The startling progress of internationalization these days has increased the necessity for the practical communication ability of the students to be raised in Japanese English classes. The Ministry of Education (Monbusho) has decided to provide Japanese students with the opportunity to come into close contact with native speakers in foreign language classes. In fact, the students are experiencing more and more communicative activities and team-teaching with Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) in English classes.

A variety of problems, however, can arise in carrying out such activities in the classroom. When obligated to communicate in English in the classroom, Japanese junior high school students, who have just started learning English, are at a loss with their poor knowledge of vocabulary and grammar.

Generally speaking, the methods we use to communicate when there is a limited command of a language are called communication strategies (CS). In this research we analyze how the Japanese junior high school students manage to converse with ALTs in English classes, that is to say, how they use CS when interacting with native speakers in order to solve problems faced during communicative activities in the classroom. Furthermore we consider how the use of CS is influenced after teachers raise the learner’s consciousness to some of them.

We defined CS referring to definitions made by some respected SLA researchers, and classified CS relying mainly on Tarone’s typology, which was typical of those that followed because her classification was explicit with plentifully illustrative examples (Bialystok 1990).

In Chapter 1, we reviewed recent studies of CS, which had been conducted from various aspects.

Chapter 2 presented our research questions:

1. What kinds of CS are used by the students to communicate with ALTs in English classes?
2. How do the CS use and the students’ views on using CS change after consciousness-raising to some CS?

The research subjects were 89 second year students and 102 first year students of a junior high school in Japan. Each of the two year-groups consisted of three classes.

In order to collect data, twelve lessons were videotaped and transcribed. The lessons were held twice for each class. The first lesson took place early in February 2000, to observe the status quo of the use of CS by Japanese junior high school students. The second lesson was held a month
later, after giving consciousness-raising activities to CS, in order to investigate the influence of them.

We roughly analyzed the CS used by the students after the first lesson videotaped. Based on that analysis, we found that 'Paraphrase' was never used, and that 'Appeal for Assistance' occurred very rarely in terms of frequency. Therefore we attempted to raise the students' consciousness about using the two CS mentioned above, four times in total over a period of two weeks.

Chapter 3 dealt with the analysis of the CS actually used in both the first and second videotaped lessons. Showing examples of the use of CS, we checked them based on Tarone's typology.

Chapter 4 was concerned with the examination of the effect of consciousness-raising to CS from the qualitative analysis of actual use in the classroom. Also in this chapter, we investigated the students' views on using CS, through a questionnaire about them.

In the concluding chapter, we discussed more in detail the results of the analysis, and the effect of raising the students' consciousness to the CS use. We also referred to some limitations of the present research and offered suggestions for further research.

As a result of our study, we found that the CS used by the students consisted of seven types in all, and that three of them were peculiar to the context of the Japanese junior high school classroom. Those three strategies were: 'Silence' strategy in which a student remained silent instead of speaking with his or her ALT, 'Dependence' strategy in the sense that a student depended on his or her friends before speaking with his or her ALT, and 'Text referral' strategy by means of which a student read the text on his or her handout, notebook, or blackboard when speaking with his or her ALT.

With respect to the effect of raising the learner's consciousness to the use of CS, we came to the following conclusions. First, in the actual use of CS, we found a positive effect not in the first year students but in the second year students with regard to 'Appeal for assistance'. The increase of the use of 'Appeal for assistance' in terms of frequency reflected the difference of quality of interaction. In other words, the interaction in the second lesson was more communicative than that in the first lesson in terms of acquiring information.

Second, regarding the students' views to CS, we noticed a change, again in the second year students, with respect to the source of CS use. The second year students intended to use L2-based strategies instead of L1-based strategies when they felt difficulties in speaking to their ALT as well as in understanding what their ALT said.

We saw the effect of raising the students' consciousness to the CS in both the actual use of CS and also the students' views on using CS. Therefore we were able to conclude that it is very useful to raise the students' consciousness to CS in the interactions with ALTs.
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Abstract

The startling progress of internationalization these days has increased the necessity for the practical communication ability of the students to be raised in Japanese English classes. The Ministry of Education (Monbusho) has decided to provide Japanese students with the opportunity to come into close contact with native speakers in foreign language classes. In fact, the students are experiencing more and more communicative activities and team-teaching with Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) in English classes.

A variety of problems, however, can arise in carrying out such activities in the classroom. When obligated to communicate in English in the classroom, Japanese junior high school students, who have just started learning English, are at a loss with their poor knowledge of vocabulary and grammar.

Generally speaking, the methods we use to communicate when there is a limited command of a language are called communication strategies (CS). In this research we analyze how the Japanese junior high school students manage to converse with ALTs in English classes, that is to say, how they use CS when interacting with native speakers in order to solve problems faced during communicative activities in the classroom. Furthermore we consider how
the use of CS is influenced after teachers raise the learner’s consciousness to some of them.

We defined CS referring to definitions made by some respected SLA researchers, and classified CS relying mainly on Tarone’s typology, which was typical of those that followed because her classification was explicit with plentifully illustrative examples (Bialystok 1990).

In Chapter 1, we reviewed recent studies of CS, which had been conducted from various aspects.

