



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne  
Canada's university

FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES  
ET POSTDOCTORALES



FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND  
POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

Golda J. Tulung

AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

Ph.D. (Education)

GRADE / DEGREE

Faculty of Education

FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

Communicative Task-Generation Oral Discourse in a Second Language: A Case Study of Peer  
Interaction and Non-Native Teacher Talk in an EFL Classroom

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Marjorie Wesche

DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

Marie-Josée Vignola

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

EXAMINATEURS (EXAMINATRICES) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS EXAMINERS

Elizabeth Gatbonton

Tahered Paribakht

Patricia Palulis

Lauren Vandergrift

Gary W. Slater

Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

**COMMUNICATIVE TASK-GENERATED ORAL DISCOURSE  
IN A SECOND LANGUAGE: A CASE STUDY OF PEER INTERACTION  
AND NON-NATIVE TEACHER TALK IN AN EFL CLASSROOM**

By

**Golda Juliet Tulung**

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies  
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Education  
University of Ottawa

© Golda J. Tulung, University of Ottawa, Canada, August 2008



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file* *Votre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-48425-8*  
*Our file* *Notre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-48425-8*

**NOTICE:**

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

**AVIS:**

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

## ABSTRACT

The study sought to provide evidence regarding the pedagogic value of communicative tasks in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting. Previous research suggests that communicative tasks can provide conditions and promote processes which facilitate second language (L2) learning, as they encourage meaningful interaction in the L2 and learner attention to linguistic form. Interactive language use helps students to better comprehend novel language elements and to practice expressing themselves in the L2 as part of their language learning. Learner discourse while carrying out such tasks should reflect these processes. In EFL settings, where it is an ongoing challenge to provide learners with quality linguistic input and interaction opportunities, communicative tasks are seen as a promising pedagogical approach, yet relatively little is known about their implementation and outcomes in such settings.

This case study investigated the nature of the oral discourse generated through the use of selected communicative tasks in a university EFL class by students working in small groups and their non-native EFL teacher, emphasizing its interactive features. It also compared the effects of two task types (*jigsaw* and *decision making*). This study explored the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes with respect to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method, as well as changes in these attitudes and perceptions over a semester. Finally, it sought evidence of language learning outcomes, particularly lexical development, from these tasks. The research context was an oral academic English course for Indonesian undergraduate medical students with intermediate English proficiency. Participants included an experienced non-native English speaking teacher and her eight students who completed all the tasks and were selected as representative of the class.

Examination of the students' interactions and teacher discourse when implementing and completing the tasks revealed that both jigsaw and decision making tasks worked well in the hands of an experienced non-native teacher. Both task types generated a considerable amount of interactive language as students interacted, negotiated, and cooperated during task implementation and completion. The two task types complemented each other in terms of the various aspects of language learning they promoted, their relative difficulty, and the level of students' language proficiency required. In addition, the teacher and students reported similar, positive perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of communicative tasks, and there was anecdotal and observed evidence that the communicative tasks might facilitate lexical learning in this setting. The study contributes to our knowledge of EFL pedagogy and extends classroom-based research to EFL settings, particularly in its study of a communicative task-based methodology for promoting student interaction in an EFL setting.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the influence, support, and dedication of all those who contributed to the completion of this thesis.

I have been fortunate to have Dr. Mari Wesche as my supervisor. Her invaluable feedback and encouragement have inspired and stimulated me throughout my studies. I wish to thank her for her insightful comments, guidance, and great interest in my research. I would like to thank Dr. Marie-Josée Vignola, my co-supervisor, who later on joined us from the data management and analysis stage. Her helpful comments, organizing skills, and administrative knowledge have kept me on track. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Drs. Sima Paribakht, Larry Vandergrift, and Patricia Palulis for their support and thoughtful critiques of my work. I also want to thank Dr. Elizabeth Gatbonton, the external examiner, who carefully read and contributed to my thesis.

The research on which this thesis is based would not have been possible without the cooperation of the teacher participant and her class of 2005, particularly the eight student participants. I am grateful to them and my friends and former colleagues at the English Language Center in Sam Ratulangi University, Manado, Indonesia for their support. The research could not have been conducted in the first place without the financial support from the *Language Learning* Dissertation Grant Program of the *Language Learning* Journal, and from the ‘Sandwich Program’ of the Directorate General of Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia.

I want to express my special thanks to Monica Waterhouse, my graduate student friend, for her assistance in data verification of the transcripts.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my family for their love, support, and patience. My parents are the ones who first inspired and motivated me to pursue my studies and have kept me going with their unceasing prayer. My husband, Edwin, is the one who has continued to motivate and encourage me with his love and dedication. My children, Winda and Jason, are the ones who have given me joy in my troubled times. To them all, this thesis is dedicated.

## Table of Contents

ABSTRACT .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
<i>Episode 1 from a world where English is a foreign language</i> .....	1
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	2
Statement of the Problem .....	2
Rationale for the Study .....	6
<i>Episode 2 into a world where English is the first language</i> .....	9
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	10
Definitions and Types of Task .....	11
Linguistic and Interactional Characteristics Promoting SLA .....	14
Foreigner/Teacher Talk .....	15
Interlanguage Talk .....	17
Features of Interactional Discourse .....	20
Evidence of SLA through Communicative Tasks .....	22
Communicative Tasks in the EFL Classroom .....	28
Conceptual Framework .....	31
Research Questions .....	34
<i>Episode 3 back into the world of English as a foreign language</i> .....	36
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY .....	37
Research Design .....	37
Research Context .....	39
Research Site .....	39
EFL Course for Pre-medical Students .....	40
The Existing Oral Method .....	42
Classroom Context .....	45
Participants .....	46

Student Participants .....	46
Teacher Participant .....	49
Tasks .....	50
Selection of Task Types .....	50
Adaptation and Development .....	51
Implementation .....	53
Instruments .....	55
Data Collection .....	59
Procedures .....	59
Challenges .....	61
Data Analysis .....	64
Trustworthiness .....	69
<i>Episode 4</i> <i>worlds collided</i> .....	71
CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS .....	72
Research Question One .....	73
Word Counts .....	75
L1 Use .....	80
Discourse Moves .....	86
Topic initiations .....	88
Responses .....	90
Comprehension facilitation .....	93
Corrections .....	97
Completions .....	99
Extended questions .....	101
Uptakes .....	103
Repetitions .....	105
Turns and Negotiation Cycles .....	115
Summary of Findings on Research Question One .....	127
Research Question Two .....	131
Main Features of Teacher Discourse .....	132
Roles of Teacher Discourse .....	140
Task Difference in Teacher Discourse .....	145
Summary of Findings on Research Question Two .....	149
Research Question Three .....	150
Participants' Attitudes and Perceptions with regard to Communicative Tasks vis-à-vis Teacher-Fronted Tasks .....	151
Attitudes toward communicative tasks compared to teacher-fronted tasks .....	152
Perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in communicative tasks .....	158
Attitudes and perceptions regarding peer interaction in communicative tasks .....	160

Reasons for L1 use in task completion .....	166
Perceptions regarding other task-related issues .....	169
Perceptions of the relevance of communicative tasks to medical studies .....	172
Change of perceptions/attitudes over time .....	173
Participants' Attitudes and Perceptions with regard to Jigsaw	
Tasks vis-à-vis Decision Making Tasks .....	176
Attitudes toward jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks .....	177
Perceptions of jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks .....	180
Perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks .....	183
Attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of students .....	185
Attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of teacher .....	189
Summary of Findings on Research Question Three .....	190
Research Question Four .....	195
Words Reported Being Learned as New Vocabulary .....	196
Aspects of Word Learning as Evidenced in the Discussions .....	199
Ways of Facilitating Word Learning .....	203
Summary of Findings on Research Question Four .....	209
<i>Episode 5 in search of knowledge and understanding</i> .....	211
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION .....	212
Summary of Main Findings .....	212
Discussion of Findings .....	215
Learning Context .....	216
Reading-Based Communicative Tasks .....	220
Interactive Language Use .....	224
Enhanced Involvement .....	227
Language Learning Outcomes .....	229
<i>Episode 6 looking back and ahead, looking inside and outside</i> .....	232
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION .....	233
Limitations of the Study .....	234
Contributions of the Study .....	235
Implications of the Study .....	237
REFERENCES .....	241

## APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student Participant Consent Form .....	252
Appendix B: Teacher Participant Consent Form .....	254
Appendix C: Non-Modified Activities and Alternate Jigsaw Task .....	256
Appendix D: Non-Modified Activities and Alternate Decision Making Task .....	262
Appendix E: Teacher Questionnaire .....	266
Appendix F: Student Pre-Questionnaire .....	269
Appendix G: Student Post-Questionnaire .....	271
Appendix H: Timed Observation Protocol Adapted from COLT .....	272
Appendix I: Students' Reflective Comments .....	273
Appendix J: Teacher's Reflective Comments .....	274
Appendix K: Taxonomy of Discourse Moves with Acronyms and Descriptions .....	275
Appendix L: An Example of Coded Transcript of a Jigsaw Task .....	278
Appendix M: An Example of Coded Transcript of a Decision-Making Task .....	284

## List of Tables

Table 1	List of student participants with their characteristics .....	47
Table 2	Group formation of student participants during communicative tasks .....	49
Table 3	Chronological procedures of data collection .....	60
Table 4	Transcription conventions .....	66
Table 5	Word counts in jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	76
Table 6	Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw) (n=8) .....	77
Table 7	Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw) (n=8) .....	77
Table 8	Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making) (n=8) .....	79
Table 9	Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making) (n=8) .....	79
Table 10	Taxonomy of discourse moves with acronyms .....	87
Table 11	Topic initiation category .....	88
Table 12	Topic initiations during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	89
Table 13	Distribution of topic initiations among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	89
Table 14	Distribution of topic initiations among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	90
Table 15	Response category .....	91
Table 16	Responses during jigsaw and decision making tasks .....	92
Table 17	Distribution of responses among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	92
Table 18	Distribution of responses among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	92
Table 19	Comprehension facilitation category .....	94
Table 20	Comprehension facilitation during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	95
Table 21	Distribution of comprehension facilitation among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	96
Table 22	Distribution of comprehension facilitation among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	96
Table 23	Correction category .....	97
Table 24	Corrections during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	98
Table 25	Distribution of corrections among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	98
Table 26	Distribution of corrections among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	99
Table 27	Completion category .....	100
Table 28	Completions during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	100
Table 29	Distribution of completions among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	100

Table 30	Distribution of completions among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	100
Table 31	Extended questions category .....	101
Table 32	Extended questions during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) ..	102
Table 33	Distribution of extended questions among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	102
Table 34	Distribution of extended questions among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	103
Table 35	Uptake category .....	104
Table 36	Uptakes during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	104
Table 37	Distribution of uptakes among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8) ..	105
Table 38	Distribution of uptakes among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8) .....	105
Table 39	Self repetitions and other repetitions in jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	107
Table 40	Self repetitions and other repetitions in decision making tasks (n=8) ..	107
Table 41	Discourse moves carried out by self and other repetitions in jigsaw and decision making tasks .....	109
Table 42	Distribution of self repetitions among participants in jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	110
Table 43	Distribution of self repetitions among participants in decision making (n=8) .....	111
Table 44	Distribution of other repetitions among participants in jigsaw tasks (n=8) .....	113
Table 45	Distribution of other repetitions among participants in decision making tasks (n=8) .....	113
Table 46	Total turns and negotiation cycle turns in proportion (n=8) .....	123
Table 47	Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw) (n=8) .....	124
Table 48	Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw) (n=8) .....	124
Table 49	Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making) (n=8) .....	125
Table 50	Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making) (n=8) .....	125
Table 51	Summary of findings on the frequency of discourse moves and of self and other repetitions observed during communicative tasks .....	129
Table 52	Students were more active and talk more in communicative tasks ....	153
Table 53	Students became motivated and enjoying doing communicative tasks .....	154
Table 54	Students were not shy or afraid of making mistakes while doing communicative tasks with their classmates .....	154
Table 55	Students liked communicative tasks due to their benefits .....	155
Table 56	Students liked communicative tasks due to their differences from teacher-fronted tasks .....	156
Table 57	Students liked communicative tasks due to topics related to students' Field .....	157

Table 58	Preferences for communicative tasks in L2 instruction .....	157
Table 59	Multi-modal processing in communicative tasks: vocabulary, speaking, listening, and writing .....	158
Table 60	Written support from the text in communicative tasks .....	160
Table 61	Students' confidence building as a benefit of practicing with peers ...	161
Table 62	Unthreatening atmosphere as a benefit of practicing with peers .....	162
Table 63	Indirect learning as a benefit of practicing with peers .....	162
Table 64	Influence from the more or less active peers .....	163
Table 65	Influence in L1/L2 use .....	164
Table 66	"New" vs. "old" peers .....	165
Table 67	Group size of four students .....	165
Table 68	Limited L2 proficiency as a reason for L1 use in task completion .....	167
Table 69	Habit/spontaneity/L1 environment as a reason for L1 use in task completion .....	167
Table 70	To move along as a reason for L1 use in task completion .....	168
Table 71	Unintelligible pronunciation/ lack of comprehension as a reason for L1 use in task completion .....	169
Table 72	Lack of concern about the process/attention focused on the product...	170
Table 73	Sense of time pressure .....	171
Table 74	Unfamiliarity with the tasks .....	171
Table 75	Need for teacher support .....	172
Table 76	Relevance of content .....	172
Table 77	Language use in professional situation .....	173
Table 78	Change in students' perceptions/attitudes: from positive to negative...	174
Table 79	No change in students' perceptions/attitudes: positive from the beginning .....	175
Table 80	Change in teacher's way of teaching .....	175
Table 81	Less vs. more interesting discussion .....	178
Table 82	One-way vs. two-way interaction in terms of responding .....	178
Table 83	Less vs. more preferred task type by students .....	179
Table 84	No preference for the teacher .....	180
Table 85	The nature: sharing information vs. expressing own ideas .....	181
Table 86	Task shortcomings: simply reading, more use of L1 .....	181
Table 87	Benefit for less vs. more proficient students .....	182
Table 88	Practice in listening vs. speaking .....	183
Table 89	More new words vs. more familiar words .....	184
Table 90	More vs. fewer repetitions .....	185
Table 91	Role as a group leader .....	186
Table 92	Role as a speaker/listener .....	187
Table 93	Gestures and facial expressions .....	187
Table 94	Willingness to use L2 .....	188
Table 95	Role as a facilitator .....	190
Table 96	Role as a monitor .....	190
Table 97	Preparation and class management .....	191
Table 98	Summary of findings on students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding communicative tasks versus teacher-fronted tasks..	192

Table 99	Summary of findings on students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding jigsaw tasks versus decision making tasks .....	194
Table 100	Words reported being learned in jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8) .....	197
Table 101	Asking peers as a way of facilitating word learning .....	204
Table 102	Listening to peers as a way of facilitating word learning .....	204
Table 103	Exposure to the text as a way of facilitating word learning .....	205
Table 104	Guessing from the verbal context as a way of facilitating word Learning .....	205
Table 105	Guessing from the non-verbal context as a way of facilitating word learning .....	206
Table 106	Looking up in the dictionary as a way of facilitating word learning ...	207
Table 107	Self-practicing as a way of facilitating word learning .....	207
Table 108	Listening to the teacher as a way of facilitating word learning .....	208

*Episode 1 from a world where English is a foreign language*

Carrying a bag full of dreams and expectations

Carrying a bag full of excitement and anxiety

... I have developed a research interest in what goes on in the classroom, particularly in the relationship among teachers, students, and texts or materials used. I am especially interested in the foreign language class, more specifically in English as a foreign language (EFL) settings where the teachers have learned English as an additional language and have the same first language as the students, and where the target language exposure and opportunities to use it are very limited ... I am interested in exploring the influence of the 'input' on students' language acquisition and how it can be enhanced in their learning.

*Personal statement for a scholarship application,  
February 4, 2004*

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The case study presented in this thesis reports on the development, implementation, and outcomes of selected communicative tasks in an English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom. The study sought to provide evidence regarding the pedagogic value of communicative tasks in the EFL setting. It examined the nature of students' oral discourse generated through the use of communicative tasks in small groups, analyzed the main features and roles of teacher discourse, investigated students' and teacher's related attitudes and perceptions regarding communicative tasks, and explored evidence of language learning outcomes, particularly lexical development, from these tasks. This chapter presents the background information and the rationale for the study.

### *Statement of the problem*

Language learning is a complex cognitive process that is affected by psychological and sociocultural factors. Particularly in learning another language (L2), success is not always guaranteed. The social and resulting linguistic contexts where the learning and teaching take place often determine learners' success. More specifically, the social context affects the availability, quality, and characteristics of *input* (i.e., oral/written L2 exposure) including the possibilities for learner *interaction* (i.e., engaging in conversations) in that language. In terms of the availability of input and interaction, as well as other factors, a distinction is often made between two kinds of sociolinguistic contexts that may influence learners' success in L2 learning. The first includes contexts

where the additional language learned by an individual is used by the society as a dominant language; this additional language is termed a *second* language. The other refers to contexts where the additional language learned is not widely used in the surrounding environment; this additional language is termed a *foreign* language.

Highlighting the main difference between the two major sociolinguistic contexts of English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL), Chaudron (1988) states that in the foreign language context, “the learner acquires the L2 when there is little natural use of the language in surrounding society”, while in the second language context, “the L2 is not only the content of instruction but the medium of instruction” (p.5). Paraphrasing it, Hall and Walsh (2002) state that second language classrooms include “contexts in which the language being learned in the classroom is also the language of the community” and “foreign language learning contexts are those in which exposure to and opportunities for target language interaction are restricted for the most part to the language classroom” (p. 186). In other words, the main difference between these two contexts is the access the learners have to the language being learned: in an ESL context, students have access to the language not only inside but even more outside of the classroom, often from native speakers<sup>1</sup> (NSs) in diverse situations; while in an EFL context, their access to the language outside of the classroom is very limited, though they may have access to the internet and English TV programs.

Obviously, one of the problems in learning a foreign language, in this case English as a foreign language (EFL), has always been providing quality linguistic input to learners. In such contexts, learners get exposure to the L2 primarily in the language

---

<sup>1</sup> A term widely used in the literature of second language teaching and learning meaning the people speak the language as their mother tongue or first language.

classroom. Thus, where English is learned as a foreign language, teachers are very important because they are the main source of English language input, particularly oral language, for most students. Students look to teachers' language production and their explanations of the language as a model. Teachers' language becomes the norm for their students. However, the teachers in EFL settings may themselves not be fully competent in English; as non-native speakers<sup>2</sup> (NNSs), their oral abilities and sociolinguistic competence tend to be limited (e.g., Li, 1998). Since the amount and type of *teacher talk* (i.e., the spontaneous, adapted language that teachers produce in the classroom for learners) is related to the teaching approach used, we then need to consider how teachers, in this case the emphasis is on EFL teachers, can best teach in ways that will provide learners with the language exposure and practice they need. All this is influenced by the context where the teaching and learning take place.

