think beautiful is strange, so I used pretty here. Then we can say Nice to meet you, she said.)
(What's that? (some anger) Ah. (disappointedly))

Although they started collaboratively in Day 2, they changed the feature suddenly starting from Line 22, where Yuko sought Miki’s confirmation. Yuko's
comment sounded a bit strange because Miki had already asked about one of the character's (Kumi) behavior in the picture (Line 19). Ynko then answered that question (Line 20), and Miki extended it and tried to translate it into English (Line 21). Miki's attempt to jointly construct their story was suddenly interrupted by Ynko's question. It was clear to Ynko and Miki, who pointed to the picture card while they talked, that the topic was about Kumi. Despite this agreement, Ynko's question in Line 22 seemed as if Ynko did not listen to Miki's talk or did not understand what was going on. Miki showed signs of not understanding what Ynko thought and asked "what are you talking about?" with some anger (Line 23); however, Ynko kept making her story (Line 24). Similarly, in Line 25, though Miki gave a suggestion about Ynko's comment, Ynko readily rejected it and called it "strange" (Line 26). In response, Miki's voice sounded angry and disappointed in Line 27. Interestingly, Miki did not write any comments on the post-task reflection sheet about the peer interaction on that day. This might show that Miki was not satisfied with their Revision Talk at all. In that way, although they had distinct patterns of dominant/dominant dyadic interaction, some features were different from the dominant/dominant learners in Storch's study which might be particular to young Japanese learners.

3.1.4 Dominant/Passive Dyad

The dyadic interaction of students in this study did not show the distinct pattern of dominant/passive. This is probably due to the fact that the students used their mother tongue, Japanese, in Revision Talk. Additionally, as I discussed before, it might be rare to be dominant in the Japanese classroom because of cultural norms. However, depending on the nature of the task or the
fluidness of the expert's role, the relationship of expert/novice might easily change to dominant/passive, as discussed earlier.

In Storch's study, the distinct characteristics of dominant/passive are that one of the learners dominates the interaction throughout the session and appropriates the task as is manifested by long monologues in which he/she reads, deliberates, and decides on how to edit the given task. There is very little attempt to involve the other learner's contribution. The self-directed questions are a form of private speech that guides his/her behavior throughout the task. It is directed to the self, and its purpose is to direct one's own mental activity, particularly when confronting difficulties of a cognitive nature. The other student's role seems more limited or passive. Although such a passive student follows what a dominant student is proposing, evident by his/her phatic utterances, a passive learner does not propose many changes nor challenge many of the dominant learner's suggestions. Thus, there is little assistance sought nor offered.

3.1.5 Passive-Passive Dyad

One more pattern, passive/passive, was found in Japanese JHS students although it was not evidenced in Storch's study. The analysis of dyadic interaction within the function of an EFL young learners' classroom has shown something teachers always suspect: not all students work collaboratively when assigned to work on a language task in pairs. Moreover, it is likely that some young learners at this age in an EFL context do not want to join the task itself; that is, it is normal to show passive features about learning in the classroom. In this research, two dyads occasionally showed the passive/passive features in one of the task sessions. One dyad is Dyad C (Rie & Keiko), who focused on the task
performance so much that they could not interact with each other during the reflection time; they thought the result was much more important than the process of learning. Surprisingly, their interactions changed stage by stage. I will discuss Dyad C in Chapter 4 in more detail. Another dyad (Dyad B) which showed the passive/passive features had a very different situation from Dyad C. Dyad B (Takuya & Seiji) shows how an outside variable can affect the study. Both learners were very good friends and members of the same sports club. They showed collaborative features in their dyadic interaction in Days 1 and 2. These features disappeared suddenly on Day 3. When I closely looked at the video tape, I found Takuya had a bad temper because one of the club members defamed him just before the study. He was affected by what happened outside the task and it continued to affect him during the study. This also influenced his partner, Seiji, who wanted to participate in the study as usual.

I suggest that, like Dyad B, all students are likely to be affected by things that happen outside of the classroom, and one of the learners in each pair become a passive learner. This shows if assigned to work in pairs, it is easy for one of them to be a passive student. I also suggest that because all the pairs consisted of the same gender in this study, there is a possibility that some other distinct patterns would emerge if they were paired with the different genders.

3.2 Summary

Among the Japanese JHS learners, distinct patterns of the nature of dyadic interactions are found as a result of the first analysis stage. These are collaborative, expert/novice, and dominant/dominant patterns. Additionally, depending on the circumstances, students' attitudes about learning have a high
possibility of becoming passive/passive. In the next chapter, I will show the second analysis stage, which will describe the links between these distinct patterns of dyadic interactions and learning uptake in the sequence task performance.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS 2

Links Between the Nature of Dyadic Interactions and Language Uptake

In Chapter 4, based on the analysis conducted in the previous chapter, I will explore the links between the nature of dyadic interactions of the eight dyads and the language uptake observed in the subsequent task performance. First, LREs will be identified in Revision Talk made by the dyads, and then they will be examined to show how they are related to the subsequent task performance. The analysis will suggest that the relationships between LREs and language uptake are affected by the patterns of the dyadic interaction introduced in Chapter 3.

4.1 Patterns of Dyadic Interactions and Language Uptake

4.1.1 Collaborative: Dyad E (Mari & Nanako)

Dyad E, as was seen in Chapter 3, showed a collaborative pattern of dyadic interaction. More dynamic patterns and more collaborative interactions had been observed over time. That is, the equality and mutuality of the dyad became higher which distinctly affected their subsequent performance. In order to show the relationship between their dyadic interaction and the subsequent task performance, I will first present their task performance (i.e., story telling) recorded in Day 1 (Excerpt 7) and the LREs observed in their Revision Talk (Excerpts 8 & 9). Secondly, their task performance recorded in Day 3 (Excerpt 9) will be compared with the LREs (in Excerpt 10).
Excerpt 7. Dyad E: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 1

1st Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mari</th>
<th>Nanako</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 She listens to music.</td>
<td>1 There is a girl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 She likes music.</td>
<td>2 She is listening to CD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 There is a comic.</td>
<td>3 There is a bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 There is a comic. She likes music.</td>
<td>4 There is a bag by the bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 She is Ms. Baker.</td>
<td>5 He calling her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 He is cooking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mari</th>
<th>Nanako</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 She is Susan.</td>
<td>1 She is Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 She is listening to music.</td>
<td>2 She is listening to music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 She likes music.</td>
<td>3 She likes music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 She looks very happy.</td>
<td>4 It (un?) It's ten now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 She is cooking on the desk.</td>
<td>5 There is a poster on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 She is (a) there is a ......</td>
<td>6 She is Nishikino Fan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 The flute is on the bed.</td>
<td>7 So, she (un? is nai) there is a poster on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 She is Mr. Nishikino fan.</td>
<td>8 There is a bag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 So she in her room is (chau chau) so there is Mr. Nishikino's poster on the wall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the study sessions, the students tried the story-telling task for one minute individually and then discussed together for ten minutes how to revise their previous performance and prepared for the subsequent task performance. Interestingly, the first three sentences in their second performance were almost identical. This clearly indicates their Revision Talk affected the subsequent task performance. Let us look at the following Revision Talk.