Chapter 2 presented our research questions: (1) What kinds of CS are used by the students to communicate with ALTs in English classes? (2) How do the CS use and the students’ views on using CS change after consciousness-raising to some CS? The research subjects were 89 second year students and 102 first year students of a junior high school in Japan. Each of the two year-groups consisted of three classes.

In order to collect data, twelve lessons were videotaped and transcribed. The lessons were held twice for each class. The first lesson took place early in February 2000, to observe the status quo of the use of CS by Japanese junior high school students. The second lesson was held a month later, after giving consciousness-raising activities to CS, in order to investigate the influence of them.

We roughly analyzed the CS used by the students after
the first lesson videotaped. Based on that analysis, we found that ‘Paraphrase’ was never used, and that ‘Appeal for Assistance’ occurred very rarely in terms of frequency. Therefore we attempted to raise the students’ consciousness about using the two CS mentioned above, four times in total.

Chapter 3 dealt with the analysis of the CS actually used in both the first and second videotaped lessons. Showing examples of the use of CS, we checked them based on Tarone’s typology.

Chapter 4 was concerned with the examination of the effect of consciousness-raising to CS from the qualitative analysis of actual use in the classroom. Also in this chapter, we investigated the students’ views on using CS, through a questionnaire about them.

In the concluding chapter, we discussed more in detail the results of the analysis, and the effect of raising the students’ consciousness to the CS use. We also referred to some limitations of the present research and offered suggestions for further research.

As a result of our study, we found that the CS used by the students consisted of seven types in all, and that three of them were peculiar to the context of the Japanese junior high school classroom. Those three strategies were: ‘Silence’ strategy in which a student remained silent instead of speaking with his or her ALT, ‘Dependence’ strategy in the
sense that a student depended on his or her friends before speaking with his or her ALT, and 'Text referral' strategy by means of which a student read the text on his or her handout, notebook, or blackboard when speaking with his or her ALT.

With respect to the effect of raising the learner's consciousness to the use of CS, we came to the following conclusions. First, in the actual use of CS, we found a positive effect not in the first year students but in the second year students with regard to 'Appeal for assistance'. The increase of the use of 'Appeal for assistance' in terms of frequency reflected the difference of quality of interaction. In other words, the interaction in the second lesson was more communicative than that in the first lesson in terms of acquiring information.

Second, regarding the students' views to CS, we noticed a change, again in the second year students, with respect to the source of CS use. The second year students intended to use L2-based strategies instead of L1-based strategies when they felt difficulties in speaking to their ALT as well as in understanding what their ALT said.

We saw the effect of raising the students' consciousness to the CS in both the actual use of CS and also the students' views on using CS. Therefore we were able to conclude that it is very useful to raise the students' consciousness to CS in the interactions with ALTs.
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Introduction

The startling progress of internationalization these days has increased the necessity for practical communication ability of the students to be raised in Japanese English classes. The ministry of Education (Monbusho) has designated the study of foreign language learning as a compulsory subject in the new Course of Study for secondary schools and the aim is as follows:

Placing particular emphasis on speaking and listening, Monbusho has improved the content of foreign language education by stressing practical communicative abilities which correspond with the language used in everyday situations.

Monbusho has decided to provide Japanese students with the opportunity to come into close contact with native speakers in foreign language classes. In fact, the students are experiencing more and more communicative activities and team-teaching with assistant language teachers (ALTs) in English classes.

A variety of problems, however, can arise in carrying out such activities in the classroom. Kinue Hirano (1993) pointed out like this:
The students do not know what to do when they are expected to communicate actively in English classes with their poor knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, because they have been raised in the Japanese culture in which silence is considered to be golden and they are generally expected to take part in other classes by just listening to what teachers say.

In addition, Japanese junior high school students, who have just started learning English, are at a loss when they are obligated to communicate in English in the classroom.

Generally speaking the methods we use to communicate when there is a limited command of a language are called communication strategies (CS). In this research we analyze how the Japanese junior high school students manage to converse with ALTs in English classes, that is to say, how they use CS when interacting with native speakers in order to solve problems during communicative activities in the classroom. Furthermore we consider how the use of CS is influenced after teachers raise the learner's consciousness to some of them.

In Chapter 1, we would like to review CS studies, touching upon the origin, the definition, the classification and so on.
Chapter 2 presents our research questions and describes our research method, with explanations of subjects, procedures, and implementation of consciousness-raising.

Chapter 3 deals with the analysis of the CS used by the Japanese junior high school students. We show examples of the use of CS by the students, and check them based on a traditional classification.

Chapter 4 is concerned with the examination of the effect of consciousness-raising to CS from the qualitative analysis of actual use in the classroom. Also in this chapter, we investigate the students' views on using CS, through a questionnaire about them.

In the concluding chapter, we discuss more in detail the results of the analysis, and the effect of raising the students' consciousness to the CS use. We also refer to some limitations of the present research and offer suggestions for further research.
Chapter 1

Communication Strategies

1.1 Introduction
This chapter summarizes communication strategies (CS) in terms of origin, definitions and classifications. This chapter also reviews recent studies of CS which have been conducted from various aspects.