One possibility of providing input and interaction opportunities to students is through communicative task-based instruction. In task-based instruction, learners use the language to transact or complete tasks rather than primarily learning individual language items (Foster, 1999). Such instruction places tasks centrally, as the unit of syllabus design (Long & Crookes, 1992, 1993), and the driving force for language development is language use during task completion (Prabhu, 1987; Long, 1990). This suggests that language learning is internally influenced and may be driven through interaction (Wesche & Skehan, 2002). As students transact tasks, they are engaging in purposeful activities,

---

<sup>2</sup> A term widely used in the literature of second language teaching and learning meaning the people speak the language not as their mother tongue or first language, but as their additional language. However, a controversy around the terms of NS/NNS is acknowledged in the literature; for example, Luk and Lin (2006) have revisited the notion of native speakerness and challenged the dichotomy.

which focus on meaning and require both comprehension and production of the language, activities which have been shown to promote language learning (Foster, 1999).

Most of the research on task-based language instruction has taken place in ESL classrooms with students representing diverse first languages (L1) and where English is necessarily the language of communication. Such research has focused on task features and characteristics (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996), task implementation (e.g., Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996), and pedagogic techniques for using tasks (e.g., Skehan, 1996). This research, much of it carried out in well-controlled experimental settings, focuses on learners, and particularly on the language they produce. As Crookes & Gass (1993a) point out, “With this emphasis on what learners do with language and on what learners learn from it came a focus on how different tasks influence the kind of language which learners produced” (p. 2). In other words, the relationship between different task types and the linguistic performance of learners participating in the tasks has become an important area of task-based research. However, there is relatively little research to date that focuses on the use of communicative tasks in a real, working classroom in an EFL setting where students find it very unnatural to use English with their fellow L1 speaking peers. In my M.A. research (Tulung, 2001) I was able to describe teacher talk during communicative tasks in such a setting. Building on that work, this study is a more comprehensive exploration, focusing mainly on student interaction.

Whatever the classroom context, teacher talk in the L2 serves as an important linguistic model for students, since the teacher guides them through classroom processes and activities, and provides explanation and feedback or correction (Kennedy, 1996).

The L2 exposure provided in this context also includes talk produced by fellow students, some of it in a context of peer interaction. As students work together in the classroom, interaction with fellow students in the L2 may be particularly helpful in their learning. Research has demonstrated that L2 interaction triggers negotiation of meaning among learners and “scaffolding” assistance from one another in achieving successful communication (e.g., Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). In this way, the language input learners encounter and produce, interacting with one another, is activated through social interaction and some of it is internalized cognitively by the individual learner. The availability, quality, and characteristics of the input provided in a given context, including the added immediacy, social weight and feedback of interactive input, will strongly influence language learning.

#### *Rationale for the study*

Teaching always takes place within a larger sociolinguistic context and is realized differently in different contexts (see Holliday, 1994). Much classroom research has not acknowledged the effect that the sociolinguistic context has on language teaching and so has tended to generalize the research findings from classrooms in one context to those in another. For example, generalization has often been made from L2 teaching research to a foreign language teaching context, which involves different conditions and situations (Vandale, 1997). It is necessary to look at how context influences what happens in teaching, and in turn learning.

Looking more closely at what happens among participants in the classroom, Johnson (1995) points out that it is essential for teachers and those involved in L2

education to understand the dynamics of classroom communication, and that the nature of classroom communication lies in the interrelationship between what teachers and students bring to the classroom and what actually happens during face-to-face communication in the classroom. She wants teachers to recognize

how the patterns of communication are established and maintained in second language classrooms, the effects these patterns have on how second language students participate in classroom activities, and how their participation shapes the ways in which they use language for classroom learning and their opportunities for second language acquisition. (p. 3)

Context at all levels plays an important role in L2 learning. On the one hand, it may stimulate, enrich, and promote learning. On the other hand, it may hinder the learning process. Contextual factors at macro and micro levels influence language learning. In a larger sociolinguistic context, these factors include the wider society and the language teaching environment, and in the micro context of a classroom, these factors include the teacher and student as individuals who also belong to the larger context.

In contrast to a general ESL context where the availability, quality, and characteristics of input/interaction are not so much of a concern, these factors are quite significant in an EFL context. Limited quality input through natural use in the larger context means fewer opportunities for interaction and practice. This condition may affect students' attitude toward learning the language, and is likely to influence their oral language development. In short, students may feel discouraged or may not feel pushed enough to develop their language competence as they do not see the practical application of learning the target language in their real life.

While the macro environmental factors are difficult, if not impossible to change, it is possible to intervene in the micro factors such as the input/interaction in the classroom between the teacher and the student, and among students. However, how to provide a rich linguistic environment in an EFL classroom remains a serious challenge. The study reported here was a response to this challenge. It looked specifically at how intervention at the micro level might enhance students' exposure to adequate, appropriate language being learned and opportunities to interact in this language, and change students' attitudes toward their learning.

The topic of this research was how communicative tasks might be used to generate interactive discourse in adult English language instruction in a foreign language classroom. The context was a course in academic oral English for undergraduate medical students with intermediate English proficiency at a university in Manado, Indonesia. The main purpose was to explore the nature and content of the L2 discourse that arises from doing communicative tasks, both from the teacher and from interaction among students, as it might relate to language development and related attitudes toward the use of such tasks. Its focus was on how communicative tasks could promote oral peer interaction in the EFL classroom, which in turn might promote more effective L2 learning. The study looked at the oral discourse generated by EFL students and the teacher through carrying out selected communicative tasks. While the goal was to promote both the amount and the quality of oral interactive language and language practice available to students, students' subsequent lexical development was also explored. A further related purpose of the study was to describe student attitudes toward and perceptions of the use of communicative tasks over time as these might affect their language development.

*Episode 2 into a world where English is the first language*

What a privileged opportunity!

To be able to immerse into another language and culture

To be able to have access to rich resources and fabulous facilities

Time to focus:

To enhance expertise and familiarity with the research literature

To narrow down and polish the research questions

Using tasks ... it will look at the oral discourse teachers and students generate from different kinds of tasks. The focus is on how reading-based communicative tasks can promote oral peer interaction in the EFL classroom, and in turn, more effective vocabulary learning.

*Paper presented at an international conference,  
April 14, 2004*

Discuss how second language communicative tasks can elicit meaningful oral exchanges among classroom learners, and how the linguistic and interactional characteristics of these exchanges may differentially promote learners' language acquisition.

*Question for the comprehensive examination,  
May 3, 2004*

Now, let's have a look at the literature that supports the use of communicative tasks for language learning: what they are, why they are important, and the evidence of their importance.

*Thesis proposal seminar,  
November 25, 2004*

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Studies of second language acquisition (SLA) indicate that communicative tasks can provide conditions and promote processes believed to facilitate L2 learning. Bygate, Skehan, and Swain (2001), Crookes and Gass (1993a, 1993b), Ellis (2003), and Skehan (1998) have reviewed work on tasks that asserts the importance of tasks for learners' language development and their implications for language teaching. This chapter examines communicative tasks in L2 learning by (1) defining and categorizing tasks, (2) discussing how task-generated oral exchanges in an EFL setting may promote interactive language use between teacher and students, and among students, (3) providing evidence on how communicative tasks facilitate language learning and providing related cognitive theoretical underpinning of learner involvement, (4) situating the present study within this framework, (5) conceptualizing the study under this framework, and (6) presenting the research questions of the study.

One area in which SLA researchers have used tasks in L2 classroom research is to study their generation of L2 *interaction* (i.e., “opportunities to engage in conversations in which other speakers modify their speech to match the learners’ communication requirements” (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 122)). Interaction is important because it promotes *negotiation of meaning* (i.e., “interaction between speakers who make adjustments to their speech and use other techniques in order to facilitate communication” (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 124)), which is argued to be a catalyst in L2 acquisition processes through both the language input and the feedback it provides to

learners. As Bygate, Skehan, and Swain (2001, p. 4) point out, “tasks may be used as a device to uncover the effective engagement of acquisitional processes”. In addition to promoting negotiation of meaning, interaction during communicative tasks enhances learner engagement and involves practice, both are important elements for language learning (Hulstjin, 2001; Hulstjin & Laufer, 2001; Laufer & Hulstjin, 2001).

### *Definitions and types of task*

‘Task’ has been variously defined. Kumaravadivelu (1993) presents definitions proposed by writers who exemplify two extremes: tasks as anything purposeful done in the classroom (Breen, 1984), and tasks as activity or practice of activities that learners are likely to do in the target language outside the classroom (Long, 1985, 1990). An influential definition is that of Nunan (1989), who defines the communicative task specifically as “a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (p. 10). Skehan, in a synthesis of the essential characteristics from other definitions, defines a communicative task as an activity in which:

- meaning is primary;
- there is some communication problem to solve;
- there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities;
- task completion has some priority;
- the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome.

(Skehan, 1998, p. 95)

Among these characteristics of communicative tasks, the relationship to real-world language use is problematic as researchers do not often talk about what the dimensions of that real-world relationship are. Tasks do not have to be real-world activities, but they should have a relationship to real-world activities, by employing the same cognitive activities. Long and Crookes (1992) discuss this issue and suggest that tasks should have a clear pedagogic relationship to real-world language needs. They see needs analyses as a means of identifying target uses of language and argue that classroom tasks should have a meaningful relationship to such language uses, and therefore be adapted from the real-world tasks. Skehan (1998) notes that such tasks, though desirable, are difficult to realize in practice. In this view, the emphasis should be on the cognitive processing demands that are made by the tasks.

Considering the different purposes for which tasks are used, Bygate, Skehan, and Swain (2001) suggest defining tasks based on their pragmatic/pedagogic, learning, and assessment purposes. McDonough and Mackey (2000) point out that “at the core of each definition is an emphasis on the communication of meaning” (p. 82).

Like these definitions, task types vary according to their characteristics and expected effects on performance. Ellis (2003) proposes a general framework with four design features and their key dimensions; these are input, conditions, processes, and outcomes (p. 217). Two more specific taxonomies emphasizing psycholinguistic elements are offered by Skehan (1998), and by Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993). Skehan’s taxonomy is based on task characteristics that are thought to alternatively promote fluency, accuracy, and complexity. Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993) categorize common types of communicative tasks according to certain features, in a

framework that is useful for classroom research comparing task types, which was used in the present study. Their task typology is based on two recurrent task features, *interactional activity* and *communicative goals*, expanded into four categories:

- 1) Interactant relationship of request and suppliance activities, based on which interactants hold, request, or supply information directed toward task interaction and outcomes.
- 2) Interaction requirement for activity of request-suppliance directed toward task outcomes.
- 3) Goal orientation in using information requested and supplied.
- 4) Outcome options in attempting to meet goals (e.g., convergent/divergent solution).

(Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993, p. 14-15)

They then differentiate five types of communication tasks based on these features. The first type is *jigsaw* in which each participant has information to share in order to complete the task, so the interactant relationship is two-way, and interaction is required to reach a convergent goal with a single outcome. The second one is *information gap*, which is similar to jigsaw except for the interactant relationship which is primarily one-way, because only one interactant holds information. The other three are *problem solving*, *decision making*, and *opinion exchange*. They are different from jigsaw and information gap in that the participants are not required to interact (interaction is optional) although they all have shared access to the information needed to complete the task. The differences among the three are in goal orientation and outcome options: whereas problem solving and decision making tasks have a convergent goal, an opinion exchange

task has a divergent one; and whereas the outcome of a problem solving task is closed, that of decision making and opinion exchange tasks is open. Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993) further report research evidence from multiple sources showing that *jigsaw* and *information gap* tasks, done in pairs or small groups, generate more interaction, more turns, and greater negotiation of meaning than the other three types. For them, these tasks provide “the greatest opportunity for students to interact, seeking comprehensible input and modify their output for communication” (p. 31).

Other research on task-based instruction concerning task features and task implementation has shown that different types of task goals lead to different cognitive operations carried out within the tasks and that these have an impact on L2 performance (e.g., Brown, 1991; Foster and Skehan, 1996); that is, different tasks lead via different cognitive processes to different outcomes. The linguistic and interactional characteristics of the meaningful oral exchanges generated from different kinds of communicative tasks are discussed in the following section.

#### *Linguistic and interactional characteristics promoting SLA*

Studies describing the discourse addressed to language learners by proficient speakers of the language have shown that it is characterized by systematic modifications from the norms of language addressed to other proficient speakers (Chaudron, 1988; Hatch, 1983; Gass & Madden, 1985; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). This occurs not only in daily life interaction, but also in L2 classroom interaction. An influential theoretical link between such discourse and SLA was provided by Krashen’s *input hypothesis* (1985). According to this hypothesis, L2 learners acquire new language by

understanding messages in that language in context. They do this by receiving what Krashen called *comprehensible input* which contains ( $i+1$ ); that is “by understanding input that contains structures at [their] next stage ( $i+1$ ) ... a bit beyond [their] current level of competence ( $i$ )” (p. 2) with respect to acquisitional sequences.

Numerous studies, inspired by the importance of oral language in L1 development, have looked at NSs', including teachers', language modifications and conversational interaction patterns used with NNSs both inside and outside the classroom (see review in Wesche, 1994). Among the types of oral language addressed to learners, *foreigner talk* (i.e., a cover term for modifications made by proficient- native or near native- interlocutors when communicating with language learners; in the classroom context it is called *teacher talk*) and *interlanguage talk* (i.e., language used among learners) are of particular interest here. Foreigner talk and interlanguage talk are common in the classroom context and are considered important sources of L2 input for language development.

#### *Foreigner/teacher talk*

Language modifications by proficient (often native) speakers addressing language learners are used primarily to make language comprehensible so that communication can take place. Long (1983a) distinguished this kind of discourse into *ungrammatical* foreigner talk, sometimes used by NSs with NNSs in temporary (spontaneous) non-equal status situations (where NNSs had very low L2 proficiency or social status) (Ferguson, 1971), and *grammatical* foreigner talk, generally used in the classroom (as found in *language teacher talk*) and in longer term NS/NNS relationships. The linguistic and

interactional adaptations for learners in this foreigner/teacher talk are also called *input* and *interaction modifications*, respectively. Most or all input and interactional modifications appear to have one or more of the following functions: to promote communication, to establish an affective bond, or to implicitly teach the language (Hatch, 1983). The adjustments made by native or near native speakers when addressing learners can make communication possible because the language becomes comprehensible for the learners. In addition, as the negotiation of meaning between the two occurs, a special affective bond may be established, which may further support language learning.

Wesche (1994) summarizes the kinds of linguistic modifications by NSs which have been identified at all levels of the communication system; i.e., speech rate, phonology, prosody, morphology, syntax, and vocabulary, as well as at the discourse level. These non-discourse categories now are generally referred to as input/linguistic modifications. Some early 'input' researchers also focused on modifications at the discourse level, with a major distinction between one-way (transmission) vs. two-way (interactional) discourse (Hatch, 1983). Features noted included the use of questions as topic initiating moves and of repetitions and paraphrases which may help learners' comprehension. Discourse modifications have become the focus of subsequent research on interactional modifications (below).

In general, the primary function of foreigner/teacher talk is to make language comprehensible for communication (Cullen, 1998). Foreigner/teacher talk with its modifications serves as important input for L2 students, guides students through classroom processes and activities, and provides explanations and feedback or correction

(Chaudron, 1988; Johnson, 1995; Kennedy, 1996; Lynch, 1996; Richards & Lockhart, 1994). These three purposes are interrelated and inseparable (see Tulung, 2004).

### *Interlanguage talk*

Interlanguage talk is the language that learners produce when addressing other learners, such as simpler vocabulary and shorter sentences. Many of the characteristics of foreigner talk are also found in interlanguage talk among NNS peers (Ellis, 1994). However, as may be expected, interlanguage talk tends to be less grammatical than teacher or NS-NNS talk. On the other hand, interlanguage talk among learners creates more opportunities for them to negotiate meaning than does foreigner talk (Pica & Doughty, 1985). Communicative L2 tasks help promote interlanguage talk, providing learners with practice using the target language and receiving feedback, which in turn may help develop learners' language knowledge and ability to use it. In this case, not only do learners practice their language/linguistic knowledge, but they also practice their discourse knowledge such as turn taking, topic initiations, etc.

Prabhu (1987), though, argues against interlanguage talk among learners for language development. He states that "sustained interaction between learners is likely to provide much less opportunity for system-revision ... [t]here will then be a risk of fossilization" (p. 81-82). Porter's (1986) and Garcia-Mayo and Pica's (2000) findings suggest that interlanguage talk may represent a relatively less rich environment for learners to receive feedback on their interlanguage output. As Adams (2007) points out, "while learner provision of feedback is generally low, there is always the possibility of miscorrections" (p. 48).

Despite these limitations of interlanguage talk, Long & Porter (1985) in their review of studies on interlanguage talk identified beneficial outcomes from combining small-group work (including pair work) with communicative tasks. The benefits are seen in the quantity of talk, negotiation, and comprehensible input obtained. Other studies have indicated that in interlanguage talk, learners receive opportunities to negotiate for meaning and to receive other's feedback (Gass & Varonis, 1985, 1989; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos & Linnell, 1996; Varonis & Gass, 1985), and opportunities to modify output (Garcia-Mayo & Pica, 2000). Furthermore, Adams' (2007) findings indicate that "learner-learner interactions did lead to learning of forms" (p. 42). Group dynamics also influence peer interaction. As learners interact, they relate with each other within the groups and patterns of interaction are developed, in which certain patterns are more conducive than others to language learning (Storch, 2002a, 2002b). Furthermore, Beebe (1985) argues that learners are "active participants in choosing the target language models they prefer and thus acquiring 'the right stuff' according to their values" (p. 404). In other words, they differentiate the model they will copy and are aware that classmates make errors. She further explicates how learners, depending on their feelings and motivations, may prefer or reject a certain model of the language being learned, and how this preference or rejection is highly affected by the social and situational context. Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, and Linnell (1996) reported on the effect of L2 learners' interaction with other learners compared to that with NSs with respect to their language exposure, language production, and feedback needs. They suggest both caution and optimism towards learners' interaction in the classroom: caution, because "learners are a somewhat limited source of modified input" (p. 80), and optimism, because of the

effectiveness of their feedback “in segmenting portions of each other’s utterances as signals for message comprehensibility and as models of L2 morphosyntax” (p.80).