Excerpt 8. Dyad E: Day1 Joint-construction 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 M</th>
<th>1 She is Susan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 N</td>
<td>2 She is listening to music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>3 She likes music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 N</td>
<td>4 She looks very happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 M</td>
<td>5 She is cooking on the desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 N</td>
<td>6 She is (a) there is a ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 M</td>
<td>7 The flute is on the bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 N</td>
<td>8 She is Mr. Nishikino fan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 M</td>
<td>9 So she in her room is (chau chau) so there is Mr. Nishikino's poster on the wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 M hajime na, She is Susan. ni shiyo. (First of all, 'She is Susan', OK?)
5 N She is Susan. (She is Susan.)
6 M un (Yeah.)
16 M She is Susan. (She is Susan.)
17 N un (Yeah.)
18 M She is listening to music. Yamete... (She listen to music. I will not use it.)
19 N un? (Ha?)
20 M She is listening to music. ni shiyo. (She is listening to music. I use it.)
21 N un. ee son nan de im kaina. (OK. Is that right?)
22 M mou ikkai ikude. (Shall we try one more time?)
134 N eigo? (in English?)
135 M ikude She is Susan. (Shall we go? She is Susan.)
136 N un. (Yes.)
137 M She is listening to music. She likes music. It music is rock. outoru, korede? (She is listening to music. She likes music. It music is rock. Is that right?)
138 N soucharun? (I think so.)
139 M eeto, She looks happy. She is (Well, She looks happy. She is)
Excerpt 8 shows that they confirmed the first three sentences three times (Lines 4-6, 16-20, 135-137) during their Revision Talk. Dicamella and Anton (1997) demonstrate that of self and other “repetition” function as a mediating strategy during peer interaction. They reason that since repetition occurs with fairly high frequency during collaborative dialogue, it could play a key role in mediating learning (cited in Lantolf, 2000). Repetition, however, might not be a good strategy and might waste time because they were allowed to spend just ten-minutes on Revision Talk in this study session. Therefore, even if they interacted collaboratively, there were only two episodes that are considered to affect the possible use of the subsequent task performance in Day 1. Repeating the revised parts could have been effective if they could have spent more time on revision. Also, some ideas agreed in the LREs were not necessarily used by both students, but only one of them used them in the subsequent task performance. There might be cognitive mismatches between Mari and Nanako in Day 1. I will show one of the episodes in Excerpt 9.

Excerpt 9. Dyad E: Day 1 A Cognitive Mismatch

In the training session which was administered before the study session, the students were instructed some strategies to describe the story. One of them was to describe the characters’ emotions by using adjectives. Mari suggested Nanako
use the strategy, but Nanako did not recognize what Mari implied. Nanako could not use the strategy nor make the sentence, “She looks happy,” even though they confirmed it together (Line 139 in Excerpt 8) in the last part of their Revision Talk.

Another episode which had guided the subsequent task performance (in Mari’s Lines 8–9 and Nanako’s Lines 6–7 in Excerpt 7) was found in Lines 142–144 in Excerpt 8. In Revision Talk on Day 1, they had to pay attention not only to the story-telling task but also to the procedure of Revision Talk.

In Day 3, their Revision Talk was full of LREs which led the students to generate almost identical story-telling in the subsequent performance. As the first part of their Revision Talk on Day 3 was already presented in Excerpt 2, I will show their task performance in Excerpt 10, and then the latter part of the LRE which is related to the performance will be shown in Excerpt 11.

Excerpt 10. Dyad E: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Performance</th>
<th>2nd Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mari</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nanako</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Susan is Nick’s sister.</td>
<td>1 She is Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 He likes plane.</td>
<td>2 He is Nick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 So, 1koku in poster ga on the wall.</td>
<td>3 It’s seven thirty now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 It’s seven thirteen.</td>
<td>4 Mr. Baker is Nick and Susan’s father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mr. Baker is Nick and Susan, Baker</td>
<td>5 Nick got up seven thirty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 They’re father</td>
<td>6 Nick and Susan go to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nick and Susan go to school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| 54 M de ee to Mr. Baker wa Susan to Nick no fathderdesu. | (then well, Mr. Baker is Susan and Nick’s father.) |
| 55 N father desu the tokoro dokoro eigo de | (father, you used English only part by part.) |
| 56 M (laughing) | (laughing) |
| 64 M kare ga ii mashi ta. He saying... | (He is saying. He saying) |
During the Revision Talk, the two students kept talking and frequently used the dictionary effectively. After the Revision Talk, they produced stories which were almost identical. It is not only Dyad E but also the other collaborative dyads that showed an identical or similar task performance in the subsequent task in this study. Storch (2002) explains that, once the learners are highly involved in the interaction, their cognitive processes are strongly affected by each other, and this allows the learners to reconstruct or co-construct the sentences in the subsequent task. Interestingly, it seems that the collaborative Revision Talk also made the students feel satisfied not only with the results of the task performance (i.e., story-telling) but also with the peer-to-peer interactions they had during the Revision Talk. Table 1 shows some post-task reflections written by Mari and Nanako.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Mari</th>
<th>Nanako</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Using Japanese, we could talk a lot.  The best of it is that I am in pairs with Nanako.</td>
<td>Mari could make more words than I, so she was helpful. However, it was hard to listen because her voice was very small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Nanako wrote what I didn't recognize.</td>
<td>When I reflected the task with Mari, she helped me a lot, I think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>Nanako told me what and how to say.</td>
<td>We made a lot of sentences as the previous tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(translation mine)
They indicated their satisfactions with working in pairs in Revision Talk. Even though it was the last study session, Nanako wrote, “It will be my pleasure that I have an opportunity of learning like this,” in the space of eagerness for the next day on her reflection sheet. Similarly, the learners in collaborative dyads indicated positive attitudes toward the peer-to-peer interactions, and many of them also positively participated the subsequent learning opportunities.

4.1.2 Expert/Novice: Dyad A (Michiko & Yuki)

Dyad A showed high mutuality but low equality interaction: expert/novice dyad. Since there was a discrepancy between their English proficiencies, as was described in the previous chapter, I observed that Michiko, expert learner, mostly taught and guided Yuki in their interaction. Michiko’s assistance was sensitive and effective to Yuki’s learning. As mentioned in Chapter 3, Michiko changed her manner of scaffolding from explicit to implicit in a very natural way. This conforms to Donato’s findings of collective scaffolding (1994). Michiko tried to hand over control of the task to Yuki—to remove the scaffolding behavior (Mercer, 1995; Wells, 1998; Donato, 2000). I will show how Michiko’s behavior affected their subsequent task performance below.