Strategies of communication were first invoked by Selinker (1972) in his paper 'Interlanguage', to account for certain classes of errors made by learners of a second language (Corder 1983). Since then, a host of researchers such as Váradi, Corder, Tarone, Faerch and Kasper, Bialystok, and so on, have studied CS from various perspectives. First of all, let us examine some definitions of CS.

1.2 Definitions of CS
When we identify CS, we face a fundamental problem, in that it is very difficult to define CS because the phenomena or criteria which are considered to be important vary among researchers (Iwai 2000). So some investigators have tried to define CS from their own points of view. Some definitions given are as follows:
A systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty; (Corder, 1977)

A mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared; (Tarone, 1980)

Potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal; (Faerch and Kasper, 1983)

Techniques of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second language; (Stern, 1983)

Psycholinguistic plans which exist as part of the language user's communicative competence. They are potentially conscious and serve as substitutes for production plans which the learner is unable to implement. (Ellis, 1985)

There are various definitions with a wide range of approaches: ranging from an interactional approach to a psycholinguistic one.
1.3 Classifications of CS

The taxonomy of CS has also been studied by a lot of researchers. Categories, although named differently by each of them, seem to be largely common in characteristics. Tarone's typology is typical of those that followed because her classifications are explicit with plentifully illustrative examples (Bialystok 1990). The taxonomy is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Classification of CS by Tarone (1977)**

1. Avoidance
   (a) Topic avoidance
   (b) Message abandonment
2. Paraphrase
   (a) Approximation
   (b) Word coinage
   (c) Circumlocution
3. Conscious transfer
   (a) Literal translation
   (b) Language switch
4. Appeal for assistance
5. Mime
The classification has five major categories with subcategories for three of them. Each of the five major categories reflects a different sort of decision about how to solve the communication problem (Bialystok 1990).

Váradi (1983) classified CS based on the speaker’s production, whereas Corder (1983), Faerch and Kasper (1983) based their classification on the source of information. Bialystok’s classification (1983) depended on the source of information which was divided into two types. One type was L1-based (mother tongue) strategies and the other was L2-based (target language).

1.4 Several Evidential Studies Concerned with CS
Various aspects of CS have come under scrutiny since these definitions and classifications were made. For example, L2 learners’ proficiency and CS use (Tarone 1977; Bialystok 1983; Paribakht 1985; Chen 1990), CS in L1 and L2 (Poulisse 1990; Iwai 1995), CS by NS and NNS (Paribakht 1985; Bongaerts et al. 1987), Effectiveness of CS (Bialystok 1983), and Task effects to CS (Fakhri 1984).

1.5 Summary
Much of the research conducted on CS has been rather narrow, in that it has focused predominantly on learners’ gaps in lexis (Williams 1997). Actually, only a few studies of CS
use in an interactional context have been investigated. Even amongst those studies conducted in an interactional context, the subjects have been adults or the method of investigation has been under controlled circumstances. One of those interactional studies was conducted by Williams et al. (1997), who analyzed the interaction between a NNS teaching assistant and NS undergraduates in chemistry laboratory sessions. In the Williams' CS study the subjects were adults, but in this study the subjects are junior high school students whose proficiency in the target language is relatively poor. Therefore it is difficult to consider the analysis made by Williams with regard to this study.
Chapter 2

Research

2.1 Introduction
This chapter identifies the aim of our research and then explains our research method. The purpose of this study is to investigate how Japanese junior high school students cope with the conversational difficulties in English classes with ALTs, and how their CS use is influenced by receiving instruction to raise their consciousness to the fundamental CS. The following two questions are posed for the present study.

2.2 Research Questions
1. What kinds of CS are used by the students to communicate with ALTs in English classes?
2. How do the CS use and the students' views on using them change after consciousness-raising to some CS?

2.3 Subjects
The subjects are 89 second year students and 102 first year students of a junior high school in Fukuoka. Each of the two year-groups consists of three classes. They learn English as a foreign language from two different Japanese
English teachers and two different ALTs. One ALT, who is in charge of the second year, is an English woman who has been an ALT for seven years. The other ALT, who is an American man and who has been an ALT for two years, teaches the first year students. The students in every class have two lessons per month with their respective ALT.

2.4 Data Collection and Analysis

2.4.1 Data Collection

In order to collect data, twelve lessons were videotaped and transcribed. The lessons were held twice for each class. The first lesson took place early in February 2000, to observe the status quo of the use of CS by Japanese junior high school students. And the second lesson was held a month later after giving consciousness-raising activities to CS, in order to investigate the influence of them. The schedule for data collection was as follows.

Table 2: The Schedule for Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>What was done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 8,9</td>
<td>The first lesson videotaped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A rough analysis of CS used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17</td>
<td>Consciousness-raising of CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8,9</td>
<td>The second lesson videotaped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2 The Content of the Lessons

The content of the lessons was the same in each class. All lessons mainly consisted of communication activities as shown in Table 3, but were different in detail for each grade.