When students share the same L1, as in most EFL settings, there is the issue of their using the L1 in interlanguage talk. In a study on the L2 composing process, Wang and Wen (2002) found that EFL Chinese learners, when asked to compose aloud on two tasks, had both their L1 and L2 at their disposal: “They were more likely to rely on L1 when they were managing their writing processes, generating and organizing ideas, but more likely to rely on L2 when undertaking task-examining and text-generating activities” (p. 225). Tarone and Swain (1995) put forward the case of immersion students who avoid using the L2 in the classroom as they move into higher primary grade levels, particularly when conversing with one another. They do this because “they do not have an appropriate L2 vernacular to use for peer-peer conversation” (p. 174), which to some extent may be related to Prabu’s (1987) counter argument of learner-learner interaction. Furthermore, Carless (2004) and Carless and Gordon (1997) report some concerns from the teachers in Hong Kong while implementing task-based language teaching about the learners’ use of the L1 rather than the L2. Belz (2003) deals with this issue of L1 use in the EFL classroom more thoroughly as she relates it with learner identity and deficiency.

Overall, it appears that in spite of its limitations and differences from foreigner/teacher talk, interlanguage talk is important for language development, both for its availability and particularly relating to the importance of negotiation of meaning for acquisition.

*Features of interactional discourse.*

As noted above, modifications can be classified into input/linguistic modifications and interactional modifications. The linguistic modifications, which range from phonological to syntactic features, can aid comprehension and help learners to participate in a conversation (Gass, 2002). They can also serve as canonical models (e.g., pronunciation of full forms). Long (1983b), however, claims that interactional modifications are more important for SLA because they are more extensive and occur more consistently. Interactional modifications can be divided into *discourse management*, or strategies, whose purpose is to avoid communication problems, and *discourse repair*, or tactics, whose purpose is to repair the discourse when communication breaks down. Ellis (1994) elaborates on this distinction. Discourse management includes the amount and type of information communicated, use of questions, here-and-now orientation, comprehension checks, and self-repetition by the proficient interlocutor. Discourse repair takes the form of negotiation of meaning, including requests for clarification or confirmation, self and other repetitions, self and other corrections, and feedback.

Lynch (1996), following other researchers (such as Long, 1983a; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, Berducci & Newman, 1991), provides brief definitions from the teacher's point of view of these widely studied interactional features:

- *confirmation check*, making sure that what you have understood is what the learner means;
- *comprehension check*, making sure that the learner has understood what you mean;

- *clarification request*, asking the learner to explain or rephrase;
- *repetition*, repeating your words or those of the learner;
- *reformulation*, rephrasing the content of what you have said;
- *completion*, completing the learner's utterance. (p. 47).

Another interactional feature that has been explored is *recast*, involving “the teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). Recast has proven a particularly important element in SLA (see Braid, 2002; Long, 1996, 2007; Mackey, 2007; Pica, 1994). Previous studies have shown beneficial effects of recasts on learner accuracy (e.g., Mackey & Philip, 1998) and that the usefulness of recasts also depends on learners’ attention control and analytical ability (Trofimovich, Ammar, and Gatbonton, 2007).

Gass (2002) asserts a further importance of negotiation, through which “the learner may direct attention to an area of the target language (1) about which she or he may be entertaining a hypothesis (or about which she or he is trying to formulate a hypothesis), or (2) about which she or he has no information” (p. 175), thus focusing the interaction on her or his current language learning. As a result, learning can occur during a conversation or a communicative task when learners negotiate meaning in their interaction or receive feedback about their production. This kind of learning, as Gass points out, can either be in the form of “on the spot learning” which takes place immediately, or delayed learning from stored input which needs some time to occur.

There is a consensus among researchers that negotiation of meaning is only facilitative in L2 development with *attention* or *noticing* of the target language form/meaning by the learner. As Gass (2002) points out, for interaction to have an effect,

“the learner must notice that his or her conversational partner is explicitly or implicitly making a correction” (p. 178). Thus, there must be a part of the language, either the pronunciation, vocabulary, or syntax, that triggers learners’ attention during an interaction and becomes an initial step for learning. The role of attention is central to an understanding of L2 development and consequently is crucial for instruction. As Schmidt (2001) states, “the crucial evidence that triggers changes in the unconscious system must be attended [to]” (p. 6). Reviewing other studies, he elaborates that attention to language exposure is necessary for temporary memory storage and hypothesis formulation/testing since it allows learners to see a gap in their language production. Interaction during communicative tasks can help learners to see gaps or differences in their language production that can facilitate their further L2 development.

#### *Evidence of SLA through communicative tasks*

Studies of SLA (e.g., Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; and Towell & Hawkins, 1994) have revealed that language learning is a non-linear and organic developmental process; students do not acquire the target language in the order it is presented to them but follow developmental sequences at different levels. The use of learner-tailored or learner-directed communicative tasks in the classroom accords with this contemporary view of language learning. According to Foster (1999), “giving learners tasks to transact, rather than items to learn provides an environment which best promotes language learning process” (p. 69). By transacting tasks, engaging in meaningful activities that focus on meaning and comprehensibility of the language, learners’ interlanguage is stretched and developed (Foster & Skehan, 1996).

Long's (1985) *interaction hypothesis* (an extension of the input hypothesis) has been one of the main rationales for using communicative tasks in the L2 classroom. According to Long, interaction facilitates SLA because of the conversational and linguistic modifications occurring in such discourse. Learners often negotiate meaning in communicative tasks to obtain mutual comprehension using a variety of strategies such as comprehension questions, clarification checks, and recasts: “[L]anguage learning is assisted through the social interaction of learners and their interlocutors, particularly when they negotiate meaning toward mutual comprehension of each other’s message meaning” (Pica, Kanagy & Falodun 1993, p. 11).

Several recent studies have empirically demonstrated that interaction containing negotiation and recasts can facilitate students’ language development (see Mackey, 2007). Using a pre-test, post-test design, these studies (e.g., Ellis & He, 1999; Mackey, 1999; Mackey & Oliver, 2002; Mackey & Philip, 1998; McDonough, 2005) have reported positive effects for interactional feedback on learning. The studies of question formation on adult L2 learners having different L1 (Mackey & Philip, 1998; Mackey, 1999) strongly suggest that students need to actively participate in interaction for question formation to develop. Mackey and Philip look at the effects of negotiated interaction, in this case recasts, on the production and development of question forms. They summarize their findings as: “learners at higher developmental levels who participated in interaction with intensive recasts showed a greater increase in structures at higher developmental levels than learners who participated in interaction without intensive recasts” (p. 351).

With a slightly different focus, Mackey (1999) aimed to test Long's interaction hypothesis claiming that "taking part in interaction can facilitate second language development" (p. 565). Her findings show that conversational interaction did facilitate L2 development, giving empirical support to Long's hypothesis. In her findings, students who actively participated in the interaction increased their stage or developmental level<sup>3</sup> and produced more frequent higher level structures. Also, the increase in developmentally more advanced structures was not an immediate effect, but a delayed one. This implies that learners may hold features in memory until they are developmentally ready (as noted by Gass, 2002).

Swain's (1985) *output hypothesis* also supports the use of task-based activities in the L2 classroom. This hypothesis claims that through the process of producing language (output), learners may be forced to focus on the syntax and morphology of the target language and then formulate a hypothesis about it. Thus while producing language, learners may become involved in negotiation with their interlocutors and get feedback from them; this provides an opportunity for learners to modify their utterances. In Swain and Lapkin's (1998) and Swain's (2001) studies, learners working together on collaborative writing tasks encountered linguistic problems and tried to solve them through negotiation and scaffolding. In this way, the students could use their knowledge about the language for their output, "allowing them to reflect on it, revise it, and apply it" (2001: 44). Such tasks provide students with learning opportunities as they notice gaps, externalize their knowledge, and participate actively.

---

<sup>3</sup> Referring to developmental sequences, i.e. "the order in which certain features of a language (for example, *grammatical morphemes*) are acquired in language learning" (Lightbown & Spada, 1999).

Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) propose a more recent theoretical construct related to vocabulary acquisition, namely *task-induced involvement*, bringing in the factor of motivation that has been lacking in cognitive theory. This is a motivational-cognitive construct, consisting of *need* (the motivational, non-cognitive dimension of involvement), and *search* and *evaluation* (the two cognitive dimensions of involvement). The basic assumption is that the degree of involvement in processing unfamiliar words in the task determines their retention. Hulstijn & Laufer (2001) provide some empirical evidence supporting this hypothesis. Results of their study of adult EFL learners in two countries show a relationship between the amount of retention and the amount of task-induced involvement load: “words that are processed with higher involvement load will be retained better than words that are processed with lower involvement load” (p. 552). In addition, vocabulary learning can occur when learners have paid attention to repeated encounters with given unfamiliar words in their different forms and meanings (elaboration) and have the opportunity to practice them (Hulstijn, 2001; Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001).

Several studies focusing on incidental vocabulary learning show students’ learning of vocabulary through communication (Joe, 1995, 1998; Newton, 1995). Joe (1995, 1998) investigated the effects of text-based tasks (requiring students to read a text and retell it afterwards) and generative processing (using new vocabulary items in new contexts) on vocabulary learning. The results show that engaging students in tasks that require them to read and retell but with no explicit focus on vocabulary can lead to their acquisition of vocabulary, and students who used the vocabulary in new contexts and structures (more generatively) in the retelling gained the most.

Newton's study (1995) examines the relationship of communication tasks with vocabulary gains by an adult ESL learner. He found that words were retained better when their meanings were negotiated with each other. He also argues that vocabulary learning opportunities occur through the use of and exposure to vocabulary provided in the worksheets for communication tasks. The study "provides important evidence of a learner incidentally acquiring a substantial amount of unfamiliar vocabulary from a communication task" (p. 171). Newton (2001) reemphasizes the importance of interacting with word meanings during task performance. While learners are attending to new words in meaningful contexts, they have opportunities to use them directly and have the advantage of recognizing the words when others use them in communication. In other words, practice or rehearsal is enhanced and potential elaboration may occur during communicative tasks, two important elements in vocabulary learning (Hulstijn, 2001).

In sum, interaction resulting from doing communicative tasks should promote L2 learning. Thus it is important to create tasks "that provide learners with opportunities to engage in meaningful interaction and to direct their attention to linguistic form" (McDonough & Mackey, 2000). This can be accomplished by giving learners the chance to control the discourse (Ellis, 1999) and by inducing tasks with a greater involvement load (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001). In this way, SLA can be facilitated. However, further research is still needed. Since task-based language teaching has also been adopted in EFL settings such as China (Gatbonton & Gu, 1994), Hong Kong (Carless, 2004; Carless & Gordon, 1997), and Thailand (McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007), and with the EFL context in mind, De Bot (2001) suggests that research should be conducted on "what, if any, interaction takes place in real L2 classrooms" (p. 603).

One of the few studies of interaction in communicative tasks conducted in an EFL setting is that of Gracia-Mayo and Pica (2000). Their study addresses issues dealing with the EFL classroom “as an environment that promotes input, feedback and the production of output for second language (L2) learning” (p.1). Based on their use of two communication tasks (information gap and decision making) with advanced adult learners, their findings supported the EFL classroom as a learning environment that can promote input, feedback, and output production. A more recent study by Pinter (2007) also shows some benefits of peer-peer interaction as two 10-year-old children with very low levels of L2 competence completed a spot-the-differences task in an EFL context in Hungary. However, these two studies were conducted in laboratory settings. As Hasan (2006) points out, there is surprisingly little research to date conducted in classroom EFL settings looking at the performance of NNS-NNS discourse using communicative tasks. The present study is to fill some of the gaps since it examines NNS-NNS discourse while completing communicative tasks in a working EFL classroom.

In this study the use of communicative tasks is explored as a means of promoting L2 learning through interaction in an EFL setting, as students are encouraged to interact meaningfully and to pay attention to linguistic form while doing tasks which can create the necessary conditions for SLA. Based on evidence mainly from ESL classrooms, it is expected that interaction during well-designed communicative tasks (e.g., by considering students’ needs) will help EFL students not only to comprehend the language learned, but also to produce it. Using communicative tasks should provide them with opportunities for learning through encouragement of negotiation of meaning and scaffolding that in turn facilitates acquisition.

In the present study I will describe the outcomes of communicative tasks in generating meaning-oriented interactive discourse in an EFL classroom, and explore links between such an activity and language use, students' attitudes, and in so far as possible, oral language development. My goal is to provide evidence regarding the pedagogic value of communicative tasks in an EFL setting.

### *Communicative tasks in the EFL classroom*

As noted in the previous sections, learners' exposure to L2 through teacher talk, materials in the language learned, and interaction with fellow students, should result in language development. There are, however, many variables to consider. Both the larger and the immediate social support and atmosphere for learning will vary. The input and interaction experienced by the learner will also vary depending on the teaching context. Different communicative tasks will also lead to different performance and outcomes (e.g., in fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary). In addition, individual learners may vary in the degree to which they benefit from the language exposure and interaction they have experienced from doing communicative tasks, depending on psychological factors, such as their cognitive abilities and their attitudes.

In contrast to the ESL setting, in an EFL setting exposure to and use of the L2 are mainly limited to the classroom environment. In addition, since most of the teachers are NNSs of English, a question may be raised about the quality and characteristics of the input they provide. As Li (1998) points out, such teachers tend to be limited in oral and sociolinguistic competence. Moreover, with teachers and students having a shared L1, it is difficult to engage them in communicative tasks without using the L1. Given teacher

fluency and experience in the L2, there is often a tendency to explain things in the L1 as well. Orland-Barak and Yinon's study (2005) of student teachers' perceptions of L1 use in the EFL classroom show that the teachers used the L1 for clarification, communication, and rapport purposes. In terms of the students who share the same L1 and have very limited access to L2, the question of attitude toward and motivation for L2 learning is prominent; negative attitudes and low motivation may negatively affect their language development. An advantageous EFL setting was chosen for the present study in order to minimize these common problems of EFL settings. The teacher was an experienced and very proficient NNS of English, and the students were pre-medical students who would have some eventual, work-related need for the English language and so to some extent were quite motivated.

Task design in the present study responds to learners' need to pay attention to L2 exposure first before comprehension, learning, and eventual production can take place. Gradually, through experience in using the L2, elaboration (e.g., analyzing aspects of a word's form and meaning), and practice, learners are likely to internalize some part or a near complete representation of the language they have been exposed to or used, and eventually be able to retrieve it automatically and externalize it through production. In order to analyze learner production generated from communicative tasks, it is desirable to focus on negotiation of meaning (Long, 1996; Pica, 1994) with its interactional features (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985). During communicative tasks, learners thus need to talk, to get their meaning across, and interact with the teacher and other students in order to construct new knowledge.

Two different types of communicative tasks were used in the study: jigsaw and decision making. Jigsaw requires each participant to share her/his different information to complete the task with a convergent goal and a single outcome. This particular task was chosen because earlier research has found that two-way tasks such as this are more likely to produce optimal conditions for negotiation of meaning (see Ellis, 2000; Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993). Decision making provides participants with the opportunity to share their opinions regarding the information they all have shared access to in order to complete the task with a convergent goal but an open outcome. Earlier research (see Ellis, 2000; Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993) has also found that since participants are required to reach a convergent goal, this task is likely to generate good negotiation opportunities, although one participant may do most of the speaking or participate in most of the negotiation of meaning.

Overall, communicative tasks provide learners with learning opportunities as they attend to elaborate and rehearse the language meanings and forms they are learning (see Hulstijn, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), in a social context which motivates them to use language to communicate new information. Such tasks guide students to do specific things that in a way are conducive to noticing, elaboration, and practice. As students work together on the tasks, being involved in the interaction, they may notice a gap in their understanding of the language item and attempt to solve it through negotiation, elaborating on aspects of the item's form and meaning, and helping each other. While negotiating meaning and completing the tasks, they are also practicing using the item. In other words, practice is increased with communicative tasks. Such interaction is an improvement over traditional learning activities which provide mere input exposure.

### *Conceptual Framework*

The conceptual basis for the present study is drawn from previous research on task-based communicative language teaching and on the role of interactive speech in SLA. Within this orientation, SLA is seen as an internal, individual, cognitive process (Long & Doughty, 2003). Or, as Zuengler and Miller (2006, p. 46) summarize Kasper's (1997) and Gass' (1998) views, "although social context can influence SLA, the SLA process itself is essentially cognitive" and learning is "largely an individualized mental process". In this position, the primary concern is with learner-internal changes of state or individual mental states and their changes (Gregg, 2003).

Communicative tasks are seen as a promising pedagogical approach due to their relationship to language learning. When learners work on tasks, they are engaging in meaningful activities and their focus is directed toward meaning and comprehensibility of the language, and so their interlanguage is developed (Foster & Skehan, 1996). While doing so, their learning is assisted through the social interaction arising among themselves and their interlocutors, specifically as they negotiate meaning in an attempt to reach mutual comprehension (Pica, Kanagy & Falodun, 1993). Within a supportive social context, the language development goal of communicative tasks is to create conversational interactions as the means for promoting SLA. Gass (2003, p. 224) points out that research on interaction "takes as its starting point the assumption that language learning is stimulated by communicative pressure, and examines the relationship between communication and acquisition and the mechanisms (e.g., noticing, attention) that mediates between them". Attention as one of the mechanism is important in understanding how the cognitive processes work in interaction (Gass, 1997, 2002, 2003;

Gass & Mackey, 2007; Long, 1996; Mackey, 2006a; Pica, 1994; Schmidt, 2001). As Gass and Varonis (1994, p. 299) state, “Attention allows learners to notice a gap between what they produce/know and what is produced by the speakers of the L2. The perception of a gap or mismatch may lead to grammar restructuring.” Schmidt (2001) and Robinson (2003) argue that in order for input to be internalized, learners must consciously notice it. More specifically, in terms of L2 lexical learning, learners’ attention on new vocabulary depends on “the quality and frequency of the information processing activities (i.e., elaboration on aspects of a word’s form and meaning, plus rehearsal), which determine the retention of new information” (Hulstijn, 2001, p. 275).

Furthermore, due to their characteristics, communicative tasks tend to be motivating and appealing to both students and teachers. These characteristics include meaning-focused, outcome-evaluated, and real world related (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan, 1998). While working on a task, students negotiate meaning to accomplish it, and then teachers evaluate students’ production based on the outcomes or accomplishments of the task. In addition, since the task is based on what students would do in real world activities, it motivates students the more. Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) suggest that by inducing tasks with a greater involvement load, SLA can be facilitated. As students have the need (the motivational factor of involvement) to achieve, referring to “a drive to comply with the task requirement” (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001, p. 14), their learning is facilitated through resulting search and evaluation processes, the cognitive/information processing factors of involvement, depending on their degree of involvement (see Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001).