In Day 1, Michiko invited Yuki’s contribution to reconstruct the sentences. Then Yuki asked some questions and Michiko gave the answers directly. It might have been relatively easy for Yuki to use these phrases taught by Michiko on the subsequent performance (e.g., Yuki’s Lines 4–5, Excerpt 12). Also, by making use of Yuki’s question, Michiko was able to create different sentences, and used them on her subsequent task performance (e.g., Michiko’s Lines 9–10).
**Excerpt 12. Dyad A: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 1**

### 1st Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michiko</th>
<th>Yuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 This is a Susan's room.</td>
<td>1 This is a Susan's room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Susan is in the, her's room .</td>
<td>2 This is on the wall picture on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Susan is listening to the music.</td>
<td>3 This is an computer on the desk and pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mr. Baker is saying &quot;Susan, let's eat dinner.&quot;</td>
<td>4 This is notebook on the desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Susan is (murmur)</td>
<td>(murmur)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2nd Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michiko</th>
<th>Yuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 This is a Susan's room.</td>
<td>1 This is Susan's room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Susan is in her room .</td>
<td>2 This is a computer and on, on the desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 There is a singer's poster on the wall .</td>
<td>3 This is a picture on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 She has a flute .</td>
<td>4 She is listen to the music .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 She is in the music club .</td>
<td>5 She looks happy .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 So she likes music very much .</td>
<td>6 Mr. Baker cook .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 She tries studying .</td>
<td>7 Mr. Baker is cooking dinner .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 But she likes music better than studying .</td>
<td>8 Mr. Baker is Susan's father .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 She is listening music now .</td>
<td>(see koko ga wakaranhen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Well, she looks very happy .</td>
<td>9 This is a notebook on the desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 When she is listening to the music, her father is cooking .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mr. Baker is saying &quot;Susan, let's eat dinner, please come here.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 But she wants to listen to music more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The episode which is linked to these two sentences created by Yuki, "She is listening to music" and "She looks happy," in the task performance was already analyzed in Excerpt 3 as explicit scaffolding. Several researchers observed it is possible that the learners hand over the control to their peers. Ohta (1995) shows that not only novices but also experts could benefit from the interaction. van Lier (1996) points out that students can learn from the act of teaching others, and Allright (1984) asserts that the act of teaching or explaining to others may help L2 learners construct a more coherent and clear representation of their own L2 knowledge.

In Day 1, though Michiko generally gave direct answers to Yuki, there was one episode in which Michiko gave implicit advice (Excerpt 13).

**Excerpt 13. Dyad A: Day1  Implicit Scaffolding 2 (Comparatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michiko</th>
<th>Yuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me dakara koko ni, nan ka benkyou sitoru kedo, hottara kashtoru yan ka.</td>
<td>(and so here, she is studying but stuffs are messy, right?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y un.</td>
<td>(Yeah.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me dakara benkyou yori mo ongaku ga suki desu toka.</td>
<td>(So, she likes music better than studying.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikaku kyu naratta yaro? Sore tukatte mite yo.</td>
<td>(You've studied the comparative degree. Try to use it.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They had learned *comparatives* at school a few months ago. As one of the main aims of this task was to make coherent stories by using various grammatical items and structures they had learned, Michiko suggested to Yuki to use comparatives, but this suggestion was not easy for Yuki to use in her task performance. It turned out that only Michiko, not Yuki, used comparatives in her subsequent performance (Lines 8, 13).

As stated earlier, Michiko did not always *teach* but rather *guided* Yuki to do the task alone. The effects of her guidance strikingly appear in the Revision Talk. At last, Yuki admired herself, “I can do it [the task performance] much better than before” (Line 90 in Excerpt 4). Interestingly, after this comment, Michiko did not give any explicit help to Yuki but rather let Yuki do her work by herself. These phases passed so quickly that Yuki could not embed all of the scaffoldings in her performance; however, her task performance improved, and she was able to revise grammatical errors by herself on Day 3 (Excerpt 14).

In Excerpt 14, Yuki often said, “iya chau” in Japanese (e.g., Lines 2, 3 on the second performance), which means “it’s wrong.” This indicates that she was able to monitor the errors she made while doing the task performance. In Lines 3 & 6, she self-corrected the grammatical errors (the preposition “ni” and the article “a”).

---

**Excerpt 14. Dyad A: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michiko</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Susan comes to Nick’s room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nick is sleeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Susan is saying “Nick, get up early. Hurry up, hurry up.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nick is saying “Hello Susan. What time is it now?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Susan is saying “It’s seven thirty. Get up now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 After, Nick is, after, Nick gets up early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Susan and Nick doesn’t, (go) Susan and Nick don’t have breakfast today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mr. Baker is saying, “Hurry up, hurry up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 You are late for school.” Nick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2nd Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michiko</th>
<th>Yuki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Susan comes to Nick's room.</td>
<td>1 This is Nick's room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Susan is saying “Get up now, Nick.”</td>
<td>2 Susan is Nick's sister. (nya chau ma ii ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nick is saying “Good morning Susan. Why are you crying?”</td>
<td>3 Susan is Nick's room. (nya chau Susan is in Nick's room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Susan is saying, “It’s seven thirty. Get up now. You’re late for the school.”</td>
<td>4 (ita to) Nick is get up early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nick is surprised.</td>
<td>5 Mr. Baker is Susan and Nick's father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mr. Baker is saying, “It's eight o'clock, You're late for the school. Hurry up, Hurry up.”</td>
<td>6 Mr. Baker has watch, has a watch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nick and Susan don't have breakfast today.</td>
<td>7 Mr. Baker has ryukku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nick and Susan are running.</td>
<td>8 Mr. Baker is saying, (ee to) (ee to) Nick has ryukku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Because they don't, they late for the school.</td>
<td>(as machigeta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 They are tired, but they can't walk. They must running.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 15. Dyad A: Day 3 Making Sure (watch)

39 Y nan te iu n? udedokei tte nan te iu n? (What shall I say? How do you say ‘watch’ in English?)
40 M watch (watch)
41 Y aah, watch ka. (Oh, watch. I see.)
42 M Mr.Baker has watch de yoku nai? (Why don’t you use “Mr Baker has watch.”)
43 Y sore itten kedo watch ka douka mayotto ten. (I said so but I was wondering whether it was right or not.)
44 M un. outoru (Yes, that’s fine.)

In Day 3, Michiko and Yuki interacted for only three to four minutes. They were often silent or they individually rehearsed their story-telling. Before the interaction shown in Excerpt 15, Michiko had been rehearsing by herself for one minute. On the contrary, it seemed that Yuki was still seeking help from Michiko and asked Michiko, “How do you say udedokei in English?” (Line 39, Excerpt 15). It is assumed that Yuki understood the change of Michiko’s manner from implicit guidance to joint-construction with Yuki, and Yuki tried to invite Michiko’s contribution by asking the question whose topic was already familiar to Yuki. She actually used the word, watch, in the first performance (Yuki’s Line 5, Excerpt 14). Michiko’s attitude, however, was completely different from what was observed in the previous sessions; she immediately gave Yuki the answer “watch,” rather than providing her partner with guided instructions, as observed in the
previous sessions. Even though Michiko decreased the amount of scaffolding, it enabled Yuki to improve her story-telling dramatically, given that she was not able to produce any sentences in the training sessions.

The analysis of the post-task reflection shows that Michiko transformed her perception of the peer-to-peer interaction. She wrote, “Yuki used some different grammar which we have learned, and she improved considerably” (in Day 2). “Both of us were able to detect the errors, I think. I taught her how to say in English but I myself learned from her in some parts” (in Day 3). I suggest that Michiko did not just learn, but she was also able to recognize the learning with her peer. The development of Michiko’s metacognitive strategies surely helped Yuki improve her English and self-regulate her learning.