Table 3: The Flow of the Lessons Videotaped

---

**Second Year**

**First Lesson Videotaped**
- Stage 1: Easy English Conversation Including Greetings
- Stage 2: Questions and Answers using Comparative Structures
- Stage 3: 'Guess-Who' Game using Comparative Structures
- Stage 4: Check of the Answers to Stage 3

**Second Lesson Videotaped**
- Stage 1: Easy English Conversation Including Greetings
- Stage 2: 'Three Hints' Game
- Stage 3: 'Association' Game

**First Year**

**First Lesson Videotaped**
- Stage 1: Easy English Conversation Including Greetings
- Stage 2: Practice in the Usage of 'can'
- Stage 3: Demonstration of Stage 2
- Stage 4: 'Who am I?' Game
Second Lesson Videotaped

Stage 1: Easy English Conversation Including Greetings
Stage 2: ‘Line’ Game (English Conversation)
Stage 3: Practice of the Telephone Dialogue
Stage 4: Demonstration of Stage 3

2.4.3 Consciousness-raising to the CS Use

As shown in Table 2, we roughly analyzed CS used by the students after the first lesson videotaped. Based on that analysis, we found that ‘Paraphrase’ was never used, and that ‘Appeal for Assistance’ occurred very rarely in terms of frequency. Therefore we attempted to raise the students’ consciousness about using the two CS mentioned above, four times over a period of two weeks. The first time, we let the students recall how to use the CS, because although they had previously learned it as classroom English, they had forgotten a lot of the expressions. From the second to the fourth time, the students practiced the strategies in pairs while playing games such as ‘Information gap’ game, ‘Description’ game, and so on.

We raised the students’ consciousness to the two CS by giving examples of the following expressions.
Table 4: The Expressions as the CS

For the second year students

1. When they do not know words ('Paraphrase')
   - It's a kind of __.
   - It's like __.

2. When they do not understand what a speaker says ('Appeal for Assistance')
   - (Sorry) I don't understand.
   - I beg your pardon?
   - Would you say that again?
   - Will you speak more slowly?

3. When they do not know what to say ('Appeal for Assistance')
   - What do you call __ in English?
   - How do you say __?

For the first year students

1. When they do not know words ('Paraphrase')
   - It's like __.

2. When they do not understand what a speaker says ('Appeal for Assistance')
   - Pardon?
   - Once more please.
   - (Please speak) more slowly.

3. When they do not know what to say ('Appeal for Assistance')
   - How do you say __?

2.4.4 Data Analysis

In collecting data, interactions to be analyzed were basically restricted to those between one student and his or her ALT. This was because we could not observe CS in interactions
between groups of students and the ALT. In the case of interactions between students, we only expected 'Language switch' to be used.

The CS use was classified according to Tarone's taxonomy (Table 1 on p.6), as it was the most typical and her approach to CS was interactional.

2.4.5 Interview with Students Using CS
Some of the students who had used CS in the lessons were interviewed after school. They were shown the videotape of them actually using CS, and were asked why they had used the strategy in the interactions.

2.4.6 Questionnaire about the CS Use
In addition to observing CS actually used by the students on the transcription, we let all the students answer a questionnaire about CS use after the first and second lessons. We investigated what kinds of CS they intended to use and whether their use of CS had changed or not (See Appendix).
Chapter 3

Analysis and Results (1):
The Use of CS by the Students

3.1 Introduction
In the previous chapter, two research questions were posed for the current study. This chapter focuses on one of them. It shows the analysis of the CS actually used by the students in the classroom for the purpose of responding to the first research question, 'What kinds of CS are used by the students to communicate with ALTs in English classes?'

Results of the analysis are shown with tables and figures, and individual explanations of all the CS analyzed are given with examples.

3.2 Results of Analysis
The CS, which were used by the students in the interactions with an ALT, were analyzed according to Tarone's taxonomy (Table 1 on p.6). We found four major categories of the five in Tarone's, but 'Paraphrase' could not be observed. These four categories included 'Message abandonment' ('Avoidance'), 'Language switch' ('Conscious transfer'), 'Appeal for assistance', and 'Mime'. In addition to these, three CS which did not belong to Tarone's categories, were
used by the students. We have named these strategies 'Silence' (a student remains silent when he or she is asked), 'Text referral' (a student looks at his or her handout, notebook, and so on when he or she speaks in a target language), and 'dependence' (a student asks his or her friends or JTE before answering questions in a target language).

We analyzed the data year-group by year-group, because each year-group had the same lessons and was taught by the same JTE and ALT. Table 5 displays the results of the first year students.

Table 5: The Frequency of CS Used by the First Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of CS</th>
<th>The first lesson</th>
<th>The second lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Language switch</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Message abandonment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dependence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Silence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mime</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Text referral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Appeal for assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Paraphrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the results of both the first lesson and the second lesson for the first year students. The second lesson shows
the results after the instruction of consciousness-raising to CS. The number (107,54) for 'Interaction', means how many times interactions between a student and his or her ALT were attempted. The number for the second lesson is about a half of that of the first lesson. This may have been caused by the content of the class. One third of the content of the second lesson was the interaction between students. Other numbers are the frequency of each strategy. We could not directly compare the numbers because the activities were not the same. But we were able to roughly estimate the results by looking at Figure 1, which is shown as a bar graph.

Figure 1: The Frequency of CS Used by the First Year Students
The most frequent strategy was 'Language switch'. 'Silence', 'Dependence', and 'Text referral', which do not belong to Tarone's categories, were also resorted to frequently. On the contrary, 'Appeal for assistance' was seldom used.