In order to explore specific interactional features and characteristics of participants' oral discourse and their linguistic environment during communicative tasks, this study employed an interactionist approach drawing on cognitive perspectives. Pica (1994) claims that negotiation for meaning and the resulting interactional modifications can facilitate SLA because they generate certain processes and conditions for SLA to take place. These include exposure to language that is made comprehensible to the learner by the speakers they interact with, feedback from them on their language use, and the learner's noticing of his or her knowledge gaps in the L2. She further points out that negotiation occurs when learners and the speakers they interact with alert each other to problems in their communication and attempt to resolve the problems. Her model of negotiation, consisting of *trigger*, *signal*, *response*, and *closure*, is thus used in the present study to describe the interactional characteristics in the data. Long (1996) in his updated version of the interaction hypothesis states that "*negotiation for meaning*, and especially negotiation work that triggers *interactional* adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (pp. 451-452, italic as in the original). Following this framework, and like other interaction-based research, the present study attempts to describe processes that may lead to "L2 learning through learners' exposure to language, their production of language, and the feedback they receive on their production" (Mackey & Gass, 2006, p. 170), with a focus on "how learners use their linguistic environment, in particular *conversational interactions* to build their knowledge of the second language" (Gass, 2002, p. 171, italic as in the original).

Therefore, this study was framed within the interaction approach in which negotiation of meaning and its related interactional characteristics are claimed to facilitate SLA, and was carried out in the context of an EFL classroom. Attention as a key mechanism in understanding how the cognitive processes work in interaction, coupled with elaboration and practice, was applied in the study. As students complete the task, interaction among them occurs; and their attention during the interaction may be directed to something new, such as a new lexical item or grammatical construction, which promotes the development of the L2 (Gass & Mackey, 2007). All this, in addition to the motivational factor of need in learner involvement was appropriate to answer the research questions guiding the present study.

#### *Research questions*

Following the conceptual framework described above, taking into account the need for appropriate language models, as well as feedback, positive learner attitudes, engagement/involvement, attention, rehearsal, and practice, the study focused on how communicative language could be taught using tasks in an EFL classroom. Two communicative task types, jigsaw and decision making, were employed, both of which were expected to promote interactive language use, but it was important to see whether one would work better and under what circumstances.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What is the nature of EFL university students' oral discourse generated through the use of selected communicative tasks (jigsaw and decision making) in small

groups in terms of its interactive features? Does task type affect patterns of interactive language use? In what ways?

2. What are the main features of discourse used by the NNS teacher and what are the roles of her discourse during class sessions when the tasks were implemented?
3. What are the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes with respect to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method? Is there evidence of change in their perceptions and attitudes over the course of the semester?
4. Is there any evidence that communicative tasks may facilitate lexical development?

*Episode 3 back into the world of English as a foreign language*

About my project, so far so good ... This Friday was actually the first meeting in the class with the student participants. I joined the class for the whole session (the teacher introduced me in the beginning), and was given the last half hour to administer the consent form and the student questionnaire. There were 27 students; only one didn't sign the consent form ...

One thing I want to ask you is about using video camera in the classroom. I know I didn't put this in my ethics, but I think this will be a very helpful thing to do, particularly to see the big picture of the whole class interaction. It won't be for my main data collection. This is primarily for my back-up in case it's difficult to see what is happening just from the tapes. What do you think?

*Email message to MW, February 19, 2005*

Thanks for your informative message. It sounds as though things are going reasonably well, all things considered! The best thing is that you seem to have excellent cooperation on site.

I think the video is an excellent idea for the reasons you mention. You should clear it with Ethics, ... I suggest that you write to X asking about the procedure for a small amendment to data collection procedures and exactly what you must do. Tell her of the audio-audibility problem, your possibility of whole class' video filming, not for data collection per se, but as a back-up means for double checking ambiguities in the data – e.g., identifying who is speaking. Also mention that the teacher and administration are in agreement, that you expect all class members will accept it, given the almost unanimous agreement to participate in your study, and that you will get students' written permission to videotape. I don't see ... why Ethics shouldn't grant permission. Do you think the students will agree? That is, of course, key.

*Email message from MW, February 21, 2005*

Well, many things happened not as planned that sometimes made me frustrated ... I had to strategize, and I think this is part of the research; it was so messy. Anyway, three tasks were implemented in May, though I wasn't able to interview the sub-group every after task (only for tasks 1 and 2), and from 11 students participating in task 1, I lost 3 others (only 8 students participated in all 4 tasks).

*Email message to MW, May 29, 2005*

It sounds as though you got some data, in spite of all the challenges. It's always messy, and never quite what one expects or hopes. The important thing is to write everything down while you remember it ... Then catch your breath, and get ready for the long haul of organizing and making sense of it. Anyhow, I'll be around to help in August!

MJV is looking forward to meeting you and getting involved.

*Email message from MW, May 30, 2005*

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

The study was primarily designed to seek evidence regarding the pedagogical value of communicative tasks in an EFL setting. Within the topic of how communicative tasks might be used to generate interactive discourse in adult English language instruction in a foreign language classroom, the study examined the oral discourse EFL students and their teacher generated through carrying out selected communicative tasks. This chapter presents a detailed description of the research process undertaken, including the design, context, participants, tasks, instruments, data collection, data analysis, and trustworthiness of the study.

#### *Research Design*

This is a descriptive case study. Creswell (1998) defines a case study as “an exploration of a ‘bounded system’ or a case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed, in depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context” (p. 61). As a bounded system, what characterizes a case study is not the topic of inquiry, but the unit of analysis, which is a single entity (Merriam, 2002). The case can be an individual student or teacher, a classroom, a school or school district, a program, or an event. Furthermore, Merriam (2002) argues that by defining a case study as a bounded system, it allows for other qualitative strategies to be incorporated into the case. For purposeful sampling, I studied an ordinary and accessible case (Creswell, 1998) and selected the sample from which I expected to learn the most (Merriam, 1988). I observed

one specific classroom over a period of one academic term, in which a teacher implemented four selected communicative tasks in alternation with the more traditional (although there were some communicative activities, whole group, teacher-fronted activities were still dominant) curriculum.

The case study was used to examine an academic EFL classroom with respect to how communicative tasks generate oral discourse among the students and a non-native EFL teacher through interaction and to investigate the characteristics of this discourse. The study describes the students' task related oral (and supplementary written) language use during peer interaction in the L2 and that of the teacher during task performance. It also includes content analysis of this discourse and other data with respect to student and teacher attitudes toward communicative tasks, as well as students' lexical development.

The study involved one course section with one teacher and 27 students, and covered the sessions when they worked on selected communicative tasks as well as regular whole-group sessions. Thus, it is bounded by time and place to a certain schedule and classroom, and it fits Merriam's (1988) point that case study research is concerned with description and interpretation within a bounded context. A pilot study was conducted at the beginning of the course (i.e., during the second session), particularly for logistical and instrument refinement. Consequently, several decisions were made, including the use of manual tape recordings for small group discussions instead of the planned voice activated digital, the additional use of video recordings for the whole class during task implementation, teacher training/orientation before each task implementation, student guidelines on the use of tape recorders, and the choice of small groups of four with mixed gender (two females and two males) for task implementation (see below).

While observing the whole classroom for four months, I was present during all class sessions, approximately two hours per week, in order to establish rapport and to minimize the distance between myself and the participants. I did not intervene in classroom activities unless asked by the participants, particularly in the sessions during task implementation. I analyzed the audio-recordings of teacher discourse and interaction among a participant subgroup of eight selected students, made when the four communicative tasks were implemented. I closely followed these eight students as representatives of the class in order to examine their oral language use, vocabulary learning, and attitudes toward the tasks over time. I attempted to understand and describe their perspectives from observation of their language use during specific instructional activities and from their responses in individual/group debriefing after task performance and interviews. A case study of these eight students was developed, “not to represent the world, but to represent the case”, to understand its particularity and complexity (Skate, 1994, p. 245). What and how much may be learned from the case were examined and reported here in a comprehensive description. Due to the focus on a single unit and in response to the issue of generalizability, Merriam (2002) asserts that the reader must determine whether the case is transferable to other situations.

### *Research Context*

#### *Research site*

The research was conducted in university EFL classes for undergraduate medical students at a university in Manado, Indonesia. There are two dominant languages in Manado: Melayu Manado, a language that people speak in their daily life, and Bahasa

Indonesia, the national language of Indonesia that people use on formal occasions and for publications. Unlike Bahasa Indonesia, whose main function is for written communication, Melayu Manado is used primarily for oral communication in informal interaction, such as between family and friends, between employers and employees, for shopping, and in other everyday exchanges. It is occasionally mixed with Bahasa Indonesia in formal settings, such as classrooms or offices.

English is taught and learned at school as a foreign language. In the larger society, it is used only in places or occasions where people work with or talk to foreigners. However, exposure to the language is also available through TV programs, films, internet, and reading materials (textbooks and newspapers), though access to them is not equal for all students. The medical students participating in the present study were young adults, at an intermediate level of English proficiency, who had had English instruction at primary and secondary schools for about eight years. These students had already used and would continue to use English receptively in the form of written language, as they needed to read popular and academic English texts during their undergraduate studies. They would likely need productive oral/written English later during their internship and professional lives.

#### *EFL course for pre-medical students*

The research was carried out at the Language Center that offers English programs/courses for the university. The Communication Skills course consisted of 28 institutional hours and was taught once a week on Fridays for 14 weeks (one semester) from February 2005 to June 2005, two hours per session from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

The course was based on a textbook of nine units updated from the previous course and compiled together by the teaching staff at the Center. The main objective of the course was for students to be able to express personal information and complaints related to pain, to discuss diagnosis and treatments of illnesses in English, and to understand language functions, enhance vocabulary and pronunciation, and express ideas in accurate sentences.

The Communication Skills course was a non-credit, extra-curricular course, but required for the undergraduate medical students. They needed to pass the course as per the requirement of the faculty. The course was offered in the second semester for first year students and above. The students took a placement test administered by the Center before the course started in order to place them according to their proficiency levels. The placement test was in the form of a role play between a patient and a doctor dealing with common illnesses. Based on the test, the students were grouped by proficiency levels into five classes, ranging from 20 to 28 students per class, with five different teachers. The data collected for the research were taken from a class of intermediate proficiency level. The participant teacher was a NNS of English who shares the same L1 as the students and had had the experience of being a foreign language learner. In brief, the setting was English language education in a university in an EFL context.

In addition to a required attendance of 75% of the classes, the students needed to do assignments and two role-play exams to determine their success/failure in the course. The syllabus was organized according to different language functions (e.g., describing complaints, giving instruction and advice) with topics particularly tied to English for medical purposes. In other words, it can be considered as an ESP (English for Specific

Purpose) course. The activities were varied, ranging from matching sentences with pictures, listening to and completing written dialogues, completing and orally practicing dialogues, unscrambling dialogues, to role-playing and creating new dialogues. These were usually done individually or in pairs, and there was occasional language focus (i.e., grammar) for teachers to explain. A typical class usually began with the whole-group approach, with teacher explanation and individual vocabulary or listening exercises; continued with oral dialogue modeling/completing/practicing or role-playing, either in the whole group or in pairs; and, ended with students creating or performing their own dialogues in pairs.

### *The Existing Oral Method*

As observed, the existing oral method allowed the teacher to dominate the class time with her instructions and explanations, and the activities were heavily dependent on written models and simulated oral language. Examples of activities in regular classrooms employing the existing oral method are presented below based on four classroom observations using an adapted COLT protocol. These observations were conducted periodically during the semester when the communicative tasks were not implemented.

In the first observation, the teacher started the class by checking the students' answers on homework. Then, the students did several different activities including listening, speaking, and writing as well as a couple of matching exercises in vocabulary. Before each activity the teacher would give directions and explain vocabulary and grammar when necessary and as indicated in the lesson's 'language focus'. After each activity the teacher would check the students' work. In the listening activity, the students

had to complete a note and fill in a table after listening to patient-doctor dialogues on a tape. They did this individually first and then were asked to compare their work with that of another student before the teacher checked the answers. In the speaking activity, the students worked in groups of three to do a patient-doctor role play and perform it in front of the class. In the writing activity, the students worked in groups of three to make up questions in order to obtain information for a patient's case history. In the matching exercises, the students worked in pairs to match the suspected problems with suitable questions, and the medical terms for common symptoms with terms easily understood by patients. The teacher ended the class by assigning homework.

In the second observation, the teacher started the class by checking the students' answers on their homework. Then, the students did two similar activities, one involving integrated reading, writing, and listening skills, followed by writing. In each of the integrated activities, while working in pairs, the students had to read and complete a written conversation (one between two doctors and the other between a doctor and a patient), pertaining particularly to the doctor's questions. After the teacher checked their answers, they then read the completed version out loud while the teacher corrected their pronunciation and explained word meanings. In the writing activity, the students, working in pairs had to make up questions in order to obtain certain information from a patient. The teacher ended the class with an explanation of several grammatical points.

In the third observation, the teacher started the class by writing difficult words on the board and demonstrating or giving examples pertaining to their meanings. The students then did several listening/speaking activities and a reading/writing activity, and the teacher explained a couple of language focus points as indicated in the textbook. In

the listening/speaking activities, while working together, the students had to predict (based on the pictures) the order that a doctor would follow in examining a patient. Next, they had to listen to the teacher reading the conversation to check if their prediction was right. In the reading/writing activity, the students had to read a conversation between a doctor and a patient, and complete it, particularly regarding the doctor's instructions. They did this individually, then the teacher checked their answers. The teacher ended the class by giving homework for the students and informing them about the upcoming midterm test.

What was found in the fourth observation was different from the other three. The students had asked for a shorter class period due to overload in all their courses at the semester's end, which was granted by the teacher. Therefore, the class time was less than an hour compared to approximately two hours for each of the other classes. The other major difference was that there was no specific activity for the students to do. The teacher took up all the class time explaining the grammar supplement and the students listened to her explanation.

Overall, the existing oral method made use of some communicative activities since it employed various language skills, many of which were integrated when the students worked as they often did in pairs. However, as can be seen from the observations, the teacher still dominated the class time as she gave instructions and explained procedures, checked students' answers, and explained vocabulary or grammatical points. While the first two observations seemed to show a rather balanced class time between teacher talk and student talk as well as various skills practiced, the third observation seemed to show a more dominating participation of the teacher and

more listening by students, and the fourth observation (in which the teacher compressed the lesson into a shortened class period) shows complete domination of the teacher with only listening by students. In other words, the existing oral method may be said to employ a teacher-fronted approach to activities.

### *Classroom context*

The classroom was located on the first floor of a two-floor building. It was large and bright. The glass windows with cloth curtains covering the two large sides of the classroom made it visible from the outside. People passing by outside the classroom could see what the students and teacher were doing, and vice versa. Due to ventilation system, the classroom was not sound proof. The students and teacher could hear the noise from the outside of the classroom. There was one blackboard in the front of the classroom and the seating arrangement was lecture style. The students usually sat in rows facing the teacher, but when they were working in small groups, they moved the chairs and formed small circles. There was also a portable tape recorder at the teacher's desk, used for listening activities.

The whole class consisted of 27 registered students, 12 females and 15 males. However, class attendance varied every week and even during the class, due to the fact that four male Muslim students had to leave the class and miss part of each session to go to the mosque for Friday prayers. Eight of the 27 students, four females and four males, were the student participants who participated in all four communicative tasks.

### *Participants*

Two types of participants were involved in the study: 1) eight EFL students of a class of 27 undergraduate medical students enrolled in the Communication Skills course, and 2) one EFL teacher. The teacher and all her 27 students, except for one, consented to participate in the study. The student and teacher consent forms are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

#### *Student participants*

All the students in this class were categorized as having an “intermediate” English proficiency level based on the placement test. In addition, they had passed the Academic Reading course taken in the previous semester. Their ages ranged from 18 to 20 years and most of them were in their first year of study at the Faculty of Medicine. The eight student participants who were studied in depth were those who participated in all four tasks (in two or three groups with rotating members). As a group, they can be considered representative of the class because of their characteristics, which included a balanced mix of gender, having seven to nine years of English learning at school, having less than two years of English learning outside school, having experience or no experience with NS of English, and a range of ability in L2 academic reading. Specifically due to the range of L2 academic reading scores, students were classified by the teacher and researcher into “stronger” and “weaker” categories within this intermediate level of proficiency. These factors were insofar as possible considered in the formation of small groups for task implementation, so that each group would consist of mixed proficiency levels and gender.

The characteristics of the eight participants, elicited from a pre-questionnaire administered in the beginning of the course, are provided in more detail in Table 1 below.

Table 1 *List of student participants<sup>4</sup> with their characteristics*

Student/ Gender	Age	English Learning at school	English Learning outside school	Experience with NS of English	Final mark in English Academic Reading
F1	19	8 years	About 2 years	No	B (2.76)
F2	19	8 years	2 years	Yes	C (2.56)
F4	19	7 years	About 1 year	No	C (2.10)
F6	19	8 years	None	No	C (2.52)
M1	18	8 years	4 months	No	B (3.33)
M2	18	9 years	3 years	No	C (2.69)
M3	18	8 years	None	No	B (2.76)
M5	20	8 years	1 year	Yes	B (3.16)

Participant selection happened through an elimination process. When the first communicative task was implemented, of the 27 students, 12 attended the class and so 11 automatically became the student participants (minus the one who did not consent). Fortunately enough, they comprised a balanced number of female and male students, and also mixed levels of proficiency within the intermediate category of stronger and weaker students based on their L2 reading scores. The 12 were placed in three groups of four based on gender, the characteristics elicited from questionnaire responses and in consultation with the teacher. Each group was directed to choose a leader to manage or organize the group discussion. When the second task was implemented, one of the participants did not attend and so was eliminated. In this second task the then 10 student participants were placed in their previous three groups, with each group having a new member joining who was a non-participant. This time, the student participants were divided into two groups of four and one group of five, and the remaining students of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Student participants are identified with the initial of their gender and a number.

class or the other non-participants in one group of four and one group of five. In the third and fourth tasks another participant did not attend, respectively, and so was eliminated. The eight remaining student participants were rotated and placed in two groups of four in the third and fourth tasks, based on the same criteria of gender, characteristics, and in consultation with the teacher. The remaining students of the class were placed in three groups of four in Communicative Task 3, and two groups of four and one group of three in Communicative Task 4. These eight students, four females and four males, were the final selected participants since they participated in all four communicative tasks.

Table 2 below shows how the student participants were placed in groups, based on gender and intermediate proficiency level of stronger (S) and weaker (W) students, during the four communicative tasks that were implemented in turns between jigsaw and decision making task types. In the first and second tasks the student participants were divided into three groups of four (with the exception of Group 1 in Communicative Task 2, which had five students), each of which included one or two non-participants (with the exception of Group 1 in Communicative Task 1 without a non-participant). In the third and fourth tasks the student participants were in intact groups of four. Each group doing the four tasks appointed its own leader, who in almost all cases was a student with higher proficiency (with the exception of Group 1 in Communicative Task 2 and Group 2 in Communicative Task 3, the reason might be leadership ability). In general, the students tended to appoint the same leaders: M3 in three tasks and M5 in four tasks.