4.1.3 Dominant/Dominant: Dyad D (Yuko & Miki)

Dyad D showed dominant/dominant features in Revision Talk in Chapter 3. Most of their interactions ended with no-solution; they did not fully share ideas and quickly moved onto another topic.

Excerpt 16. Dyad D: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Performance</th>
<th>2nd Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yuko</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 She is Susan.</td>
<td>1 She is Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 She in the room.</td>
<td>2 There is her bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 She listen to music.</td>
<td>3 They, Susan looks happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 She, she is very cute.</td>
<td>4 There is poster on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Her father’s cooking.</td>
<td>5 He Susan’s father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Her father calls Susan.</td>
<td>6 She like star, poster on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 She room in, in the computer near the book.</td>
<td>7 Her father is calling to her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpt 16 shows how these features affected their task performance in Day 1. Though they had Revision Talk between the first and second performance, their second performance did not improve as much as the other dyads; their sentences were shorter and they just listed the items in the picture rather than creating stories. Excerpt 5 in Chapter 3 was an example of their disputational talk, in which both of them argued over saying “Susan’s father” or “her father.”

The disagreement in the Revision Talk was directly reflected in their second performance (Yuko’s Line 6 and Miki’s Line 6 in Excerpt 16). In Day 2, I identified five topics as LREs in their Revision Talk, but none of them were solved (see Excerpt 6: “come to see” or “met;” “cute” or “beautiful”). They should have changed to “came to see,” if they wanted to use past tense. As for “cute” or “beautiful,” either of them was suitable. Their interlanguage might not have been fully developed so that they could handle the problems; therefore, they just argued with each other instead of adjusting their linguistic knowledge by repairing or recasting the peer talk. There was further evidence of this in Excerpt 17.

Excerpt 17. Dyad D: Day 2 Disputational Talk 3 (jacket or wear)

31 Y fuku tte jacket chau na. fuku tte nan te iu n? (cloth...it's not a jacket, is it? What shall we say 'cloth'?)
32 M ee to ue wear tte fuku ja nai kana? (Well, wear, I think it's a wear.)
33 Y sore kiri, kiri ja nai? sensei ya. (it may represent the action, to wear. Oh, here the teacher comes.)
34 M matte mashita tte nan te iu n? (How shall I say ‘I'm waiting’)
35 Y want nan te iu n? (wait I don't know)
36 M sensei ni kai te ii n? (Can we ask the teacher about it?)
37 Y sensei tango wakaran toki sensei ni kite mo i i n desu ka? (Teacher, when we don't know what to say, can we ask you?) (translation mine)

Trying to make a sentence about a character's clothes, they looked for a word equivalent to “clothes.” Though both of them suggested appropriate expressions, they could not make a final decision. Then they changed the topic and asked me
for help to solve the linguistic problem. Two dictionaries and the worksheets used in the training sessions could have been used as learning resources. However, they never used them. The mediation Yuko and Miki took was not the expert nor the artificial one; thus, most of the problems they had were beyond their ZPD. This limitation has caused their argumentative talk, which prevents them from resolving the problems. I will show their task performance in Day 2 in Excerpt 18.

Excerpt 18. Dyad D: The Transcript of Task Performance on the Day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Performance</th>
<th>Miki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   That is Kumi.</td>
<td>1   Emily, Emily has yellow bag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   This is Emily.</td>
<td>2   Kumi looks happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   They are friend.</td>
<td>3   There are speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Kumi is very cute.</td>
<td>4   Emily, Kumi's friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Emily is very beautiful, (mm?) pretty.</td>
<td>5   He is Kumi's father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6   They are friend.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   Emily is going (mm?) come to the, come to the Kumi's house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8   This is Kumi's father, Mr. Tanaka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   Mr. Tanaka is very nice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Performance</th>
<th>Miki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   That is Kumi.</td>
<td>1   She is Kumi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   This is Emily.</td>
<td>2   She is Mary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   They are friends.</td>
<td>3   Mary is, Mary, Kumi's friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Kumi, Kumi, young...young looks, Kumi younger than Emily.</td>
<td>4   Mary has yellow bag and blue bag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Kumi, Kumi, Kumi's...Mr. Tanaka, This is Mr Tanaka, Kumi's father.</td>
<td>5   Kumi looks happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6   Mary is long hair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7   Kumi is short hair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8   He Kumi's father.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Summary of Results in Chapter 4

In this chapter, the analysis focused on the data of three dyads: collaborative (Dyad E), expert/novice (Dyad A), and dominant/dominant (Dyad D). I examined the performances of each of these dyads and their corresponding LREs in order to find links between them. LREs represent opportunities for learning and solving language problems, and it is assumed that some portion of the language which the
students produced in the task could be traced back to the LREs. I found out that different styles of peer-to-peer learning depended on the specific patterns of dyadic interactions.

The collaborative dyads can learn more than the other dyads. The data shown in Excerpts 7–11 makes it clear that their dyadic interaction affected their subsequent individual performance, and that the pairs generated similar products. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Storch used the term, transfer of knowledge, to explain the relationship between the patterns of dyadic interaction and the language development. In this study, the collaborative dyad also showed the similarity of task performance and transfer of knowledge. In addition, the collaborative dyad in this study felt satisfaction with their collaboration in the dyadic interaction as well as and the results of their story-telling tasks. This satisfaction increased their learning motivation.

In the expert/novice dyad, the novice learner clearly gains language uptake from the expert learner during the dyadic interaction. This suggests that a transfer of knowledge takes place when knowledge of lexical and grammatical items are consolidated. The novice (Yuko) used the lexical items she learned in the Revision Talk and noticed the grammatical errors more frequently. Not only the novice, but also the expert learner improved from their interaction. While participating in this study, the expert (Michiko) developed her cognitive process and was able to assess her own learning and the interaction with the novice peer. Another finding is that their interaction time shortened. In the Revision Talk of Day 2, after the expert (Michiko) cheered up the novice (in Line 58 in Excerpt 4), Michiko said, “I need time to practice for my performance too” (Line 59). Additionally, in Michiko’s post-task reflection sheet on the same day, she wrote, “I
want to use more time to make my own story next time.” Young learners or beginners would better keep the expert/novice relationship if teacher’s guidance or help is available.

As for the dominant/dominant dyad, there is only a little evidence which shows the connections between LREs and the subsequent individual performance. Instead, when they came across a language problem, each learner kept giving his/her own ideas and did not negotiate with each other during Revision Talk. The lack of transfer is due to the low mutuality mentioned earlier. Their Revision Talk gave me extremely important implications for language pedagogy. They often have difficulties in reaching an agreement over what details to include, how to express their ideas, and task management. Though language is a crucial tool of communication as well as learning, it can become difficult for young learners to achieve affective communications with each other, even in their native language. One effective way to avoid the dominant/dominant dyad would be to teach learners strategies to express their own opinions and listen to others’ opinions before the task. The strategy for using artificial mediation (i.e., dictionaries) may also be an effective way. Dyad D also highlighted the need for teachers to monitor the deliberations and decisions learners make as they work in pairs.