Table 6 and Figure 2 on this and the next page show the results of the analysis for the second year. The number for the second lesson is much larger than that for the first lesson. This may have been caused by the content of the class, too. At a glance we can see that two strategies, 'Language switch' and 'Mime', were used more frequently than the others.

**Table 6: The Frequency of CS Used by the Second Year Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of CS</th>
<th>The first lesson</th>
<th>The second lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Language switch</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Message abandonment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dependence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Silence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mime</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Text referral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Appeal for assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Paraphrase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Examples of the Seven CS Actually Used by the Students

Now we have seen the frequency of the use of CS in 3.2, let us examine how these strategies were used in context, by quoting examples.

3.3.1 Examples of CS Categorized in Tarone's Taxonomy

First, let us look at the four CS which we can see in the classification made by Tarone. The following transcription conventions are used in Table 7.
Table 7: Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>The student interacting with the ALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'</td>
<td>Other student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Assistant language teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Japanese teacher of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>overlapping turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>contextual information accompanying text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>a short pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ }</td>
<td>speech hard to discern, analyst guess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1: Language Switch

A student is going to ask the ALT a question during the game.

1. S: Excuse me.
2. A: Yes.
3. C: (Laughter)
4. S: **Nandakke?** Who is youngest?
5. A: Who is the youngest?
8. S: Rachel?
10. S: Rachou?
11. A: Rache-l.
12. S: Rachel-l?
14. S: **Sensei mouikkai ittekudasai.**
15. A: Rachel.
16. S: Oh, thank you.
This interaction was observed at Stage 3 of the second year's first lesson ('Guess-Who' Game using Comparative Structures). In Lines 4 and 14, 'Language switch', which means the straightforward insertion of words from another language (Bialystok 1990), is used to appeal for assistance. The characteristic of this strategy, is that it seems likely to occur when the listener knows both languages (Cook 1991). In the interview after the lesson, the subject answered that if possible he wished he could have expressed it in English. This strategy was used the most frequently of all by both first and second year students.

Example 2: Message Abandonment

A student is going to ask the ALT a question during the game.

1 S: Who is + + last + + +
2 A: Who has which?
3 S: Nandakke? Who is + + +lyayappa iidesu.
4 A: Glasses? Glasses?
5 S: Glasses and hat.
6 A: Ah, who has glasses and a hat?
7 S: A soso.
8 J: Kuraberareru shitsumon-kana sore?
9 S: Zenzen.
10 J: Dakara ichiban ookina megane-tokasa, ichiban
chiisana megane-toka yattajanai. Ichiban ookina+

11  S:  Issu.
12  A: How about hat size?
13  J: Hat size.
14  S: Hat size, big.
15  J: Big + bigger.
16  S: Biggest.
17  A: Biggest?
18  S: Biggest hat.
19  A: OK. Who has the biggest hat? I think Henry has the biggest hat.
20  S: Henry.
21  A: Henry has the biggest hat. Ok?

This was observed at Stage 3 of the second year’s first lesson, too (‘Guess-Who’ Game using Comparative Structures). This student also used ‘Language switch’ many times, and at the same time, resorted to ‘Message abandonment’ in Line 3. ‘Message abandonment’ means learners stumble into a topic that is too difficult and simply give up and go on to another (Bialystok 1990). In the case of this transcription, the student intended to give up and stop talking, but the ALT helped him to go on. According to the post-lesson interview with him, the reason why he used this strategy is that he felt difficulty in constructing what he wanted to say in spite of his knowledge of vocabulary.

Example 3: Mime

The ALT is asking her student a question to check the
answer.

1 A: Who is + as tall as Richard? Who is as tall as Richard?
2 J: Omizu-kun.
3 S: ++ +.
4 A: Who is as tall as Richard?
5 S: ++ +.
6 J: Which?
7 S: (Pointing the right one.)
8 A: Who is as tall as Richard? Richard. This is Richard.
9 S: (Pointing the right one.)
10 S': Ben is.
11 A: Ben is. Good. Well-done. Ben is as tall as Richard.

This interaction was found at Stage 4 of the second year's first lesson (Check of the Answer of 'Guess-Who' Game using Comparative Structures). In Lines 7 and 9, 'Mime' was used, which includes all nonverbal accompaniments to communication, particularly those that serve in the place of a missing target language word (Bialystok 1990). In the Second year's second lesson, 'Mime' was resorted to more frequently than 'Language switch', because the activity of Stage 3 was 'Association' Game.

Example 4: Appeal for Assistance

A student is greeting his ALT.

1 A: Do you have any brothers or sisters? Do you have any brothers or sisters?
S: I have two sisters.
A: Two sisters. Are your sisters older than you or younger than you?
S: Ee. Once more please.
A: Are your sisters older than you or younger than you?
C: (Laughter.)
J: Natural speed.
S: Speak slowly.
A: OK.
S: Etto, younger.
A: Younger. How old are they?
S: How older?
A: How old are they?
S: Imouto? Wakaran, majide. Ee, chotto matte kudasai-ne.
(Looking at his notebook.) I don’t understand.
C: Laughter.
A: You don’t understand. OK.
A: You have two sisters. Yes?
S: Yes. (Nodding)
A: OK. How old are you?
S: I am fourteen.
A: Fourteen. How old are your sisters? Two sisters, you say? How old are they?
S: They are. Nansai-ka wakaran. Eto, chotto matte kudasai-yo.
J: [No Japanese.]
S: Ten. Ten and eleven.
A: Ten and eleven. OK. Good. Thank you very much. You can sit down.