Table 2 *Group formation of student participants during communicative tasks*

<p><b>Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)</b></p> <p>Group 1: F1*, F2, M1, M2 S, W, S, W</p> <p>Group 2: F4, M3*, [F3, M4] W, S, [S, W]</p> <p>Group 3: F6, M5*, [F5, M6] W, S, [W, S]</p>	<p><b>Communicative Task 2 (Decision-Making)</b></p> <p>Group 1: F1, F2, M1, M2, [M7*] S, W, S, W, [W]</p> <p>Group 2: F4, M3*, [F3, F7] W, S, [S, W]</p> <p>Group 3: F6, M5*, [F5, M8] W, S, [W, S]</p>
<p><b>Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw)</b></p> <p>Group 1: F1, F6, M2, M5* S, W, W, S</p> <p>Group 2: F2*, F4, M1, M3 W, W, S, S</p>	<p><b>Communicative Task 4 (Decision-Making)</b></p> <p>Group 1: F1, F6, M2, M5* S, W, W, S</p> <p>Group 2: F2, F4, M1, M3* W, W, S, S</p>

Note: F = female; M = male; S = stronger; W = weaker; \* = leader; [ ] = non participants

### *Teacher participant*

The teacher was an experienced NNS EFL teacher. Like most of her students, her L1 was Melayu Manado. She had taught the course for several years. She was 65 years old with 33 years of English language teaching experience at the time of study. She had earned her highest educational degree, an M.A., at the University of Iowa, USA in 1982. Her command of English was near native like, and she was familiar with, and had previously used, communicative activities in her oral language courses. As a staff member at the Center, she had also received ongoing in-house training in English language teaching. (The Center, originally sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), offered frequent workshops and seminars conducted by various experts in the field of language teaching for its staff.)

## *Tasks*

### *Selection of task types*

Two types of pedagogical tasks were selected for the study; each type was implemented twice with small groups of approximately four students. The task types were *jigsaw* and *decision making*. They were selected because it has been shown in the literature that these two task types are effective in promoting language learning (see Ellis, 2003; Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993). Jigsaw requires each participant to share her/his different information to complete the task with a convergent goal and a single outcome. This particular task was chosen because earlier research has found that two-way tasks such as this are more likely to produce optimal conditions for negotiation of meaning (see Ellis, 2000; Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993). Decision making provides participants with the opportunity to share their opinions regarding the information they all have access to in order to complete the task with a convergent goal but an open outcome. Earlier research (see Ellis, 2000; Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993) has also found that since participants are required to reach a convergent goal, this task is likely to generate good negotiation opportunities, although one participant may do most of the speaking or participate in most of the negotiation of meaning.

These jigsaw and decision making tasks had not been used with the students for this specific course prior to the study. As pointed out, jigsaw tasks have a single outcome and provide each student with part of information in a text that s/he needs to share to complete the task. Decision-making tasks provide each student with the same information needed to complete the task, and have a number of possible outcomes. Thus, while working in small groups, the students were encouraged to talk about topics in

the texts, and needed to get their meaning across through interaction and to work together to solve problems. Furthermore, since the context of the study was in an EFL setting, where language exposure and opportunity for production outside of classroom were limited, I considered it desirable to provide students with reading texts as a basis for their oral discourse generation. Previous research has argued that through the use of and exposure to vocabulary provided in the worksheets for communication tasks vocabulary learning opportunities occur (Newton, 1995). In this case the written texts provided students with the language they needed to communicate in different medical contexts. As the reading materials included specific medical terminology, they enabled interactive practice of more difficult language.

#### *Adaptation and Development*

In preparing the tasks, I reviewed the regular Communicative Skills course materials and methods, and adapted them to create the four reading-based communicative tasks. While the modifications made to the materials in the current textbook in creating the two jigsaw tasks were considerable, only minor modifications were needed for the two decision making tasks, since this type of task was already employed in the newly updated textbook. In order to create the jigsaw tasks, the written dialogues or written information on patients in the textbook, which were intended to be read or listened to and completed, were first turned into patients' cases with basic information (e.g., name, age, gender, complaints, diagnosis, and treatment). This information was then reorganized into written notes for each student in a group providing complementary partial information about each patient. A patients' information table was also created to be filled

in by the group. Each student would have a note with different information to share in order to complete the patients' information table. As for the decision making tasks, the adaptation was only in the instruction part to accommodate the design of small group and task procedures, because the activities employed were already oriented toward decision making.

The two jigsaw and two decision making tasks were designed for small group discussion with approximately four students. In addition, each task included a pre-task activity consisting of several open-ended content-related questions to activate students' background knowledge regarding the specific topic of the task. A post-task activity, consisting of a set of open-ended questions for students to reflect on their learning during the particular task, was completed in the L1. The main task was based on reading texts presenting different medical topics; for jigsaw the reading texts were modified from the textbook, and for decision making they were taken from the existing text. While the reading texts were relatively brief in the jigsaw tasks, since they consisted of different chunks of information for each student, they were relatively extensive in the decision making tasks. Much of the content-related language in the reading texts of both task types was specific to medicine-related topics and quite specialized. Examples of the non-modified activities in the text and their alternate forms as jigsaw and decision making tasks are provided in Appendix C and Appendix D, respectively. The outcomes of these two types of tasks are compared with each other in terms of the oral language they generated, and with the existing oral method with regard to participants' perceptions of their advantages and disadvantages, management of vocabulary difficulties, use of L1, and use of new vocabulary.

### *Implementation*

During one semester (14 Fridays with classroom sessions of two hours each, from February to June) of the Communicative Skills course, students participated in four communicative tasks. Each task, including the pre- and post-task activity, was implemented in one two-hour class session, involving peer interaction in a small group discussion. These tasks, using reading texts as a basis for oral discourse generation, provided students with vocabulary used in different medical contexts, and stimulated and enriched their conversational discourse. The use of discipline-related communicative tasks is particularly relevant in the EFL setting where exposure to and opportunity for interaction in the L2 are limited. Students needed to use new medical vocabulary from the reading texts to complete the tasks. So, instead of practicing and creating modeled dialogues, as in the existing oral method (which were used alternatively for certain units), students doing communicative tasks in the adapted units were encouraged to talk about the topics in the texts, and needed to work together to solve problems and to get their meaning across through interactive discourse. In other words, all students took an active role in completing the tasks.

As well, due to this design of reading-based communicative tasks, the teacher had a different although still active role to play. Before each task implementation, I explained the purpose and features of the task to the teacher and we discussed its procedures and activities. During the task implementation, the teacher worked as a facilitator who made sure that the students understood what was expected of them when doing the tasks; that is, the students had to participate actively in reading, writing, listening and speaking to complete the tasks. She provided help as needed and always encouraged them to

participate. She also monitored the small group discussions as she moved around the class while the students were working on the tasks. After the small group discussions were finished, she led and interacted with the students in the whole class discussion to review the groups' answers and to reach some possible consensus.

The activities varied, depending on task type, and students played important active roles in task completion, either as a leader or a group member. While the leader managed or organized, as well as participated in the discussion, the group members basically participated in it. In the jigsaw tasks, students worked together to complete tables based on different information provided to each one of them. Students enacted a balanced role as initiators and responders in facilitating the discussion, with the leaders and the members of the groups usually taking turns asking and responding. Response in a timely manner was absolutely necessary to task completion. In the decision making tasks, students worked together to decide on cases based on the same text. The leaders usually enacted the role as the initiators to prompt the discussion, and the other members as the responders, but not necessarily. They could choose when to respond, or not at all. Each task lasted for two hours at the most and this was the time allocated for each session. In terms of the leadership appointment, students were allowed to appoint their own group leaders. However, not until the first task was completed were they directed to do so. Consequently, while in the other three tasks the leaders were appointed by the group members at the beginning of the discussion, this was not the case in the first task where the leaders emerged after some time during the discussion.

### *Instruments*

As Merriam (1988) indicates, in qualitative case study research, “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (p. 52). Consequently as the researcher, I was the one who collected all the data. In order to have a holistic analysis, I collected data from multiple sources, from the questionnaires to the interview, as explained below. The current study describes the nature of the oral language produced by the teacher and students as well as peer interactions which occur as students complete different types of communicative tasks over a four-month period. It also looks at the relationship between the language students produced and their learning of new words introduced by the readings, the teacher, or peers. The instruments for data collection were as follow.

- 1) *Questionnaires* were administered at the beginning of the study to the teacher and all her students, and at the end of the study to all students. The *Teacher Questionnaire* (Appendix E) elicited information about her background, including educational and working experiences, and her beliefs about effective oral language teaching and learning. The *Student Pre-Questionnaire* (Appendix F) elicited information about their educational and background knowledge, and their beliefs about effective language learning. Both questionnaires were designed to learn about the participants’ initial attitudes toward and perceptions of communicative activities. Following the last task, the students completed the *Student Post-Questionnaire* (Appendix G), which elicited information about any changes in their attitudes toward and perceptions of communicative tasks. While

the *Teacher Questionnaire* was in English (the L2), the *Student Pre- and Post-Questionnaires* were in their L1, Bahasa Indonesia.

- 2) *Teacher-whole group classroom observations* were conducted periodically throughout the semester and recorded through a timed observation protocol adapted from the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) scheme Part A designed by Spada & Frohlich, 1995, which can be found in Appendix H. This protocol included a set of categories to observe. It was particularly intended for observation of participant organization (the way in which students were organized), content (referring to the subject matter/themes of activities), content control (who selected/determined the topic/task), and student modality (various language skills involved in an activity). It also framed the description of significant interactional patterns and language use, and allowed clarification of different phases and activities in the classroom. This protocol was used four times during the implementation of four regular units as a baseline for seeing how the communicative task implementation was different. Thus the description of the existing oral method was mainly based on this instrument. However, it was impossible to use it during communicative task sessions due to my indirect involvement in task implementation.
- 3) *Video recordings* of the whole class during the four classroom communicative task sessions were deemed important as an additional tool for observation of the participants' behaviors during task implementation. One video camera set on tripod was used when each task was implemented. It was placed behind the students and directed at the centre of the room capturing the interaction of most

students. Occasional moves and random zooms were done particularly when the students were discussing in small groups. These video recordings helped in clarification of different phases and activities in the classroom when the tasks were implemented. They were informal observations, particularly used as a basis of the field notes to literally see the dynamics of the classroom when viewed again and to get an impression of how the implementation of the communicative tasks was different from that of the regular units.

- 4) *Transcripts* of the four audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, including *small group work* of the eight student participants and *teacher discourse (in small group and whole class settings)*, were the primary data for analysis of the classroom discourse (interactive features; meaning negotiation). Manual audio recorders were used, with the teacher wearing a small microphone attached to a tape recorder and each small group recording its own discussions. While the teacher's transcripts included her talk/interaction from the beginning of a class to the end of the task, the students' transcripts consisted of their talk/interaction in small groups while completing the task. Thus, there are a total of four teacher transcripts (Communicative Tasks 1, 2, 3, and 4) and a total of 10 small group transcripts (three of Communicative Tasks 1 and 2, and two of Communicative Tasks 3 and 4). The later included the transcripts of the eight student participants working on the tasks in their groups.
- 5) *Reflective written comments* of the same specific open-ended questions were elicited from the whole class, as part of the task (Appendix I), and from the teacher (Appendix J) after each task implementation in order to explore their

attitudes, perceptions, and self-reported learning. This commentary about what they thought they had accomplished and learned when doing the particular task was completed in the L1 for the students and in the L2 for the teacher.

- 6) *Transcripts of introspective debriefing sessions* with the eight student participants were elicited after the first and second tasks, representing one example each of a jigsaw and decision making task. They were conducted for clarification and elaboration purposes on the reflective comments, particularly to find out students' attitudes and perceptions regarding communicative tasks, and their self-reported learning. These debriefings were conducted four times (twice after each task) per individual outside the classroom, accommodating students' busy schedules, and most of them were done one on one. Of the two debriefings after each task, one was based on the students' reflective written comments from the post task and the other on several excerpts of the students' small group discussions. These debriefings (32 in total) focused on the students' language use, attitudes toward and perceptions of the task, and self-reported learning. They were carried out and transcribed in Melayu Manado and/or Bahasa Indonesia (L1), and then translated into English (L2). They were the primary data for analysis of the participants' attitudes toward and perceptions of communicative tasks.
- 7) An *interview* with the teacher was done a couple of days after the last task implementation to explore her attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of communicative tasks, and change in attitudes and perceptions over time. It was conducted in English (L2) and then transcribed.

## *Data Collection*

### *Procedures*

During the data collection and analysis, my insights and perspective have been informed by my own experience teaching English, my interaction with the teacher participant as a fellow colleague, and the fact that I share both Melayu Manado and Bahasa Indonesia with the teacher and student participants. Thus I know the nuances of meaning and use of these languages. By 2005, when the study was conducted, I had taught EFL at the Center for four years and had been involved with the teacher in the preparation of an earlier version of the course. Together with the teacher and other teaching staff at the Center, I was also involved in compiling the current textbook and in administering the placement test to the students prior to the course. During the data collection phase, I attended classes as a non-participant observer, to observe use of the regular method. However, during task implementation, I had a more active role in group formation and task management (the teacher would ask me for advice once in a while). In addition, occasional interactions with the students occurred as I moved around in the class to make sure the tape recorders used by each small group were functioning properly.

The data collection procedures, including task implementation, were conducted during the Communication Skills course for four months from February to May 2005. The chronological procedures of data collection are presented in Table 3 below, based on the class schedule of all Fridays, unless indicated (\*), during the four-month period.

Table 3 *Chronological procedures of data collection*

Date	Classroom and Research Activities
Feb. 18	<i>Session 1:</i> Unit 1 – 23 students Administering Consent Forms and Questionnaires
Feb. 25	<i>Session 2:</i> Unit 1 (Continued) – 26 students Conducting Pilot Study
March 4	<i>Session 3:</i> Unit 2 – 15 students Observation of Regular Method
March 11	No Class (Holiday for the Hindus)
March 18	<i>Session 4:</i> Unit 2 (Continued) – 10 students Observation of Regular Method
March 25	No Class (Holiday for the Christians)
April 1	<i>Session 5:</i> Unit 3 – 12 students Task 1 Implementation (Jigsaw)
April 8	<i>Session 6:</i> Unit 4 – 3 students Observation of Regular Method
April 15	<i>Session 7:</i> Midterm Test – 27 students Debriefings on Task 1 with the student participants outside the classroom
April 21*	Debriefings on Task 1 with the student participants outside the classroom
April 22	No Class (Holiday for the Muslims)
April 29	<i>Session 8:</i> Unit 4 (Continued) – 8 students Observation of Regular Method Debriefings on Task 1 with the student participants outside the classroom
May 6	<i>Session 9:</i> Unit 4 Special Project – 22 students Task 2 Implementation (Decision Making)
May 13	<i>Session 10:</i> Unit 6 – 20 students Task 3 Implementation (Jigsaw) Debriefings on Task 2 with the student participants outside the classroom
May 20	Class cancelled due to a mandatory event at the Faculty
May 27	<i>Session 11:</i> Unit 9 – 19 students Task 4 Implementation (Decision Making) Debriefings on Task 2 with the student participants outside the classroom
May 30*	Interview with the Teacher

### *Challenges*

From Table 3 above, one may anticipate some challenges that occurred during the data collection. In fact, there were three main challenges that made it difficult to proceed as planned: scheduling issues, the credit status of the course, and technical issues in data gathering. First, the scheduling of the course by the Faculty of Medicine was for Fridays from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Due to this appointed day, there were extra intervals between some sessions, as classes were cancelled on three official holidays and a couple of mandatory occasions at the Faculty. Consequently, of the supposed 16 sessions over a semester, only 14 sessions were held. These fewer sessions affected the course in general. In addition, due to scheduling on Friday midday, four Muslim students of the class had to leave each session at about 12:00 to go to the mosque for prayers. Consequently, they could not participate completely in class activities and had to be excluded from data collection.

Another problem related to the scheduling of the course was its venue. It was held at the Language Center located on the main campus of the University, but far away from the Faculty of Medicine campus. Most students who did not use private cars had to take the minibus (local transportation) with one change in route to come to the Center from their campus where they had their earlier classes. Consequently, not all students came in on time for the course and though the teacher allowed some time before the class began, a few would come much later. This particularly affected the formation of small groups when a task was implemented. As far as the student participants were concerned, it affected one particular group during Communicative Task 2 implementation. This

group had to have five members because one of the student participants came late after the teacher and I had appointed another student to be in the group.

The second challenge was the nature of the course that affected the priority students gave to it. As a non-credit, extra curricular, although required course, students preferred to give their priority and concentration to other courses in their program. In their busy schedules as pre-medical students, they tended to ignore the importance of attending the course more than the 75%, as required, in order to pass. As can be seen in Table 3, attendance was varied and only once did all students attend, which was the session when the midterm test was administered. This attendance problem affected the task implementation schedule. Due to low class attendance, Communicative Task 1 was postponed once and Communicative Task 2 was postponed twice (during which time the observation of the regular method took place). Consequently, instead of implementing the four tasks two to three sessions apart as planned, Communicative Task 1 was implemented in Session 5 when the number of students was large enough to form three small groups of four (and these students then became the basis of the student participants), and Communicative Tasks 2, 3, and 4 were implemented subsequently in Session 9, 10, and 11. The attendance also affected the selection of the sub-group since it was based on participation in all four tasks and consequently some potential participants were eliminated. After Communicative Task 1, one student did not attend when Communicative Tasks 2, 3, and 4 were implemented, respectively. Consequently, from the 11 students selected as the initial student participants, only eight students were left as the final student participants.

Another problem that affected class attendance and task implementation was the scheduling of the debriefings with the sub-group. Of the planned debriefings on and after each task, only the debriefings on Communicative Tasks 1 and 2 could be conducted. Furthermore, they were done according to students' availability, and so not ideally right after the task was implemented. Consequently, the debriefings on Communicative Task 1 were done on three different days within two, three, and four weeks apart, and the debriefings on Communicative Task 2 were done on two different days within one and three weeks apart. Fortunately, the debriefings on these two tasks covered both task types employed in the study, and there were 2 debriefings conducted for each task, one based on each student's reflective comments and the other based on several excerpts involving that student in the small group discussion during task implementation.

The third challenge experienced during data collection was the audio recording of the small group discussions when the tasks were implemented. Based on the pilot study, manual tape recorders were used instead of voice activated digital ones since those picked up background noises too strongly. Each small group had its own manual recorder placed centrally on a chair. However, not all their utterances were recorded. Participants were supposed to turn on the tape whenever they started working on a task, giving a small introduction of the members of the group and recording the whole discussion on the task, whether it was done in the L2 or L1. In spite of this direction, each group turned off the tape once in a while, especially when they were using the L1 (as they later admitted). This was done more often in Communicative Tasks 1 and 2 than in Communicative Tasks 3 and 4, since I emphasized that they should not turn off the tape during a task and I also moved around when the task was being completed.