4.3 Further Discussion

After examining all of the eight dyads in two analysis stages, I can conclude that the nature of dyadic interactions is fluid, since the learners are still young or beginners; however, most of the dyads in my study gradually displayed dynamic patterns, becoming more collaborative over time. In this respect, the findings of the present study slightly contradicts Storch (2002) and Smagorinsky & O’
Donnell-Allen (2000). Storch claimed, “there was only one dyad that displayed a more dynamic pattern, becoming more collective over time” (p.147), and Smagorinsky & O’ Donnell-Allen (2000) also state that patterns of dyadic interaction, once established, are found to be fairly stable over time and across tasks. Table 2 shows the relationship between Revision Talk and the nature of dyadic interactions through the sessions in this study.

| Table 2  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Transformation of the Nature of Dyadic Interactions** |
|  | Revision Talk1 | Revision Talk2 | Revision Talk3 |
| **Collaborative** | Dyad B (T&S) | Dyad B (T&S) | Dyad C (R&K) |
| | Dyad F (M&A) | Dyad F (M&A) | Dyad F (M&A) |
| | Dyad G (K&M) | Dyad G (K&M) | Dyad G (K&M) |
| **Expert/Novice** | Dyad A (M&Y) | Dyad A (M&Y) | Dyad A (M&Y) |
| **Dominant/Dominant** | Dyad C (R&K) | Dyad D (Y&M) | Dyad D (Y&M) |
| | Dyad D (Y&M) | Dyad D (Y&M) | Dyad D (Y&M) |
| | Dyad H (K&J) | Dyad H (K&J) | Dyad H (K&J) |
| **Passive/Passive** | Dyad C (R&K) | Dyad B (T&S) | Dyad B (T&S) |

I will present the data and draw some pedagogical implications of Dyad C (Rie & Keiko), which immensely changed its nature of dyadic interactions stage by stage. The students in Dyad C, as introduced in Chapters 2 & 3, were in the same class and the same sports club; their academic grades at school were almost the same. They regarded each other as rivals. This rivalry clearly affected their dyadic interaction and the following task performance in this study. In Day 1, they did not interact with each other at all but kept listening to and transcribing their peer’s first performance. In the subsequent story-telling task, they competed with each other; they tried to produce more sentences than the other peer. I will show their performance in Day 1 in Excerpt 19.
Excerpt 19. Dyad C: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Performance</th>
<th>2nd Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rie</strong></td>
<td><strong>Keiko</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 There is a desk on the wall. <em>(a machigae to)</em></td>
<td>1 This is Susan’s room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 She is Susan’s room.</td>
<td>2 She is listening to CDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 There is a book on the desk.</td>
<td>3 There is she, there are some CDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 There is a pen on the desk.</td>
<td>4 There is desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 There is a cup on the desk.</td>
<td>5 There is a computer on the desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 There is a computer on the desk.</td>
<td>6 There is a cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 There is a poster on the wall.</td>
<td>7 There is a note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 There is a clock in the room.</td>
<td>8 There is a pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 She is listening to a CD.</td>
<td>9 There is a comic near the bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 CD is rock.</td>
<td>10 There is a flute, flute on the bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 There is a flute on the bed.</td>
<td>11 There is a bag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bag is near the bed.</td>
<td>12 There is a CD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Comic is near the bag.</td>
<td>13 There is a comic on the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 She looks happy.</td>
<td>14 She is happy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rie</strong></th>
<th><strong>Keiko</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 This is Susan’s room.</td>
<td>1 This is Susan’s room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Susan is pretty.</td>
<td>2 She is listening to CDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 She is listening to a CD.</td>
<td>3 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 There is a cup on the desk.</td>
<td>4 There is a cup on the desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 There is a pen on the desk.</td>
<td>5 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 There is a notebook on the wall.</td>
<td>6 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 There is a pen on the wall.</td>
<td>7 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 There is a computer on the wall.</td>
<td>8 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 There is a comic near the desk.</td>
<td>9 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 There is a bag near the comic.</td>
<td>10 There is a clock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 There is a flute on the bed.</td>
<td>11 There is a flute on the bed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 There is a clock in the room.</td>
<td>12 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 There is a hat on the wall. There is a <em>(te to)</em></td>
<td>13 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mr Baker’s cooking, Mr Baker is cooking now.</td>
<td>14 There is a clock in the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mr Baker is busy now.</td>
<td>15 Mr Baker is busy now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This excerpt shows that although they created more sentences than the other dyads did, they merely listed as many items in the picture as possible. A story could not be identified. In order to make them aware of the differences between the story-telling task and the picture-description task, I showed two transcriptions of other students’ task performance and I repeated the instructions provided in the training session. I also emphasized to them to think about creating coherent sentences by using connectors like “so” and structures like “why” or “because.”

I categorized their dyadic interaction as passive/passive in Day 1. In Day 2, they were instructed to reconstruct their preceding task performance in Revision

---

4 I should not have given any evaluative comments to the students in the middle of the sessions, and this would have distracted the data collection process if I had been conducting a quantitative study. As a teacher-researcher, however, I assume the action I made was justifiable.
Talk; however, it did not go well, and their interaction showed dominant/dominant features. Rie showed more features of a dominant learner there. The following part will show their last part of Revision Talk on Day 2.

**Excerpt 20. Dyad C: Day 2 Disputational Talk 4 (bad ending)**

157 R ima wa natsu desu kara hajime yo u. (Shall we start with "now, it's summer.")
158 K now summer... okashi I yaro (Now summer... it's strange.)
159 R ima wa natsu desu. (now, it's summer)
160 K okashi i yaro. ima wa mukashi chau nen kam. (It's strange. It's not "once upon a time...")
161 R ima wa natsu. Kumi to Emily ariki. (It's summer. Kumi and Emily were there ((the bell rings)))
162 K kon nan de owatta ra yabai yan (It's not good to finish our talk like this.)
163 R (ha ha ha )) (laughter)
164 K mou owari ka. iyaya shi... (I don't like finishing like this...) (translation mine)

They recognized that they could not revise the previous performance or could not adequately prepare for the subsequent performance; Keiko especially hesitated to talk and the Revision Talk clearly affected the subsequent task performance. When their Revision Talk was analyzed, I had an impression that they did not want to join this study. Both of them recognized, however, that their performance had not gone well, and this was mentioned in their post-task reflection sheet. Rie wrote, “I could not perform well because I was thinking too much about which words to use,” and she also apologized to her peer, Keiko, for her bad attitude in their Revision Talk. To improve the following session, Rie said, “I will try using ‘why? because-’ structures and ‘so’ or ‘well’ next time.” Keiko also said, “I hope to try performing like Michiko (in Dyad A).” After examining their reflection, I recognized that I misunderstood their attitudes toward the task. My intervention made immediately after the first study session affected their performance so strongly that in the second session they began to focus more on making stories.

In Revision Talk 3, their dyadic interaction completely changed again to a more collaborative manner. Their talk became more dynamic and they jointly
constructed a story for the subsequent performance. Their voices sounded cheerful and they seemed to enjoy finding lexical items by looking in the dictionary or at the worksheets provided in the training sessions. The comparison of the two task performances in Day 3 is shown in Excerpt 20.