This interaction occurred at Stage 1 of the second year’s second lesson (Easy English Conversation Including
Greetings). In Lines 4, 8, 12 and 14, the student resorted to ‘Appeal for assistance’, in which the speaker tries to get intentional words from an interlocutor (Bialystok 1990).

This CS is different from others, in that a problem could be solved not only by the effort of a speaker but also by the interaction between a speaker and an interlocutor (Iwai 2000). In Lines 4 and 8, he appealed to the ALT to speak more slowly or to repeat the sentence because he could not catch what she had said. And in Line 12, he repeated the first half of what she had said as he was able to only understand that part. Then in Line 14, he asked her to speak more comprehensibly, because he could not understand what she had said.

3.3.2 Examples of CS Which Are Peculiar
We have seen the four strategies actually used by the students, in Tarone’s taxonomy. Next we are going to illustrate examples of other CS, which are peculiar to the classroom context.

Example 5: Dependence

ALT is asking her student a question to check the answer.

1 A: Who is the youngest of all?
2 J: Sudo-san.
3 S: [Looking back at her friend.]
A student is greeting his ALT.

1 A: How many, how many students + in this class?
2 S: + + +.
This was from Stage 1 of the first year's first lesson (Easy English Conversation Including Greetings). In Lines 2, 4, and 6, this student remained silent instead of answering the question. So we have named this strategy 'Silence'. In most cases, after this strategy was used, the ALT, the JTE, or friends helped the speaker, as the example shows. We might regard this as a kind of 'Appeal for assistance' in terms of the result in the classroom context.

Example 7: Text Referral

A student and his ALT are demonstrating the conversation.
S: Hi. Andrew. (Looking at his handout), I bring cake and juice.

A: Oh, thank you. Thank you.

S: OK.

A: OK.

S: (Looking at his handout), excuse me. Can I borrow your toilet?

A: Sure. Dozo.

S: (Pretending to finish.)

A: Dodeshita-ka? How was it?

S: Sukkiri.

This strategy was observed in Stage 3 of the first year's first lesson (Demonstration of the Dialogue using the sentence of 'Can I__?'). In Lines 1 and 5, this student read the text on his handout, on which what he wanted to say was written. So we call this 'Text referral' strategy.

When we introduce a new form of expression as in this example, this 'Text referral' strategy tends to be used. In this case, the student looked at his handout, but in other cases, the students resorted to the text on the blackboard or to the text in their notebooks.

3.4 Summary

In this chapter, we have seen the results of analysis in order to answer the research question (1) 'What kinds of CS are used by the students to communicate with ALTs in English classes?' We have examined all of CS which were actually
used by the students. While some are in Tarone's taxonomy, others are not, and are peculiar to the classroom context. These CS are discussed in more detail in Chapter five.
Chapter 4

Analysis and Results (2):
The Effect of Consciousness-raising to CS

4.1 Introduction
In the previous chapter, we looked over the result of analysis of the CS actually used in the interactions and then examined how these strategies were used in the context by quoting examples. In this chapter, we have devoted ourselves to the analysis of the effect of consciousness-raising to CS so as to respond to the second research question, ‘How do the CS use and the students’ views on using them change after consciousness-raising to some communication strategies? ’

First we examine the actual use of CS both quantitatively by comparing the data and qualitatively by looking back at the previous example. Then we check the students’ views on the use of CS obtained from the questionnaire.

4.2 The Quantitative Change of Actual Use of CS
We had attempted to raise the students’ consciousness to the use of CS, mainly focusing on ‘Paraphrase’ and ‘Appeal for assistance’. So we chiefly dealt with these two categories to examine the effect of consciousness-raising to CS.
According to Table 5 (p. 16), ‘Paraphrase’ was not observed in either the first lesson or the second lesson, and ‘Appeal for assistance’ was observed just once in the first lesson with the first year students. As mentioned before, we could not compare the frequency of CS directly, but we could see the general tendencies of using CS.

Concerning the second year students on Table 6 (p. 18), we noticed an interesting finding. ‘Paraphrase’ was not observed, but the frequency of ‘Appeal for assistance’ in the second lesson was ten times as much as that in the first lesson, even though the total number of interactions in the second lesson was about one and a half times as much as that in the first lesson. Therefore the effect of consciousness-raising to CS was not seen in the first year students, but found in the second year students in terms of ‘Appeal for assistance’.

4.3 The Qualitative Change of Actual Use of CS

Next we examined the use of CS qualitatively by comparing interactions observed in Stage 1. Remember that Stage 1 consisted of ‘Easy English Conversation Including Greetings’, which was in common with all the lessons. From the observation of CS used by the first year students, we could find little change between the first and second lessons. As far as the CS used by the second year students
were concerned, there was a change in that the number of 'Appeal for assistance' increased in the second lesson, in particular it increased from once to eight times in Stage 1.

We could not observe 'Appeal for assistance' in the following example.