However, I could not determine for sure the exact amount of time that each group had turned off their recorder.

Another problem related to the audio recording of the small group discussion was the intelligibility of the recordings. Two aspects pertaining to this problem were sound audibility (what the word/phrase/sentence was) and voice recognition (who said what). In terms of sound audibility, there were times during small group discussion when a word/phrase/sentence was inaudible due to the way it was said, for instance when it was whispered or said far from the tape range. Consequently, inaudible parts were excluded from the data. In terms of voice recognition, there were times when it was difficult to recognize whose voice it was, particularly when it was weakly recorded or when two voices had similar tones. One specific example was when listening to a group of three females and one male completing Communicative Task 2 (a formation due to class attendance). Consequently, a decision was made from the introductory part of every recording as to which voice belonged to which student. While this problem had a solution, it complicated the data transcription process since conscientious and repeated listening was needed.

### *Data analysis*

This study sought to answer four research questions on the use of communicative tasks in an EFL classroom by an experienced NNS teacher and her university students. The first research question dealt with the nature of the oral discourse generated by students in small group discussions through the use of jigsaw and decision making tasks in terms of interactive features. The second one examined the main features of the

discourse used by the teacher and the roles of her discourse. The third one dealt with the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes with respect to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method. And the fourth research question looked for evidence that communicative tasks might facilitate lexical development.

Typical of qualitative case study is ongoing analysis while the data is being collected (Merriam, 1988). While a small amount of group discussion was transcribed for use in the debriefings on Communicative Task 1, the rest of the data were transcribed later on and organized based on the sources and within categories. Discourse and content analysis were used for category construction in relation to the research questions. Due to the multiple sources of information collected, a general strategy was used for analyzing the data based on theoretical propositions (Yin, 2003). The data were analyzed inductively through repeated readings of the data and coding of predetermined and emerging categories. Following Creswell's (1998) procedures of data analysis spiral, it began with data collection, data managing, reading, describing/classifying/ interpreting, and ended with representing and visualizing. I thus identified, noted, and categorized recurrent themes. However, a much more complex process of analysis took place since the data were taken from multiple sources, including oral and written forms, and were collected in English (L2) and Melayu Manado or Bahasa Indonesia (L1). The oral data consisted of audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions (both student and teacher discourse), student debriefings, and the teacher interview, which were the primary data of the study. These were first transcribed and, when applicable, translated into English. Then a few run-throughs were conducted to identify and code the interactive

features and recurrent themes revealed in the data. These were then classified, categorized, and interpreted for presentation.

Data transcription was carried out using the conventions summarized in Table 4 below. Thus, examples from the transcripts in this thesis follow these conventions.

Table 4 *Transcription conventions*

# on the left margin	line counts by five
T	the teacher
S	an unidentified student
Ss	more than one unidentified student
M	male student
F	female student
# after M/F	student identification
/ between students	when it was difficult to determine who said an utterance
[ in front of students	when two students said an utterance simultaneously
<b>Bold</b>	when an utterance was read from a text
<i>Italics</i>	when an utterance was in the L1
<i>(Italics)</i>	when an utterance was translated into the L2 equivalent
/.../	when an utterance was written as pronounced
(...)	when additional information was given
{...}	when certain analysis was provided
[...]	when an utterance was added
...	when an utterance was omitted

A detailed analysis of the oral language generated through peer interaction was used to answer Research Question 1. The nature and content of the students' oral discourse was examined from three perspectives, namely the amount of language generated, the kind of language generated, and the kinds of interactions that occurred.

The first analysis dealt with word counts, which were applied to see how much language was generated. Students' L2 oral production was differentiated between spontaneous language use and language use while reading/partial reading. Their L1 use was also described.

The second analysis concerned interactive features of recorded student discourse, which were identified and counted to see the kind of language that was generated. In this case, the focus was on discourse moves based on Larsen-Freeman and Long's (1991, p. 126) taxonomy of conversational adjustments, including questions for topic initiations, repetition, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, clarification requests, decompositions, and left dislocations. Due to other observed moves from the data and based on Pica and Doughty (1985), this list was expanded to include statements for topic initiations, direct answers, extended answers, comments, confirmations, comprehensions, self corrections, peer corrections, peer completions, extended wh-questions, extended yes/no questions, extended or-questions, extended imperatives/requests, uptakes from peer, and uptakes from teacher. Taken together, they were all classified within seven appropriate categories (except for repetition, which was analyzed separately because of its complex nature that inherently included the other functions of discourse moves). The seven categories were topic initiations (to initiate a new topic or a new interlocutor), responses (to respond to a question asked directly/indirectly or to a situation), comprehension facilitation (to facilitate one's own or another's comprehension), completions (to complete one's own or another's utterance), corrections (to correct one's own or another's utterance), extended questions (to ask for further information/more explanation), and uptakes (to repeat the other's corrective utterance in order to correct one's own utterance). Added to these categories were reading-based moves, whenever applicable. A taxonomy of discourse moves was therefore created. Details can be seen in Appendix K.

Instances of such interactive language features in the form of these discourse moves were sought, coded, counted, and analyzed to give evidence of the outcomes of the two communicative tasks as well as any marked differences between the outcomes of the two task types. Two run-throughs of all the data were conducted in the coding of the discourse moves, and a third one was done specifically for the analysis on repetition (self and other repetition). After a 14-months period had elapsed, 10% of the data (one of the ten transcripts of the small group discussions) was coded again for the purpose of intra-rater reliability, and it revealed a 95% agreement. See Appendix L for an example of coded transcript of a jigsaw task and Appendix M that of a decision making task.

The third analysis dealt with turns and negotiation cycles, which were counted, described, and analyzed to see the kinds of interactions that occurred and clarify the content of student discourse. Pica's (1994) negotiation model consisting of trigger, signal, response, and closure was applied. The data sources for this discourse analysis were transcripts of audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, that is, the small group discussion of the eight student participants.

Teacher discourse, in contrast to the detailed analysis of student discourse, was described and analyzed to answer Research Question 2, focusing on the main features of her discourse, its roles, and task differences in her discourse. The data sources for this analysis were transcripts of audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, that is, the teacher talk. The data were analyzed inductively through repeated readings.

A separate focused content analysis was undertaken to answer Research Questions 3 and 4. Thematic content analysis of the transcripts noted evidence of students' and teacher's attitudes and perceptions with regard to the two types of

communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method, and of students' self reported learning. The data sources for Research Question 3 were from questionnaires, excerpted transcripts of audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, reflective comments, transcripts of introspective debriefing sessions, and an interview. The data sources for Research Question 4 were exclusively taken from excerpted transcripts of audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, transcripts of introspective debriefing sessions and reflective comments to explore how attention, practice/rehearsal, and involvement lead to vocabulary learning. Thus, the analysis was descriptive, examining overall patterns of participants' interaction, perceptions and attitudes as they evolved over time. The analyzed data are reported in accordance with qualitative case study research (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1988). The findings cover a detailed, thick description of the case, an analysis of themes and issues, which were identified, and an interpretation.

### *Trustworthiness*

Instead of emphasizing the generalizability of the findings, qualitative researchers strive for accurate and detailed description of analysis and interpretation of a phenomenon. The trustworthiness of a study is the key construct in establishing the credibility of a study (Creswell, 1998). This is done through verification, occurring throughout data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

As part of the verification procedure in case study research, Stake (1995) argues for triangulation and member checks. I concentrated on triangulation, making use of multiple data sources in order to present a number of themes or perspectives that illuminate the research questions. The use of discourse and content analysis also

contributed to this aspect of triangulation. It particularly provided distinct perspectives on the findings for Research Question 4. In addition, data sources included written reflective comments from the teacher and student participants, introspective debriefing sessions with student participants, and an interview with the teacher, which delineated participants' perspectives. Finally, rich description of the participants and setting under study was sought to allow readers to transfer information to other similar contexts.

In terms of member checking, this was conducted in data collection during student debriefings and the teacher interview. I verified with the participants, asking for clarification and further elaboration on their reflective comments and several excerpted transcripts of communicative task sessions during the debriefings and interview. Unfortunately, further member checks after data analysis were very difficult to conduct due to unavailable, distant communication with the student participants. Only further member checks with the teacher participant were possible, and so conducted.

Other verification procedures were conducted for data analysis, that is, verification of transcript data. Samples of transcripts of the audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, consisting of one transcript of teacher discourse implementing a task, one transcript of small group discussion working on jigsaw, and one transcript of small group discussion working on decision making were verified by another graduate student who had several years of ESL and EFL teaching experiences. The verification of the transcript of teacher discourse revealed a 97% agreement, that of small group discussion working on jigsaw revealed a 99% agreement, and that of small group discussion working on decision making revealed a 98% agreement.

*Episode 4    worlds collided*

I am

Who am I? What am I?

Let me think ...

I am a mother

I am a wife

I am a daughter

I am a sister

I am a student

I am a teacher

I am a friend

And

I am a stranger

What autonomy!

Who am I? What am I?

Let me think ...

I am my children's mother

I am my husband's wife

I am my parents' daughter

I am my sister's sister

I am my professors' student

I am my students' teacher

I am my friends' friend

And

I am my strangers' stranger

What a commitment!

Who am I? What am I?

Let me think one more time ...

I am myself and yet other

I am other and yet myself

What a balancing act!

In an effort for a balanced life, while buried in the data and trying to organize, transcribe, analyze, code, describe, and make sense of it, I was overwhelmed, perplexed, confused, tired, and ... a thought of quitting sometimes crawled in. But, I found that making decisions was key to escape from these colliding worlds.

*Recollection on years 2005,2006,2007,  
December 2007*

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

The main purpose of the study was to explore the nature and content of the EFL student and teacher discourse that arose from doing communicative tasks, in this case jigsaw and decision-making tasks, as it might relate to language development and attitudes towards the tasks. This study sought to find out how well the two task types worked in promoting interactive language use, how they were different, and what roles the participants were playing. In other words, it sought evidence regarding the pedagogic value of communicative tasks in an EFL setting. The analysis included both qualitative aspects, in terms of participants' interactions while completing the tasks and their perceptions and attitudes with respect to the tasks, and quantitative aspects, in terms of word counts, frequency and proportion of interactive features.

This chapter reports on the outcomes of jigsaw and decision making tasks in generating meaning-oriented interactive discourse in an EFL classroom and explores links between such activities and students' attitudes, and oral language development. The chapter consists of four major sections addressing the four research questions. The first section, Research Question One, deals with students' oral language with examples from jigsaw and decision-making tasks. It looks at the nature of the oral discourse generated through peer interaction while completing the tasks, in terms of the amount and kind of language generated and the kinds of interactions that occurred. It also examines task and individual differences. The second section, Research Question Two, describes the NNS teacher's oral discourse in terms of its features and roles, and task differences.

The third section, Research Question Three, examines the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes with regards to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method. This includes communicative tasks compared to teacher-fronted tasks, and jigsaw tasks compared to decision-making tasks. The comparison between jigsaw tasks and decision making tasks is to see whether the participants have similar, positive perceptions, whether they like one task better, or whether they think both task types were complementary to one another. The fourth section, Research Question Four, explores evidence that these communicative tasks may facilitate lexical development. It looks at students' self reported learning in terms of types of words, aspects of word learning, and ways of facilitating word learning.

#### *Research Question One*

*What is the nature of EFL university students' oral discourse, generated through the use of selected communicative tasks (jigsaw and decision making) in small groups, in terms of its interactive features? Does task type appear to affect patterns of interactive language use? In what ways?*

In this study, the students were working on two types of communicative tasks, jigsaw and decision-making, adapted from their textbook and designed specifically to employ reading materials as well as peer interaction. These four tasks (two of each type), using reading texts as a basis for oral discourse generation, provided students with vocabulary used in different medical contexts and both stimulated and enriched their conversational discourse. The students, working in small groups, were encouraged to talk about the topics in the texts, and needed to work together with others to solve

problems and to get their meaning across through interactive discourse. In other words, the task design elicited interactive language and involved reading. In the jigsaw tasks, the students were provided with notes regarding partial information about different patients and were to put all the information together. Each had to share the information s/he had in order to complete the task, which was to fill in the patients' information table. In the decision-making tasks, the students were all provided with a reading text on which their decision making regarding patients' cases was to be based. Due to this design, when completing both types of task, the students not only spoke spontaneously, but also sometimes read from a text. Hence, the nature of their oral language generated in general was analyzed as either "spontaneous" (i.e., when students talked spontaneously) or "reading/partial reading" (i.e., when students read verbatim from a text).

This section considers the nature and content of the oral discourse generated through peer interaction in terms of the amount and kind of language generated and the kinds of interactions that occurred. It is divided into six subsections. From the perspective of how much language was generated through the use of communicative tasks in peer interaction, the first subsection deals with the amount of L2 use (in the form of word counts) and the second subsection deals with L1 use. The analysis of the word counts was based on how the students used the L2, that is, spontaneously or by reading. The use of a shared L1 is particularly important since the context of the study allowed the participants to purposefully or receptively use it. From the different perspective of what kind of language was generated through the use of communicative tasks in peer interaction, the third subsection considers discourse moves. This includes seven categories of discourse moves (topic initiations, responses, comprehension facilitation,

completions, corrections, extended questions, and uptakes), each of which is subdivided according to the way students performed it: spontaneously or by reading/partial reading. The fourth subsection deals with repetitions, in this case self repetitions and other repetitions. This relates to the discourse moves in terms of the functions the repetitions represented. They were similarly examined based on how the students used them, that is, spontaneously or by reading/partial reading. From the perspective of what kinds of interaction occurred during small group problem-solving, the fifth subsection concerns turn taking and negotiating meaning. For each subsection, an analysis of task type and individual differences is presented. Finally, the sixth subsection summarizes the findings.

### *Word Counts*

One perspective for describing the nature of the language use involves how much language was generated through the communicative tasks in terms of word counts. This is particularly important since the context of the study was in an EFL classroom where the students shared the same L1, had limited access to L2 input, and had little opportunity for L2 production outside the classroom. The tasks were designed to employ written materials in order for the students to have access to the L2 input as a basis for their oral discourse, and to elicit interactive discourse among the students as an opportunity for their L2 production. Through word counts we can see whether the tasks provided the students with this kind of opportunity, and determine the influence of the reading materials and the L1 on their oral language production. Hence, the word count analyses consist of spontaneous language use, reading, and L1. L1 use will be further analyzed from a different perspective in the next subsection.

Table 5 below shows the total number and percentage of words used spontaneously, read, or spoken in L1 by the students in small groups during two jigsaw tasks and two decision making tasks. It reveals one aspect of task difference involving the relative amount of spontaneous language vis-à-vis reading and L1 use.

Table 5 *Word counts in jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Words used	Jigsaw		Decision Making	
	No. of words	%	No. of words	%
Spontaneous	2473	49.9 <sup>5</sup>	4584	85.7
Reading	2253	45.5	461	8.6
L1 <sup>6</sup>	227	4.6	303	5.7
Total	4953	100.0	5348	100.0

As can be seen from Table 5, the overall total number of words generated by the two jigsaw tasks is somewhat less than in the decision making tasks, with a difference of 395 words. This means the students talked a little bit less in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. In terms of the numbers of words used, however, the students used spontaneous language almost twice as much in the decision making tasks as in the jigsaw tasks, and read aloud almost five times more often in the jigsaw tasks as in decision making tasks. They used the L1 similarly in the two task types, possibly slightly more in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks (5.7% compared to 4.6%). Within the task types themselves, in the decision making tasks the students mostly talked spontaneously compared to when they were reading: 85.7% compared to 8.6%. This shows how effective the decision making tasks were for generating spontaneous speech that could promote students' fluency. This is very different in the jigsaw tasks where there seems to be a balance between students' use of spontaneous language and reading:

<sup>5</sup> All numbers in decimals have been rounded to the nearest first decimal place.

<sup>6</sup> It appeared that students occasionally turned off the tape when they were talking in L1 while completing the tasks, particularly Task 1 (Jigsaw) and 2 (Decision Making). Consequently, the L1 words counted here were based only on what was on tape.

49.9% and 45.5%, respectively. This shows the role of reading that had an advantage in enabling practice of more difficult language interactively.

Tables 6 and 7 below show the distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading, and L1 use in the jigsaw tasks in terms of word counts. These analyses show individual and group patterns of language use, during the two jigsaw tasks, including the influence of leadership roles on individual language use and differences within group patterns. The shaded area indicates which student was the leader of her/his group.

Table 6 *Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw) (n=8)*

Task 1	Spontaneous		Reading		L1	Total No. of Words
	Words	%	Words	%	Words	
<b>Group 1</b>						
F1(leader)	342	63.2	194	35.8	5	541
F2	146	46.6	161	51.4	6	313
M1	54	26.6	140	67.9	12	206
M2	15	15.0	85	85.0	0	100
Subtotal	557	48.0	580	50.0	23	1160
<b>Group 2<sup>7</sup></b>						
F4	152	50.8	143	47.8	4	299
M3(leader)	174	55.0	142	44.9	0	316
<b>Group 3</b>						
F6	94	34.7	174	64.2	3	271
M5(leader)	533	60.1	351	39.5	3	887
<b>Total</b>	<b>1510</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>1390</b>	<b>47.4</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2933</b>

Table 7 *Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw) (n=8)*

Task 3	Spontaneous		Reading		L1	Total No. of Words
	Words	%	Words	%	Words	
<b>Group 1</b>						
F1	171	56.2	106	34.8	27	304
F6	54	25.4	154	72.6	4	212
M2	33	18.5	115	64.6	30	178
M5(leader)	441	68.3	109	16.9	95	645

<sup>7</sup> Only two members are shown for Groups 2 and 3 because the other two members of each group did not belong to the sample. For this reason the subtotals were not calculated.

Subtotal	699	52.2	484	36.1	156	1339
Group 2						
F2(leader)	96	41.5	125	54.1	10	231
F4	64	40.2	95	59.7	0	159
M1	44	27.1	90	55.5	28	162
M3	60	46.5	69	53.5	0	129
Subtotal	264	38.7	379	55.6	38	681
<b>Total</b>	<b>963</b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>2020</b>

As can be seen from the tables, in general the students showed a relatively balanced use of spontaneous language and reading in both jigsaw tasks. While the leaders of the groups tended to use spontaneous language more frequently (55% to 68.3%) than reading (16.9% to 44.9%), the other members used spontaneous language less frequently (15% to 56.2%) than reading (34.8% to 85%). In terms of the total number of words per individual, the leaders of the groups in every case had more word production, ranging from 231 to 887 words, than the other members, ranging from 100 to 313 words. This means they talked more than the other members. In addition, Table 7 particularly shows within group differences in terms of group dynamics. While Group 1 seemed to have a dominating leader (M5), who produced almost 50% of the total number of words in his group, Group 2 appeared to have a democratic leader (F2), who produced about 30% of the total number of words in her group, with the other members produced relatively equal.