Excerpt 21. Dyad C: The Transcript of Task Performance on Day 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Performance</th>
<th>2nd Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rie</strong></td>
<td><strong>Keiko</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot;Nick, good morning.&quot;</td>
<td>1 This is the Nick's room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nick's room is, <em>(ee)</em> there is a, <em>(ee)</em>?</td>
<td>2 Mr Baker is Nick's father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 This is Nick's room.</td>
<td>4 Nick and Susan, Nick and Susan, very busy morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 There is a picture on the wall.</td>
<td>5 Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 There is a w, clock on the table.</td>
<td>6 Nick and Susan getting...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nick looks very sleepy.</td>
<td>7 Susan looks very angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Susan looks very angry.</td>
<td>8 Mr Baker says, &quot;Susan Nick, come here.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nick, Susan is very easy tomo <em>(ee)</em> morning.</td>
<td>9 Nick, Susan is very easy tomo <em>(ee)</em> morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 <em>(aa)</em> Very busy morning.</td>
<td>10 <em>(aa)</em> Very busy morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 <em>(o to)</em> Nick, then looks, then Nick looks very, very busy.</td>
<td>11 <em>(o to)</em> Nick, then looks, then Nick looks very, very busy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second performance, both Rie and Keiko performed a lot better than the first performance and showed a lot of collaborative features which are observed in the other collaborative dyads. Additionally, in their post-task reflection, they indicated their satisfaction about the way they collaborated with each other as well as the results of the task performance. Keiko, who negatively evaluated their interaction after Day 2, wrote, "I want to interact more, help each
other more, and find words in the dictionaries we need for the task, as we did today."

The change of their dyadic interaction also gave us crucial pedagogical implications. First, in order to work collaboratively, some learners need guidance from a more experienced expert (i.e., a teacher). As was observed in Dyad C, the quality of the learners' joint-work changes depending on the guidance provided. Secondly, collaborative students are likely to take mutual responsibility for their peers; if Rie had worked on the task alone, she might not have changed her attitude. Lastly, not only the result, but also the process of learning is important to create an effective learning environment. The students in Dyad C always prioritized their school grades and regarded only the results of the task performance in the present study; however, they began to develop their awareness of their learning processes and the value of learning with peers.

At this point I would like to discuss the students' dyadic interactions and their performance from the argument Sato (2004a) claimed. Sato (2004a, 2004b) defines students' learning from the three point of view. First, he states that learning is a process in which learners encounter with and interact with a new world. Second, learning is a process of making and relations with others. Third, learning is a process of making meaning and relations with self. He calls these different aspects of learning "cognitive and cultural process," "social and political process," and "existential and ethical process" respectively. To allow students to experience these different aspects of learning, he believes that a teacher-fronted teaching style is not sufficient enough for learning. Rather, teachers have to create a collaborative learning environment where all the participants including teachers and the students are involved in the processes of learning. As the
present study suggests, students have strong possibilities to learn by themselves when they work in collaborative relationships. At the same time, the roles of teachers need to be reconsidered: in order for students to experience the different aspects of learning Sato defines, teachers not only teach the subject matter but also carefully design the environment and support and facilitate the students' exploration of learning. In this sense, Sato's metaphor "Reach out and jump in (senobi-to-jampu)" does make a strong sense to us.

I would also like to point out that the present study illuminated leaner strategies utilized in collaborative learning. For example, deGurrero and Villamil (1996) explored collaborative peer revision, in which they identify the following five mediating strategies that appeared in revision sessions: use of symbols and external resources; using the L1; scaffolded assistance; deploying interlanguage knowledge; externalizing private speech (Villamil and Guerrero, 1996, p.61). The students in the present study made used of these mediating strategies in their Revision Talk and improved their task performance. Teachers should understand students' potentials to learn by themselves, provide not only teacher mediation but also other mediations mentioned earlier and expand their learning opportunities.

4.4 Limitations and Short Comings of This Study

There were two main limitations of this study. One is that the task used in this study was only one kind (story-telling). Depending on the different kinds of tasks or activities, learners may have shown the different patterns of interaction. I need to continue to examine these aspects in the classroom. The other

---

5 See Sato (2004a) for more details.
limitation was that only one out of eight dyads was a male dyad (Dyad B). In the classroom, students are usually paired regardless of their genders. Thus, different patterns of dyadic interactions may be caused by gender differences. However, the result of this study is, at least, very similar to the previous studies even though the learners' have different background (i.e., age, gender, country, etc.), and which establish each other's validity. Moreover, I proved that Storch's categories of role relationships were useful for describing patterns of interaction in other learning context as well, as Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) states.

This chapter focused on Japanese young learners' voice which was surely worth examining. Some distinct patterns of the nature of dyadic interactions among Japanese learners and the relationship between those patterns and the subsequent task performance were examined.
The present study has examined how peer-to-peer learning is co-constructed by the participants from sociocultural viewpoints. It also showed that the patterns of the interaction observed in the dyads significantly affect the processes of learning as well as the consequences of learning. In order to conclude this study, I would like to draw pedagogical implications for teaching English in a classroom setting.

As I already described, I reoriented the theoretical backgrounds from a psycholinguistic, task-based learning approach to a sociocultural language learning approach. The most striking difference between these two perspectives is how language and learning are conceptualized. From the psycholinguistic point of view, the language which students produce is usually represented in quantitative terms and presented as the evidence of learning, from which researchers investigate psycholinguistic mechanisms of learning. The earlier version of the study, as I described in my introduction, followed this research framework; I quantitatively treated the data I collected. I counted the number of errors students made and the number of words students produced. I realized, however, that this way of measuring students' learning neglected some insightful pedagogical learning opportunities, which should be valued in the classroom. At first, I did not understand the process of their learning at all. My understanding was brought about when I saw that the students in pair groups looked happier than the students in other groups (i.e., Solitary and Control Groups). I wondered why they were so satisfied and motivated. Here, sociocultural perspectives came
into my mind; a sociocultural approach assumes that language represents not only the byproduct of learning, but also a mediational tool of learning. I thus focused on their Revision Talk together with their performance data. Due to the theoretical re-orientation, I began to see individual students' faces and listen to their voices. By carefully examining the students' Revision Talk, I realized I had misunderstood their attitudes. Their voices provided me with a lot of pedagogical insights, as I mentioned in previous chapters. I suggest that classroom teachers listen to their students' voices during the activities to understand the "quality of classroom life" (Allwright, 2003). Although the results obtained in the present study could not be generalized, since the students experienced learning in a particular context, the present study's framework and theoretical orientation may provide significant implications and indications on approaching students' learning in the classroom.

The students in this study interacted with their partners, stimulated each other, and developed their language through their ZPD, which were affected by the specific patterns of the dyadic interactions. The results of this study should strengthen the claims of sociocultural theorists: not only expert to novice scaffolding but also peer-to-peer scaffolding are effective for language learning. Given various scaffolding from experts (i.e., peers, teachers), learners have the capability to learn from their mistakes and improve their achievements by themselves.