Example 8: The Dialogue in the First Lesson Videotaped without 'Appeal for Assistance'

A student is greeting her ALT.

Videotaped

A: What did you do yesterday?
S: ++++++ I +
A: Did you watch TV yesterday?
S: I watched TV yesterday.
A: OK. Good. And what did you watch on TV?
What program did you watch on TV?
S: Wakaran.
A: What's the name of the TV you watched?
S: +++
A: Did you watch drama?
S: Yes.
A: Yes. What's the name of the drama?
S: Ee. Nanka-ne.
A: Do you know the name of drama?
S: Nan-no dorama-ka?
A: What's the name of the drama?
S: I don't know.
A: You don't know. OK. Good. Thank you very much.
You can sit down.

Look at Example 8. This dialogue was observed in Stage 1
of the second year students' first lesson. We could not find 'Appeal for assistance' anywhere.

On the contrary, Example 4 (p. 23) shows the use of 'Appeal for assistance': e.g. 'Once more please.' 'Speak slowly.' 'How older?' and 'I don't understand'.

The difference of the use of 'Appeal for assistance' in terms of frequency also reflects the difference of quality of interaction. The length of both interactions took about the same time (two minutes). In that time length, the ALT in Example 4 was able to understand just the fact that the student watched a drama the day before, while the same ALT in Example 8 was able to understand that the student who was fourteen had two sisters who were ten and eleven. So with regard to the second year students, we might say that the interaction in the second lesson was more communicative than that in the first lesson in terms of acquiring information. In fact the dialogue in the second lesson seemed to go more smoothly. Bialystok (1983) emphasized this point that L2-based strategies were more effective in smooth communication than L1-based strategies.

4.4 The Change of the Students' Views on Using CS

In addition to observing the actual use of CS, we investigated the students' views on using CS from a questionnaire. We asked all students to answer a questionnaire about CS use
after the first and second lessons.

First, let us look at Table 8 and see what kinds of CS the students intended to use when they could not understand what their ALTs said.

### Table 8: The CS Chosen by the First Year Students(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The first lesson</th>
<th>The second lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 To ask 'Once again'</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To ask 'More slowly'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Inference from the context</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Using knowledge except English</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dependence</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Silence</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mime</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the answers given by the first year students. The students had to choose three CS from eight options. So the number of 'Total' was about three times as much as that of the students. 'Dependence' was the most of all. In order to compare the result between the first lesson and the second lesson in the first year students clearly, let us look at Figure 3, which is shown as a bar graph.
So far as the first year students were concerned, we could find little change of their views on CS use in understanding what their ALT said.

Next let us move on to the second year students'. Table 9 and Figure 4 (p. 36) showed the result of the questionnaire about CS use.

We noticed that 'To ask "Once again"' and 'To ask "More slowly"', in other words 'Appeal for assistance', and 'Mime' increased. On the contrary, 'Dependence' and 'Silence' decreased. This might mean that the second year students intended to use not L1-based strategies but L2-based strategies.
Table 9: The CS Chosen by the Second Year Students(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The first lesson</th>
<th>The second lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To ask 'Once again'</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To ask 'More slowly'</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inference from the context</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Using knowledge except English</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: The CS Chosen by the Second Year Students(1)
Second, in Table 10, let us see what kinds of CS the students intended to use when they could not speak to their ALTs in English.

Table 10: The CS Chosen by the First Year Students(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The first lesson</th>
<th>The second lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Paraphrase</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Topic avoidance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Language switch</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mime</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Appeal for assistance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dependence</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Filler</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 represents the result of the first year students. And Figure 5 (p. 38) is a graphical representation of the result. We found that 'Paraphrase' increased slightly but there seemed little change as a whole.
On the other hand, we could see some changes in the second year students' views as shown in Table 11 and Figure 6 (p. 39). While 'Language switch' and 'Dependence' decreased, 'Appeal for assistance' and 'Mime' increased. This might mean that the second year students intended to use L2-based strategies instead of L1-based strategies when they felt difficulty in speaking to their ALT as well. Of course we were able to see that the two CS, to which we raised the students' consciousness, 'Paraphrase' and 'Appeal for assistance' increased.
Table 11: The CS Chosen by the Second Year Students(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The first lesson</th>
<th>The second lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Topic avoidance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Language switch</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mime</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appeal for assistance</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Filler</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: The CS Chosen by the Second Year Students(2)
4.5 Summary

In this chapter, we have seen the effect of consciousness-raising to CS in order to answer the research question (2): How do the CS use and the students' views on using CS change after consciousness-raising to some communication strategies? First we examined the actual use of CS both quantitatively and qualitatively. Then we investigated the students' views on the use of CS through the questionnaire. As a result, we were able to find the positive effect of consciousness-raising to CS in the second year students, but could not find any effect in the first year students. This effect is discussed more in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

We have analyzed how the Japanese junior high school students manage to converse with ALTs in English classes. Since the conversation did not actually seem to go smoothly, they resorted to communication strategies (CS) in the interaction with the native speakers so as to solve the problems in the communicative activities in the classroom.