Tables 8 and 9 below show the distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts, and L1 use in the decision making tasks. These analyses describe the patterns of language use, role of leadership, and individual/group differences during the decision making tasks. The shaded area again indicates which student was the leader of her/his group.

Table 8 *Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making) (n=8)*

Task 2	Spontaneous		Reading		L1	Total No. of Words
	Words	%	Words	%	Words	
Group 1 <sup>8</sup>						
F1	171	61.7	46	16.6	60	277
F2	186	71.5	28	10.7	46	260
M1	218	72.6	35	11.6	47	300
M2	60	81.0	14	19.0	0	74
Group 2 <sup>9</sup>						
F4	67	71.2	26	27.6	1	94
M3(leader)	52	51.5	49	48.5	0	101
Group 3						
F6	19	37.2	32	62.7	0	51
M5(leader)	524	89.7	59	10.1	1	584
<b>Total</b>	<b>1297</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>1741</b>

Table 9 *Distribution of spontaneous language use versus reading word counts in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making) (n=8)*

Task 4	Spontaneous		Reading		L1	Total No. of Words
	Words	%	Words	%	Words	
Group 1						
F1	594	91.9	29	4.4	23	646
F6	238	96.3	0	0.0	9	247
M2	202	93.5	11	5.1	3	216
M5(leader)	1123	94.3	61	5.1	7	1191
Subtotal	2157	93.8	101	4.4	42	2300
Group 2						
F2	155	83.7	5	2.7	25	185
F4	329	85.4	55	14.3	1	385
M1	242	77.5	0	0.0	70	312
M3(leader)	404	95.0	11	2.6	10	425
Subtotal	1130	86.4	71	5.4	106	1307
<b>Total</b>	<b>3287</b>	<b>91.1</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>3607</b>

As can be seen from the tables, in general both the group leaders and the other members tended to use spontaneous language much more frequently (51.5% to 96.3%)

<sup>8</sup> No leader is shown for Group 1, because the leader did not belong to the sample. For this reason the subtotal was not calculated.

<sup>9</sup> Only two members are shown for Groups 2 and 3 because the other two members of each group did not belong to the sample. For this reason the subtotals were not calculated.

than reading (0% to 48.5%). In terms of the total number of words per individual, the leaders of the groups had more word production, ranging from 101 to 1191 words, than the other members, ranging from 51 to 385 words. In one case, the leader (M3 in Task 2, Table 8) exceptionally produced almost as many read as spontaneously spoken words. This was because he usually read part of the patients' cases before asking the other members' opinions regarding the treatments. In addition, Table 9 particularly shows group differences in terms of group dynamics. While Group 1 seemed to have a dominating leader (M5) since he produced more than 50% of the total number of words in his group, Group 2 appeared to have a democratic leader (M3) with about 30% of the total number of words produced in his group, with the other members produced more or less equal. Unfortunately this pattern cannot be verified in Task 2, Table 8, due to the group membership in Task 2 that included other students who did not belong to the student participants.

### *L1 Use*

When students share the same L1 in a language classroom, their use of L1 is an important issue. Like in other contexts where students share the same L1, the EFL context of the study allowed the students to consciously or sub-consciously use it. The previous subsection presents counts of L1 words used in both task types: 227 words or 4.6% in the jigsaw tasks and 303 words or 5.7% in the decision making tasks. This unfortunately does not give the full counts since the students occasionally turned off the tape while completing the tasks. But the data show that L1 was sometimes used by almost all students in the two task types, and as the students reported in the debriefings,

they used the L1 more in the decision making tasks when debating than in the jigsaw tasks.

This subsection will look at the L1 use in terms of the kinds of things the students did in the L1 using examples from the transcripts of both task types. Basically the students used the L1 in order to complete the tasks when they stumbled over the L2 vocabulary. In this subsection, the L1 use is differentiated between mere translating into the L1 and expressing ideas in the L1.

In terms of translating, students sometimes voluntarily provided translations in the L1, but they did this only occasionally in either task type. Example 1 shows the words “retired” and “policeman” were voluntarily translated into the equivalent L1 words “pensiunan” and “polisi” by M5 and F6, respectively. (See transcription conventions in Table 4, page 66.)

Example 1     *Translating into the L1 in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw), Group 3*

M5: **He is a retired policeman.**

F5: He is?

M5: **retired**, *pensiunan (retired)*

F6: retired?

M5: **retired policeman, retired**

F6: *polisi (policeman)*

In terms of expressing ideas in the L1, the students did this while they were dealing with task management and task content, and in both cases they either replaced the unknown L2 vocabulary with the L1, or discussed an issue almost entirely in the L1. Task management refers to the procedures of the task, particularly when the students were dealing with how to start doing the task, keep it going, and finish it. Task content refers to the specific topic of the task or the information presented in the tasks.

When dealing with task management, the use of L1 was relatively brief, particularly when the students wanted to instruct each other or suggest that the others do something. This occurred a few times, specifically in the decision making tasks, as shown in Example 2 below.

Example 2 *Brief use of the L1 when dealing with task management in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making), Group 2*

M1: Um I think must start from the chief.

F2: M1, *jang bermain kwa* (please don't play).

M1: Patient two, *to?* (right?)

F2: Patient one.

However, L1 interventions were relatively lengthy when the students wanted to figure out the task procedure, and this occurred a few times in both task types. Example 3 below captures the longest exchanges in the L1 when dealing with task management in a jigsaw task, and Example 4 shows the typical length in exchanges dealing with task management in a decision making task.

Example 3 *Extended use of the L1 when dealing with task management in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw), Group 1*

M5: *Cuma baca-baca? Cuma baca-baca? (Just reading? Just reading?)*

F1: *Yang pasti nda* (Of course not only)

M5: *Cuma baca-baca dang? Nya ada beking diagnosis (Just reading then? No need to come up with a diagnosis).*

5 F1: *Ya mungkin diagnosisnya nephronic syndrome (Well maybe the diagnosis is nephronic syndrome).*

M5: *Trus nda ada, torang bukan mo cari diagnosis to? (So, there's no, we don't need to find out the diagnosis, right?)*

F1: *Ini depe diagnosis to (This is the diagnosis, right).*

10 M5: *So ada di sini (It's in here).*

F1: *So ada di sini. Io, trus depe diagnosis apa? (It's in here. Right, so what's the diagnosis?)*

M5: *Ini? (This?)*

F1: *Io, ini dia pe diagnosis (Yes, this is the diagnosis).*

15 M5: *Maksudku torang nda mo cari, nda usah cari apa depe diagnosis bagitu (I mean we don't need to find out, don't need to come up with the diagnosis ourselves like that).*

F1: Oh  
M5: *Mar ini kan torang cuma tulis-tulis. Co lia (But here we just write it down. See).*  
20 F1: *Skarang (Now) patient two.*  
M5: *Ok, patient two. Cuma baca saja (Just simply read).*  
F1: *Up to you, you are the chairman.*

Example 4 *Extended use of the L1 when dealing with task management in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making), Group 2*

M1: *Patient three dulu (first).*  
M3: *Kase berurut jo (Just rank them in order).*  
F2: *Hm?*  
M3: *Se berurut jo yang paling penting (Just rank them in order who is the most important). More important.*  
M1: *Ok, I think patient three*

As can be seen from the examples, the students used the L1 when they had trouble expressing ideas in the L2 regarding task management. They did this by mixing it with the L2 or completely using the L1 in a single exchange or in more than two exchanges. When it was in more than two exchanges, as in Examples 3 and 4, a negotiation regarding the way to do the tasks usually occurred. After they solved the problem, they got back to using the L2 and usually continued with the topic of the previous discussion without translating back into the L2 what they had said in the L1.

The use of L1 in terms of idea expression was also found when the students were dealing with task content. It was relatively brief when the students were only replacing certain word(s) or phrase(s) in the L1 to complete their utterances. This sometimes occurred in both task types, as shown in Examples 5 and 6 below. Example 5 shows how F2 used the word “tantu” in the L1 instead of “of course” as part of the answers to F1’s questions in a jigsaw task.

Example 5 *Brief use of the L1 when dealing with task content in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw), Group 1*

F1: The doctor diagnose?

F2: *Tantu (of course)* painful.

F1: And advice?

F2: *Tantu (of course)* when he carries bundles.

Example 6 shows how F1 used the word “mempengaruhi” in the L1 instead of “influential” to complete her utterance when working on a decision making task.

Example 6 *Brief use of the L1 when dealing with task content in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making), Group 2*

M5: What about in her status, he’s a poor woman.

F1: Status is, status, status is not *mempengaruhi (influential)*.

M5: How, how she can pay

Another brief use of L1 dealing with task content was when the students were negotiating meaning. This was typical in the jigsaw tasks, as illustrated in Example 7 below. The phrase “per liter ini” in the L1 in line 4 and the word “apa” in line 7 serve as signals of the negotiation of meaning involved.

Example 7 *Brief use of the L1 when dealing with task content in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw), Group 2*

F4: Results of the investigation, **lab tests show, lab tests show alkaline phosphatase (pause) one hundred and sixty units, one hundred and sixty units**

M1: *per liter ini? (is this per liter?)*

F4: **per liter. Cholestrol, choles, cholecystography shows a non-functioning gall bladder, gall bladder.**

M1: Choles *apa? (what)?*

F4: **Cholecystography shows a non-functioning, functioning gall bladder.**

However, the L1 was used relatively extensively in task content when the students were discussing an issue. This usually occurred in the decision making tasks. Example 8 below captures the longest exchanges in the L1 when dealing with task content.

Example 8 *Extended use of the L1 when dealing with task content in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making), Group 1*

- F1: *Ini obat pengobatan terhadap penisilin, bukan penisilin yg hipersensitif to? (This medicine is for penicillin, it's not a hypersensitive penicillin, right?)*
- M1: **Alternative to penicillin in hypersensitive patient**
- 5 F1: *Io, tapi ngana ingat dia ini sakit apa, dia ini meningitis karna pneumococcus. Kalu kita kase ini, dia ada hubungan so dgn meningitis ini? Berarti ngana (Yes, but you should remember what kind of illness he has, he is with meningitis due to pneumococcus. If you give him this, does it have relation to meningitis? It means you).*
- 10 M1: *Kalu orang alergi pa penisilin, rupa ngana alergi penisilin (If someone is allergic to penicillin, like if you are allergic to penicillin).*
- F1: *Io (Yes).*
- M1: *Dia kase eritomisin (He is given erythomycin).*
- F1: *Io tapi ini sembuhkan ini, bukan sembuhkan ini (Yes, but this cures this, not this one).*
- 15 M1: *Dia bukan mo sembuhkan ngana pe alergi (It is not to cure your allergy).*
- F1: *Io (Yes).*
- M1: *Ah, nda mangarti lei (Well, you don't get it).*
- F2: *Yah (Well), co-trimoxazole.*
- M7: *So, you think M1 erythomycin is same with penicillin, ya?*
- 20 M1: *Yes.*
- M7: *Can cure apa (what), apa yg penisilin bisa (what penicillin can).*
- M1: *Io stow (Yes, maybe). Maybe.*
- M7: *Jang pake stwo kwa (Don't say maybe, ok?).*
- F2: *Penicillin, just the same. He's allergic to penicillin. Erythomycin is the same*
- 25 *to penicillin?*

As can be seen from the example, the students were using the L1 when they had trouble expressing ideas regarding task content in the L2. They did this by completely using the L1 in more than two exchanges; in other cases by mixing the L1 and L2 in a single exchange or more. When they did this, it was usually to make a decision regarding a topic. After they solved the problem, they got back to using the L2 and usually continued with the topic without translating back into the L2 what they had said in the L1. This shows the inevitable use of L1 in EFL classrooms with students sharing the same L1.

### *Discourse Moves*

The language manipulation that occurs in interaction is often described in terms of discourse moves. Discourse moves can serve as practice to self and input for others, which are important for language development. Discourse moves are the elaboration of the basic functions of initiations, responses, and further responses. Both initial and further responses can include comprehension facilitation (to facilitate one's own or another's comprehension), completions (to complete one's own or another's utterance), corrections (to correct one's own or another's utterance), extended questions (to ask for further information/more explanation), and uptakes (to repeat the other's corrective utterance in order to correct one's own utterance). A taxonomy of discourse moves observed in these data was prepared, based on Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) and based on Pica and Doughty (1985), and expanded to include sections covering reading based language use. It summarizes the findings regarding the oral discourse generated from peer interaction with a specific consideration of spontaneous language and reading/partial reading components. There were seven categories of discourse moves observed in the present study: topic initiations, responses, comprehension facilitation, completions, corrections, extended questions, and uptakes. Each is divided into spontaneous language use and reading/partial reading, and has its own subcategories. Table 10 below outlines a taxonomy of discourse moves with acronyms. This is followed by a series of tables providing examples of each set of functions, interspersed with the relevant findings.

Table 10 *Taxonomy of discourse moves with acronyms*

Spontaneous Language	Reading/Partial Reading
<p>1. Topic Initiations:            - Questions (TIQ)            - Statements (TIS)</p>	<p>1. Topic Initiations :            - Questions with Partial Reading (TIQ PR)            - Statements by Reading (TIS R)</p>
<p>2. Responses:            - Direct Answers (A)            - Extended Answers (ExtA)            - Comments (Com)</p>	<p>2. Responses:            - Answers by Reading (AR)            - Extended Reading (ExtR)            - Answers with Partial Reading (A PR)            - Extended Answers with Partial Reading (ExtA PR)</p>
<p>3. Comprehension Facilitation:            - Clarification Requests (CR)            - Confirmations (Conf)            - Confirmation Checks (ConfC)            - Comprehension Assistance (Comp)            - Comprehension Checks (CompC)            - Decomposition (Decom)            - Left Dislocation (LDis)</p>	<p>3. Comprehension Facilitation:            - Confirmations by Reading (ConfR)            - Comprehensions by Reading (CompR)</p>
<p>4. Corrections            - Self Corrections (SCor)            - Peer Corrections (PCor)</p>	<p>4. Corrections            - Self Corrections by Reading (SCorR)            - Peer Corrections by Reading (PCorR)</p>
<p>5. Completions            - Peer Completions (Cmpl)</p>	
<p>6. Extended Questions:            - Wh Questions (ExtWhQ)            - Yes/No Questions (ExtY/NQ)            - Or Questions (ExtOrQ)            - Imperatives/Requests (ExtIm/Rq)</p>	
<p>7. Uptakes            - Uptakes from Peer (Uptake-P)            - Uptakes from Teacher (Uptake-T)</p>	

The following are the findings for each category while the students were completing the jigsaw and decision making tasks.

*Topic initiations*

There were four moves that the students could use to initiate a topic: spontaneously asking a question (TIQ), spontaneously giving a statement (TIS), asking a question while partially reading from a written text (TIQ PR), and reading a statement (TIS R). The acronym, description, and example of each move are shown in Table 11 below, organized to report spontaneous (shaded) then reading supported moves.

Table 11 *Topic initiation category*

Acronym	Description	Example
TIQ	Topic initiation questions occur when a student asks a question about a new topic or a previous question to a new interlocutor.	F2: How old is he?
TIS	Topic initiation statements occur when a student initiates a topic by making a statement.	F1: Patient one.
TIQ PR	Topic initiation questions with partial reading occur when a student asks a question about a new topic by partially reading from a text.	M5: What about if we give <b>intramuscular injection?</b>
TIS R	Topic initiation statements occur when a student initiates a topic by reading a statement from a written text.	F6: Patient five, <b>an eighteen year old man with left leg amputation above the knee following a road traffic accident.</b>

Table 12 below shows the comparison of these moves in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Within topic initiations, topic initiation questioning (TIQ) was the most frequent move during peer interaction in both jigsaw and decision making tasks. Overall, each participant initiated topics spontaneously with questions (TIQ) approximately the same number of times in both task types. Topic initiations with spontaneous statements (TIS) occurred twice as often in the jigsaw tasks. On the other

hand, topic initiations with statement by reading (TIS R) occurred twice as often in the decision making tasks. Topic initiation questioning with partial reading (TIQ PR) was the least used move which occurred just three times, and only in the decision making tasks. In both task types, all participants initiated topics spontaneously far more frequently than by reading/partially reading, since they generally used TIQ and TIS.

Table 12 *Topic initiations during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
TIQ	157	19.6	16.4	128	16.0	21.7
TIS	53	6.6	7.5	21	2.6	3.5
TIQ PR	0	0.0	0.0	3	0.4	0.7
TIS R	9	1.1	2.4	16	2.0	2.9

Tables 13 and 14 below show in detail how these moves were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 13 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 14 in the decision making tasks.

Table 13 *Distribution of topic initiations among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)<sup>10</sup>*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
TIQ	31	4	17	1	16	0	5	2	6	0	0	0	20	6	32	17	157
TIS	4	2	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	7	7	11	10	53
TIQ PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TIS R	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	9
Total	35	6	22	4	16	1	6	2	6	3	0	0	28	13	49	28	219

<sup>10</sup> All tables on the distributions of discourse moves (and of repetitions in the next subsection) among participants in each task type follow the keys below:  
The students are identified by the first initial of their gender (F for female and M for male) and a number.  
The tasks are identified by the letter "T" plus a number.  
The groups are identified by the letter "G" plus a number.  
The shaded area under student identification indicates when a student was the leader in her/his group.  
The shaded area on the discourse moves indicate when they were done spontaneously.

Table 14 *Distribution of topic initiations among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	
	G1	G1	G1	G2	G2	G2	G3	G1	G1	G2	G1	G2	G2	G2	G3	G1	
TIQ	1	2	2	3	1	14	0	0	12	3	0	0	7	18	25	40	128
TIS	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	7	4	21
TIQ PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
TIS R	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	2	0	16
Total	4	2	3	4	3	14	3	1	13	3	0	3	16	19	35	45	168

As can be seen from the tables, M5 was the only one who made use of each type of move, showing his variety of discourse use. F1, F4, F6, and M3 each made use of three types of moves while F2 and M1 used two types, and M2 only one type. In both task types, the students consistently tended to initiate topics spontaneously far more frequently than by reading/partially reading, and the leaders of the groups generally used more of each type of move than the other members.

In sum, the jigsaw tasks generated relatively more moves within this category than the decision making tasks. Topic initiation questions were the most important move in both task types. Spontaneous moves were far more often generated than reading-based moves in both types. The leaders of the groups tended to make use of the moves more often than the other members.

### *Responses*

There were seven possible moves that the students could use as a response to an initiation. Three of these involved spontaneous speech and four employed reading/partial reading of a written text. The acronym, description, and example of each move are shown in Table 15 below, organized to report spontaneous (shaded) then reading supported moves.