One important lesson that I learned from this thesis is to trust students' potentials and give them the opportunity to discover the answers. Focus not only on affective ways of teaching, but also on facilitating the classes to get the best results. "Everything of value begins with trust and risk" (Minatoya, 1992).
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The Questionnaire

実験調査前のアンケート

名前（　）

1. 次の項目で、自分の気持ちに当たる番号の上に〇を記入してください。

1-1 英語は好きですか？

1———2———3———4———5

きれい あまり好きではない ふつう 好き とても好き

それはなぜですか？

1-2 英語は将来必要だと思いますか？

1———2———3———4———5

全く思わない 思わない どちらでもない 思う とても思う

2. 英語では、「聞く」・「話す」・「読む」・「書く」の4つの力が必要であると言われています。次の4つのうち当てはまる物に〇をつけてください。

2-1 自分では、この4つのどれが一番得意だと思いますか？

「聞く」・「話す」・「読む」・「書く」

2-2 この中で、どの力を一番つけたいですか？

「聞く」・「話す」・「読む」・「書く」

2-3 この中で、どの力が一番必要だと思いますか？

「聞く」・「話す」・「読む」・「書く」

3. 授業中に勉強をするとき、次の3つのうちのどの形式が一番好きですか？

「一人」・「ペア」・「グループ」

4. もし、良ければ、家庭学習について教えてください。

「一人」・「家庭教師」・「塾」

時間は？（　）/一日

ありがとうございました！！！
Appendix B2

The Result of the Questionnaire

1. 実験調査前のアンケート

1.1 英語は好きですか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>とても好き</th>
<th>好き</th>
<th>ふつう</th>
<th>あまり好きではない</th>
<th>嫌い</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[理由]

5. とても好き
   • 勉強や授業をしていても楽しいし、他の教科と違って得意だから。
   • タイに3年半住んでいてとても好きになってきた。
   • おもしろいや映画などを見ると、本当に面白いと思う。

4. 好き
   • 洋楽が好きだから英語は好き。
   • 嫌いでも特別好きでもないから、横文字は好きだから4を選びました。
   • 昔からやっているから親しみがあるから。
   • どんな難しい英文が読めるようになって、理解できるようになったらたのしいから。
   • 前は、分かっていたのに今、だんだんわからないってきているから。
   • 英語は楽しいけど単語を覚えるのがめんどうだから。
   • 楽しくて、練習すればできるから。
   • 英語の授業が一番楽しいから。

3. ふつう
   • 理解できるときと理解できないときがあるから。
   • 覚えるのが楽しい。どちらかというと好き。
   • 難しいから。
   • あまり親しみがないから、でも発音は楽しい。
   • 1年の時は好きだったけど、2年になって難しくなってきたから。
   • 外国の人と話をするのは楽しいけれど、文法が嫌い。
   • 英語が話せるわけではないが、授業として好きだから。

2. あまり好きではない
   • だんだん難しくなってきて、意味がわからないから。
   • 難しいから、文法発音がとくにく。
   • たいしてテストで点数がとれるわけではないから。

1. 嫌い
   • わけが分からないから。
   • ややこしくて覚えても覚えきれないから。
   • 難しいから。
1.2 教師は将来必要だと思いますか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>とても思う</th>
<th>思う</th>
<th>どちらでもない</th>
<th>思わない</th>
<th>全く思わない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. J.A.C.E. Test の結果

Table B2

*The result of the J.A.C.E. Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>162.52</td>
<td>42.02</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C

The Brief Description of Each Dyad

**Dyad A:** Michiko (90%) / Yuki (35.3%)  
Different proficiency dyad

They were two female students from the same class. Though there was a discrepancy between their English proficiency, they had a good friendship. Michiko liked English very much and she went to an English conversation school once a week. She was an active speaker of English. On the contrary, Yuki evaluated herself as a poor English learner. She also had anxiety when she spoke in English. She did not perform well during the training sessions.

**Dyad B:** Takuya (55%) / Seiji (50.3%)  
Male dyad

They were the only male students. They were members of the same judo club. Though their scores of the JACE test were almost the same (higher than the average scores), neither of them like English very much. Takuya said “I like memorization but I am not good at listening.” Seiji said “We have a lot of words to remember. This bothers me.” They were very cheerful and spoke loudly during the sessions.

**Dyad C:** Rie (63.3%) / Keiko (60.3%)  
Rival dyad

They were from the same homeroom class and also were members of the kendo club. They adjudged each other to be a rival in good ways and in bad ways. It was easy to find this feature in their normal talk, especially when the topic was for education. Trying their best in their studies and in sports, they are always competitive. Though they got high scores on the JACE Test, they answered “I don’t like English.” Rie described the reason: “I can’t take better scores than I expect,” and Keiko said “My understanding of English has become worse compared with last year.”

**Dyad D:** Yuko (53.7%) / Miki (42.3%)  
Unwilling dyad

They were team mates of the tennis club. However, the striking feature of this dyad is that their relationship was not harmonious. On the day of making pairs, Yuko was absent from school and Miki unwillingly became her pair. Though both of

---

1 These figures shown in percentage indicate the results of J.A.C.E. test.
them tried hard on study, the result the test indicated their English proficiency were relatively low.

**Dyad E: Mari (54.7%) / Nanako (53.3%)**  
friendly dyad  
They were classmates and were doing the same club activity and almost always stayed together at school. Their scores at school were almost the same. English was their favorite subject. Both of them felt happy when they studied English. I heard their laughter during the training and the study.

**Dyad F: Miyuki (73.7%) / Akemi (44.3%)** different proficiency dyad 2  
They were in the same class and had a good relationship. From the test scores, English proficiency of Miyuki was much higher than Akemi. However, Miyuki did not have any confidence in her English ability.

**Dyad G: Kumi (54.3%) / Makiko (41.7%)** different favor dyad  
They were in the same class. Kumi liked English very much because she liked listening to English songs; on the contrary, Makiko did not like English at all because she felt that she needed to work hard when she studied English.

**Dyad H: Kazumi (67%) / Junko (65.7%)** high proficiency dyad  
They were doing the same club activity. Both of them liked English. Kazumi went to an English conversation school after school and was very confident in speaking English. She missed the last day of the training session in which all the other students practiced the story telling task. Getting high scores on English test at school, Junko also had confidence in her English ability. Tough both of them were quiet in the classroom, I found a different aspect in their pair interaction.
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Instruction on the Training Session

STORY TELLING (TRAINING)

Q: STORTY TELLING (ストーリー・テリング)とは？
一枚の絵について説明することをdescription（描写）といいます。今回の場合は、一枚の紙の中に、絵が二つ並んでいます。絵が二つ並ぶことで、それを単に、説明するだけでなく、想像力を使って絵の場面について物語を作ることができます。このように、絵を見ながら物語りを作り話すことをSTORY TELLINGといいます。

Q: なぜ、descriptionじゃなくて、story tellingでなきゃダメなの？
今回的研究では、皆さんに単純な英語の表現をしてもらいたいのではなく、目標はあくまでも、いろいろな表現を使った自然な会話をもらい、スピーキング力をアップしてもらうことです。

＊＊＊＊＊STORY TELLINGをするときの心がけること＊＊＊＊＊
「隣に人がいると思ってください。その人は絵をみていません。その人に絵の内容が伝わるように英語で話ししてください。どのような絵なのか説明するのと同時に1枚目と2枚目の絵をつなぎ合わせて話しを作って伝えてみましょう。」