We find that the CS used by the students consist of seven types in all, and that three of them are peculiar to the context in the classroom of the Japanese junior high school. These three strategies are 'Silence' strategy in which a student remains silent instead of speaking with his or her ALT, 'Dependence' strategy in the sense that a student depends on his or her friends before speaking with his or her ALT, and 'Text referral' strategy by means of which a student reads the text on his or her handout, notebook, or blackboard when speaking with his or her ALT.

Furthermore we have considered how the use of CS is influenced after we raise the learner's consciousness to some of them. We have analyzed the issue from two aspects; the actual use of CS and the students' views on CS.
First, in the actual use of CS, we have found the effect not in the first year students but in the second year students with respect to 'Appeal for assistance'. The increase of the use of 'Appeal for assistance' in terms of frequency reflected the difference of quality of the interaction, in other words, the interaction in the second lesson was more communicative than that in the first lesson for the second year students in terms of acquiring information.

Second, in the students' views on CS, we have noticed the change not in the first year students but in the second year students with respect to the source of CS use. The second year students intended to use L2-based strategies instead of L1-based strategies when they felt difficulties in speaking to their ALT as well as in understanding what their ALT said.

We saw the effect of raising the students' consciousness to the CS in both the actual use of CS and also the students' views on using CS. Therefore we were able to conclude that it is very useful to raise the students' consciousness to CS in the interactions with ALTs.

5.2 Discussion
As we have mentioned above, we have found seven CS actually used by the students in all. 'Language switch' is the most frequent of the seven, because it is the easiest for
them to use. This strategy is, however, not very suitable for the students to solve the problems from the point of view of learning English. In order not to have the students resort to 'Language switch', the following two things are important. One is the students' attitude to communicate in English even when their ALTs are not there, and the other is the ALTs' response to the students in team-teaching.

Of course JTEs should encourage the students to use English in every lesson as much as possible. ALTs should not communicate with the students in Japanese so much, simply because they can speak Japanese. It is natural for students to try to depend on 'Language switch' instead of L2-based strategies, as they can easily cope with their difficulties by using this strategy. Therefore JTEs and ALTs should discuss in advance how to minimize the ALTs' use of Japanese.

Next let us move on to the reason why 'Paraphrase' was not observed in any lessons. In spite of instruction in the forms of expression to paraphrase (e.g. 'It a kind__.', 'It's like__.') and the students' practice of them after the first lesson videotaped, the students did not use the CS in the second lesson videotaped, either. We can recognize, however, that they wanted to use the CS by the questionnaire on the CS use in Table 10 (p. 37) and Table 11 (p. 39). After all they seem to have depended on the other strategies which
are easier to use than 'Paraphrase' (e.g. 'Language switch') in the classroom though they had the will to use it. Therefore the JTE should encourage the students to use L2-based strategies (e.g. 'Paraphrase') as much as possible.

5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Some limitations of the current research must be indicated. First, the tasks employed by the students in the first lesson videotaped are different from those in the second. Though the CS use is influenced by the task (Paribakht 1985), the main theme of the present study is to describe the CS actually used by the students in the classroom.

Second, we have found three communication strategies, which are peculiar to the context in the classroom of the Japanese junior high school. But it is not clear as to whether these strategies are peculiar to English classes or not. So the students need to be observed in classes other than English in order to investigate whether these CS are used there too.

Lastly, we would like to refer to the instruction of CS. We have noticed the effect of raising the students' consciousness to the CS not in the first year students but in the second year students with respect to both the actual use of CS and also the students' views on CS. We, however, instructed the use of CS differently year-group by year-group
in terms of forms of expression (e.g. ‘Would you say that again?’ versus ‘Pardon?’). So the result shows that the students’ proficiency might be a factor of vital importance in the instruction of CS. Therefore considering the status quo that the expressions related to CS use are rarely found in the textbooks for the Japanese junior high school students (Iwai 2000), it is necessary to identify what, when, and how the students should be taught, in order to make the use of CS more effective.
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Appendix

Questionnaire about the use of CS

* これはテストではありません。また、成績にもまったく関係がないので思ったとおりに答えてください。

1 あなたは授業中に ALT と英語で聞いたり話したりするのは好きですか。（4段階）また、それはなぜですか。

2 あなたは積極的に ALT と英語で聞いたり話したりしていますか。（4段階）また、それはなぜですか。

3 ALT と英語で聞いたり話したりするときに、困ることはなんですか。（3つ選ぶ）

1 自信がない
2 緊張する
3 あせる
4 単語がわからない
5 質問はわかるが答え方がわからない
6 単語はわかるが文でいえない
7 恥ずかしい
8 質問そのものがわからない
9 その他
4 ALTから質問されたとき、よくわからない場合どうしますか。
(3つ選ぶ)
1 もう一度言ってくれるように頼む
2 ゆっくり言ってくれるように頼む
3 場面や状況から自分なりに判断する
4 経験や英語以外の知識で推測する
5 友達や先生に助けを求める
6 だまる
7 ジェスチャーや表情を使う
8 その他

5 ALTと英語で話すときに、うまくできない場合どうしますか。
(3つ選ぶ)
1 別の表現で言いかえる
2 別の話題にかえる
3 日本語を使う
4 ジェスチャーで表現する
5 相手に助けを求め
6 友達や先生に助けを求め
7 つなぎの言葉をいいながら考える
8 その他