Hint となること

☆2枚の絵を見て、まずは、大きく場面を見る。
① どういう場所なの？———公園？部屋の中？学校？病院？など
② どういう状況なの？———2つの絵がどうつながっている？（想像する）

☆登場人物に目を向けなる。（小さく見る）
③ 登場人物は何をしている？———寝ている。食べている。勉強している。など。
④ 感情は？———「楽しんでいる？」「怒っている？」「喜んでいる？」

☆その他に言うことができること
⑤ 時間は？
⑥ 天気は？
⑦ 服装は？

☆言いたいことがあるんだけど言い方が分からないときは、簡単な言い方ができないか、

考え直す。または、すぐにあきらめて次に移る。（これはすごく大事）

（使える表現集）

………………..
Appendix D2

Picture Description

Practice 1 Description の練習をしてみましょう 1

Aya's room
NAME( )

Practice 1-2 Description の練習をしてみましょう 2

Ryo's room
NAME( )

「気づいたことを書きましょう」
Appendix D3

Picture Description 2

Practice2 Description の動作を表す練習をしてみましょう
At the park 1
NAME ( )

「気づいたことを書きましょう」

Practice2 Description の動作を表す練習をしてみましょう 2
At the park 2
NAME ( )

「気づいたことを書きましょう」
Appendix D4
Worksheets on the Training Sessions (Practice of Story Telling)

Practice 3  Story Telling の練習をしてみましょう。  VOL.5
There is a boy in the room.
It's one fifty now.
He is drinking some coffee.
He is sitting on the chair.
There is a desk in the room.
There is a computer on the desk.
There is a doll by the socks.
There are two notebooks on the bed.
There is a bag near the desk.
There is a watch on the wall.

I am ~. (feel)
There are two flight attendants.
Two attendants are giving blanket to passengers.
(They are receiving blankets.)
Some of passengers are reading a book or sleeping.
They are doing many things.
Passengers are sitting .(lying down the seat.)
A girl is sitting .
Her name is Aya.
Aya is talking with her (aunt/grandmother).
(The person next to Aya is her aunt.)
Aya looks happy .
They are having a good time.
Appendix D7
Noticing the Mistakes

Practice 6 finding mistakes

1) There is computer on the desk.
2) Ryo is to drink.
3) She was sitting when spoke next human.
4) They are flight attendant.
5) Two womans sitting.
6) Some of us reading books.
7) She looks very fun.
8) Ryo likes play soccer.

Memo

気づいたこと
Appendix D8
Oral Training of Story Telling

Practice 7 Training 録音をしてみよう。録音を聞いて transcribe してみよう。
その中で良かったもの
（メアリー（スーザン）が病気）

Mary's mother comes Mary's room.

"What's wrong?" "Wake up?" she is saying.

But Mary is sleeping. She is sick.

After Mary's mother go to the living room.

She take a phone and call to a doctor.

"My daughter is sick. Please come to my house."

A doctor is saying "Of course. Please waiting for me."

He is looking for shoes because his shoes is small.

A woman is talking about shoes.

He likes this shoes.

After he bought this shoes.

Taichi and Chika visited Tom's house yesterday.

This is Tom's room.

"Come here" he said.

There is a computer in Tom's room.

Tom have two friends. They play in the Tom's house.

They meet Tom's mother.
Appendix D9
Review of the Training Sessions
Story Telling 复習の Check Point  NAME( )
では、Training を2回経て、今までに行ったことをまとめてみます。

STORY TELLING (ストーリー・テリング)
一枚の紙の中に、絵を二つ並べています。絵を二つ並べることで、それを単に、説明するだけではなく、想像力をを使って絵の場面について物語を作ることができます。このように、絵を見ながら物語を作り話すことを STORY TELLING といいます。

STORY TELLING をするときのヒント
☆2枚の絵を見て、全体に目を向ける（大きく場面を考える）。
① どういう場面なので？——例 公園？部屋の中？学校？病院？など
  They are in the park ( room/plane).
② どういう状況なので？——2つの絵がどうつながっている？（想像する）
  登場人物同士の関係を考えてみる。
☆登場人物に目を向ける。（小さく見る）
③ 登場人物はどんな人？——先生、お父さん、お母さん
④ 登場人物は何をしている？——寝ている。食べている。勉強している。など。
⑤ 感情は？——「楽しんでいる？」「怒っている？」「喜んでいる？」
☆その他に言うことができること
⑥ 時間は？
  It’s one fifty now.
⑦ 天気は？
  It’s sunny (rainy/ cloudy /windy) today.
⑧ 外見は？服装は？
  She has blue eyes. She is wearing a green skirt.
☆言いたいことがあるんだけど言い方が分からないときは、簡単な言い方ができないか、考え直してみよう。または、すぐにあきらめて次に移る。（これはすごく大事。1分しかないんだから・・・）
☆☆☆Training で学んだ使われる表現 （みんなの self evaluation より）☆☆☆☆
＊「壁に掛かっている」「時計」は watch ではなく clock
＊「かべに」は on the wall ＊「空港」は airport
＊「（人を）紹介する」のは、introduce
＊ man・womanの複数形は men・women
＊「〜のように見える」look を使う eg) She looks happy.
＊ fun という単語は、人には使わない。 ×She is fun. とは言えない。She is happy. eg) Soccer is fun.
＊ 言い換えの仕方、「毛布をあける」という言い方が分からなかったら立場を変えて、「毛布を受け取る」という言い方に変えてみる。
＊ コーヒーを飲むときなど、some coffee(tea/milk) または a lot of coffee
＊「楽しい時を過ごしている。」 They are having a good time.
＊「～の時、・・・していた。」（過去形や過去進行形を使わないといけないので難しいけど、使ってみてください。）
  When I came into her room, She was reading.
  （彼女の部屋に入ったとき、彼女は読書をしていた）
＊Two flight attendants are giving blankets to passengers .
＊「私の隣に座っている人は〜です。」 The person next to me is ～.
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Reflection Sheets
A グループ振り返りの sheet（回目）  NAME（  ）

1. 自分やペアの録音を聞きながらのメモ

2. 1度目の録音を聞いて思ったこと。また、気づいた間違いは？

3. 自分が本当に話したかった。物語ってどんなの？どんな表現が使える？

4. 辞書や、ファイルを見て、気づいたことは？

Post-Task Reflection Sheet 

1. 今回自分の storytelling に対してのがんばり度はどれくらいですか？
   —1——2——3——4——5——
   ＜——あまり————————とても——＞

2. 今回の絵は難易度で言うとどれくらいですか？
   —1——2——3——4——5——
   ＜——易しい————————難しい——＞

3. ペアをどのくらい助けましたか。（貢献度）
   —1——2——3——4——5——
   ＜——あまり————————とても——＞

4. ペアからどれくらい助けられましたか。
   —1——2——3——4——5——
   ＜——あまり————————とても——＞

5. 今回の印象を書いてください。（絵に関して、録音していたときの気持ちなど、）

6. 2度目の録音では1度目の録音と比べ、どんな工夫をしましたか。また、どんな差が出たと思いますか。

7. ペアと振り返った時の気持ちを正直に書いてください。

8. 次回 story telling を行うときの抱負などを書いてください。（次はどうしますか。）

7. その他