Table 15 *Response category*

Acronym	Description	Example
<b>A</b>	Direct answers occur when a student directly answers the question that was asked.	F6: Yes, because she, she has family.
<b>ExtA</b>	Extended answers occur when a student gives an answer/response though not being directly asked or continues completing/giving more information/explanation.	F2: Patient one. I agree with F4, patient one.
<b>Com</b>	Comments occur when a student gives a response related to the situation but not the content.	M1: Hurry up, the time is almost up.
<b>AR</b>	Answers by reading occur when a student answers a question by reading from a text.	<b>M2: The doctor advised her to have some tests.</b>
<b>ExtR</b>	Extended reading occurs when a student continues completing an answer or giving more information/explanation by reading.	<b>M3: woman, complaining of /nausi/ and episodes</b>
<b>A PR</b>	Answers with partial reading occur when a student answers a question by partially reading from a text.	F1: In the indications tell <b>invasive salmonellosis</b> , but in case one the boy <b>with meningitis due to pneumococcus</b> . I think it's not.
<b>ExtA PR</b>	Extended answers with partial reading occur when a student gives an answer/response though not being directly asked or continues completing /giving more information/explanation by partially reading from a text.	F4: But not the trimoxazole, the side effect is /nosi/. <b>She complains of /nosi/.</b>

Table 16 below captures the comparison of these moves in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Within the category of responses, answering by reading (AR) was used the most, followed by extended reading (ExtR), in jigsaw, while these moves were used the least and second least, respectively, in decision making. Direct answers (A) were used the most in decision making followed by extended answers (ExtA), and they were also used frequently in jigsaw. Answers with partial reading (A PR) and extended answers with partial reading (ExtA PR) were not used in jigsaw, but they were used in decision making, and comments were used sparingly in both task types.

Table 16 *Responses during jigsaw and decision making tasks*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
A	29	3.6	2.9	213	26.6	8.4
ExtA	27	3.4	4.0	146	18.3	15.3
Com	5	0.6	0.7	8	1.0	1.1
AR	295	36.9	8.6	7	1.0	1.3
ExtR	56	7.0	3.9	2	0.3	0.7
A PR	0	0.0	0.0	12	1.5	1.1
ExtA PR	0	0.0	0.0	19	2.4	1.5

Tables 17 and 18 below illustrate how these moves were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 17 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 18 in the decision making tasks.

Table 17 *Distribution of responses among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
A	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	2	1	0	4	2	29
ExtA	4	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4	27
Com	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
AR	18	11	21	13	29	8	40	11	18	11	13	16	28	20	29	9	295
ExtR	1	0	0	7	4	3	4	4	0	6	0	3	1	12	8	3	56
A PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ExtA PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	27	20	27	20	34	11	45	18	25	20	13	21	32	32	48	19	412

Table 18 *Distribution of responses among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2 G1	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	
A	14	28	16	8	4	12	4	13	15	18	8	19	9	17	13	15	213
ExtA	10	27	5	7	2	8	0	6	2	9	0	6	1	16	18	29	146
Com	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	8
AR	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	7

ExtR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
A PR	3	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	12
ExtA PR	2	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	19
Total	30	57	25	16	10	26	4	19	22	27	9	28	16	35	37	47	407

As can be seen from the tables, most participants made use of each type of move at some point during the four tasks. While reading supported moves were generally used in the jigsaw tasks, spontaneous moves were generally used in the decision making tasks. More specifically, all students used answers by reading multiple times during both jigsaw tasks and all students used direct (spontaneous) answers multiple times during both decision making tasks.

In sum, the jigsaw tasks and the decision making tasks generated relatively equal number of moves in total within this category. While the most important move was answers by reading in the jigsaw tasks, it was direct answers in the decision making tasks. In addition, the jigsaw tasks generated more reading-based moves and the decision making tasks more spontaneous moves. Both the leaders and members of the groups tended to make use of the moves relatively equal.

#### *Comprehension facilitation*

There were nine possible moves that the students could use to facilitate comprehension during peer interaction. Seven of these involved spontaneous speech and two employed reading/partial reading of a written text. The acronym, description, and example of each move are shown in Table 19 below, organized to report spontaneous (shaded) then reading supported moves.

Table 19 *Comprehension facilitation category*

Acronym	Description	Example
CRq	Clarification requests occur when one student asks the other to clarify a previous utterance.	M2: <b>Complaining of swelling of the ankles.</b> M5: Sorry?
Conf	Confirmation occurs when a student verbally shows that s/he has understood a previous utterance, usually by repeating it.	F1: Patient one, patient one. M5: Ok, patient one.
ConfC	Confirmation checks occur when a student wants to make sure that what s/he has understood is what the other means.	M3: <b>arms and legs.</b> F4: and legs? M3: <b>legs.</b>
Comp	Comprehension assistance occurs when a student verbally shows that s/he wants to make sure that the other has understood what s/he means.	M5: Ok, we are just talking about task five. Task five
CompC	Comprehension checks occur when a student wants to make sure that the other has understood what s/he means.	F1: oh yeah, not, not M5: not, ok? That's the findings....
Decom	Decomposition occurs when a student breaks down a long utterance into more manageable parts.	M5: Ok, and findings of examination. It's me. <b>Pregnancy test is negative.</b> So she's not pregnant.
LDis	Left dislocation occurs when a student emphasizes the topic of an utterance by putting it first.	F1: hay fever, hay fever. Patient one no complaints? Patient one? No complaint patient one?
ConfR	Confirmation by reading occurs when a student reads from a text to show that s/he has understood it.	M2: nephrotic syndrome F1: <b>The patient must have nephrotic syndrome</b>
CompR	Comprehension by reading occurs when a student verbally shows that s/he wants to make sure that the other has understood what s/he means, by rereading from a text.	F2: <b>The patient is twenty-six years old, twenty-six year old woman complaining of swelling of the ankle.</b>

Note: The description of these discourse moves is expanded from Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991)

Table 20 below captures the comparison of these moves in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Within comprehension facilitation, spontaneous confirmation (Conf) was used the most in both task types, but it was used almost twice as often in the jigsaw tasks (222 compared to 136). The other moves that were used far more frequently

in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks were clarification requests (CRq) which was used six times more often (142 compared to 23), comprehension (Comp) which was almost two times more often (26 compared to 14), confirmation by reading (ConfR) which was used eight times more often (33 compared to 4), and most of all comprehension by reading (CompR) which was used 32 times more often (68 compared to 2). Only comprehension checking (CompC) was used two times more often in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks, and only confirmation checking (ConfC) was used approximately the same number of times in both task types. The least used moves were decomposition (Decom) and left dislocation (LDis) which were used only three times and two times in the jigsaw tasks, respectively.

Table 20 *Comprehension facilitation during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
CRq	142	17.7	12.4	23	2.9	2.2
Conf	222	27.8	27.8	136	17.0	16.4
ConfC	42	5.3	4.1	44	5.5	4.8
Comp	26	3.3	4.3	14	1.8	2.1
CompC	9	1.1	3.2	18	2.3	4.3
Decom	3	0.4	0.7	0	0.0	0.0
LDis	2	0.3	0.7	0	0.0	0.0
ConfR	33	4.1	2.6	4	0.5	0.9
CompR	68	8.5	4.8	2	0.3	0.7

Tables 21 and 22 below illustrate how these moves were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 21 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 22 in the decision making tasks.

Table 21 *Distribution of comprehension facilitation among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
CR	9	7	6	13	22	20	12	1	3	4	2	2	10	2	23	6	142
Conf	19	17	5	14	13	9	13	6	7	5	2	3	13	3	53	40	222
ConfC	7	2	3	2	6	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	10	2	42
Comp	8	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4	26
CompC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9
Decom	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
LDis	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ConfR	0	1	0	1	0	2	6	1	0	4	2	2	3	4	6	1	33
CompR	10	3	3	6	2	5	5	10	5	1	0	3	1	1	11	2	68
Total	54	33	21	36	44	38	38	18	17	14	6	10	33	10	114	61	547

Table 22 *Distribution of comprehension facilitation among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2 G1	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	
CR	1	1	0	4	1	3	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	5	2	23
Conf	5	18	12	1	5	6	1	4	2	6	1	5	6	9	24	31	136
ConfC	3	1	3	6	3	8	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	44
Comp	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	5	14
CompC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	9	3	18
Decom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LDis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ConfR	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
CompR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Total	9	23	15	11	11	17	2	6	5	12	3	8	11	12	48	48	241

As can be seen from the tables, from the nine moves possible, only M5 made use of almost all the moves, while the others used five to seven moves. All the participants in general used comprehension facilitation moves more often in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. More specifically, all eight students used confirmations (Conf) in all four tasks, all students used clarification requests (CRq) in both jigsaw tasks, and almost all students used comprehension by reading (CompR) in both jigsaw tasks. While

four of the students used confirmation checks (ConfC) and confirmations by reading (ConfR) in the jigsaw tasks, five of the students used clarification requests (CRq) and confirmation checks (ConfC) in the decision making tasks.

In sum, the jigsaw tasks generated far more moves in total within this category than the decision making tasks. The most important move was confirmations in both task types. In addition, both task types generated less reading-based moves and far more spontaneous moves. The leaders of the groups in average tended to use more moves than the members.

### *Corrections*

There were four possible moves that the students could use to correct their own or another's utterance during peer interaction. Two involved spontaneous speech and the other two employed reading/partial reading of a written text. The acronym, description, and example of each move are shown in Table 23 below, organized to report spontaneous (shaded) then reading supported moves.

Table 23 *Correction category*

Acronym	Description	Example
<b>SCor</b>	Self corrections occur when a student spontaneously corrects her/his own utterance.	M3: and he, and she is elderly woman ...
<b>PCor</b>	Peer corrections occur when a student spontaneously corrects the other's utterance.	F1: <b>been /konfin/ to bed for the past five /ye/ months, /deterioting/</b> M2: dete-, deteriorating
ScorR	Self corrections occur when a student corrects her/his own utterance by reading from a text.	F2: Result of the investigation, <b>/wi/ BC, WBC /sows/ lymphocytes positive, double positive.</b>
PcorR	Peer corrections occur when a student corrects the other's utterance by reading from a text.	M5: Her marital status is? F5: Married. F6: <b>A widow, she's a widow.</b>

Table 24 below captures the comparison of these moves in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Within this category, spontaneous self corrections (SCor) were used the most in both task types with almost the same number of occurrences. Spontaneous peer corrections (PCor) were used one and a half times more in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. While self corrections by reading (SCorR) were used six times in jigsaw, they were never used in decision making. Peer corrections by reading (PCorR) were used only once in both task types.

Table 24 *Corrections during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
Scor	17	2.1	3.0	16	2.0	1.6
Pcor	12	1.5	0.9	8	1.0	0.9
ScorR	6	0.8	1.2	0	0.0	0.0
PcorR	1	0.1	0.4	1	0.1	0.4

Tables 25 and 26 below illustrate how these moves were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 25 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 26 in the decision making tasks.

Table 25 *Distribution of corrections among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
Scor	5	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	17
Pcor	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	12
ScorR	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6
PcorR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	6	3	3	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	3	1	4	6	36

Table 26 *Distribution of corrections among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	T2	T4	
	G1	G1	G1	G2	G2	G2	G3	G1	G1	G2	G1	G2	G2	G2	G3	G1	
Scor	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	16
Pcor	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	8
ScorR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PcorR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	2	3	4	25

As can be seen from the tables, self corrections were most frequent, both spontaneous and with reading for jigsaw and mostly spontaneous for decision making, and M5 who was the talkative one was the only one who made use of each move. In both task types, the participants generally self corrected accurately and made use of the spontaneous moves more often than the reading supported moves. More specifically, 21 of 36 corrections were done by the leaders in the jigsaw tasks and 9 of 25 in the decision making tasks. The leaders frequently self corrected in both task types: 13 of 17 in jigsaw and 6 of 16 in decision making. It seemed that they were aware of being role models.

In sum, the jigsaw tasks generated relatively more moves within this category than the decision making tasks. Self-corrections were the most important move in both task types. Spontaneous moves were far more often generated than reading-based moves in both types. The leaders of the groups tended to make use of the moves more often than the other members.

#### *Completions*

There was only one move that the students used to complete each other's utterances during peer interaction. It involved spontaneous speech and is categorized as

peer completion (Cmpl). The acronym, description, and example are shown in Table 27 below, with a shaded area indicating a spontaneous move.

Table 27 *Completion category*

Acronym	Description	Example
Cmpl	Peer completions occur when a student spontaneously completes the other's utterance.	M3: His condition is worse F2: His condition is worse, worse dramatically so

Table 28 below shows the comparison of this move in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Overall, peer completions (Cmpl) were used in both task types almost the same number of times, only a little bit higher in the jigsaw tasks.

Table 28 *Completions during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
Cmpl	31	3.89	2.7	25	3.1	2.2

Tables 29 and 30 below illustrate how this move was distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 25 shows the distribution in jigsaw, and Table 26 in decision making.

Table 29 *Distribution of completions among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
Cmpl	2	1	0	5	5	3	2	0	2	2	0	0	6	1	1	1	31

Table 30 *Distribution of completions among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2 G1	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	
Cmpl	1	6	2	2	1	2	1	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	1	25

As can be seen from the tables, almost all participants made use of peer completions (Cmpl) with a minimum use of once per task and a maximum use of six times per task. In general, peer completions (Cmpl) were widely distributed in both task types. More specifically, the leaders made this move more often in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. In the jigsaw tasks all five leaders used this move with a total of 15 times. Most other group members also used it, with a total of 16, while in the decision making tasks 2 of 4 leaders used this move only with a total of 2 and most other group members with a total of 23.

*Extended questions*

There were four possible moves that the students could use to ask for further information or more explanation during peer interaction. They made all these moves spontaneously. The acronym, description, and example of each move are shown in Table 31 below, with shaded areas indicating spontaneous moves.

Table 31 *Extended questions category*

Acronym	Description	Example
ExtWhQ	Extended wh-questions occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of wh-questions.	M3: And do you think why she should receive the heart? Any reason? M1, any reason?
ExtY/NO	Extended yes/no questions occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of yes/no questions.	F1: <b>The patient is six years old.</b> F6: This is a girl?
ExtOrQ	Extended or-questions occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of or-questions.	M2: <b>... a forty-nine year old, old man.</b> F6: Man or?
ExtIm/Rq	Extended imperatives/requests occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of imperatives/requests.	M5: To have some test? Can you describe the test? Describe the test?

Table 32 below captures the comparison of these moves in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Overall, extended questions were used less frequently in jigsaw than in decision making. Within this category, extended imperatives/requests (ExtIm/Rq) were used the most in the jigsaw tasks, but still often in the decision making tasks. Extended wh-questions (ExtWhQ) were used seven times less often in the jigsaw tasks than they were used in the decision making tasks. While extended yes/no questions (ExtY/NQ) were sparingly used in both task types, extended or-questions (ExtOrQ) were sparingly used in jigsaw but occasionally used in decision making.

Table 32 *Extended questions during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
ExtWhQ	4	0.5	0.8	29	3.6	5.8
ExtY/NQ	2	0.3	0.5	1	0.1	0.4
ExtOrQ	2	0.3	0.5	5	0.6	1.1
ExtIm/Rq	11	1.4	2.4	13	1.6	3.5

Tables 33 and 34 below illustrate how these moves were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 33 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 34 in the decision making tasks.

Table 33 *Distribution of extended questions among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
ExtWhQ	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4
ExtY/NQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
ExtOrQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
ExtIm/Rq	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	11
Total	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4	19

Table 34 *Distribution of extended questions among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2 G1	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	
ExtWhQ	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	9	3	13	29
ExtY/NQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
ExtOrQ	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5
ExtIm/Rq	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	13
Total	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	13	9	20	48

As can be seen from the tables, M3 and M5 made use of all four moves, M2 did not use any of these moves, and the others used at least two moves. Overall, the participants used these four moves infrequently in the jigsaw tasks and used them somewhat more frequently in the decision making tasks. In both cases they were used mainly by the leaders.

In sum, the jigsaw tasks generated far fewer moves within this category than the decision making tasks. While extended imperatives/requests were the most important move in the jigsaw tasks, extended wh-questions were the most important move in the decision making tasks. The leaders of the groups primarily used the moves in both task types.

#### *Uptakes*

There were two possible moves that the students could use as uptakes (i.e., to repeat the other's utterance in order to correct their own utterance). The moves are uptakes from peers and uptakes from the teacher. Both moves were spontaneous. The acronym, description, and example of each move are shown in Table 35 below, with shaded areas indicating spontaneous moves.

Table 35 *Uptake category*

Acronym	Description	Example
<b>Uptake-P</b>	Uptakes from peers occur when a student subsequently repeats her/his peer's utterance in order to correct her/his own.	M4: <b>bundles.</b> M3: bundle M4: <b>bundles.</b> M3: bundles. OK.
<b>Uptake-T</b>	Uptakes from teacher occur when a student subsequently repeats the teacher's utterance in order to correct her/his own.	M5: ... <b>He's suffered from /headaches/, /headaches/.</b> F5: Headaches. T: Headaches. M5: <b>Headaches</b>

Table 36 below captures the comparison of these moves in the jigsaw and decision making tasks. Within this category, both moves were used more frequently in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. In the jigsaw tasks, uptakes from peers (Uptake-P) were used as often as uptakes from the teacher (Uptake-T). But in the decision making tasks, uptakes from peers were only used once and uptakes from the teacher were not used at all.

Table 36 *Uptakes during jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD
<b>Uptake-P</b>	9	1.1	0.6	1	0.1	0.4
<b>Uptake-T</b>	9	1.1	1.6	0	0.0	0.0

Tables 37 and 38 below illustrate how these moves were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers in the group. Table 37 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 38 in the decision making tasks.

Table 37 *Distribution of uptakes among participants in the jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T1 G1	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G1	T3 G2	T1 G2	T3 G2	T1 G3	T3 G1	
Uptake-P	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	9
Uptake-T	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	9
Total	1	1	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	5	1	18

Table 38 *Distribution of uptakes among participants in the decision making tasks (n=8)*

Discourse Moves	F1		F2		F4		F6		M1		M2		M3		M5		Total
	T2 G1	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G1	T4 G2	T2 G2	T4 G2	T2 G3	T4 G1	
Uptake-P	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Uptake-T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

As can be seen from the tables, most of the participants made use of both moves at least once. Only M1 did not make use of either move, and M2 made use of only uptakes from peer once. In the jigsaw tasks, 11 of 18 uptakes were made by the leaders, and in the decision making tasks only one uptake was made.

In sum, the jigsaw tasks generated far more moves within this category than the decision making tasks. Both uptakes from peers and uptakes from the teacher were generated equally in the jigsaw tasks, and in the decision making tasks only one uptake from peers was generated. The leaders of the groups primarily used the moves.

### *Repetitions*

A special feature that was easily identified in the oral discourse generated through task-based peer interaction was repetitions. Repetitions might serve as input to others and as practice to self and others. Both are important for language learning, especially in

EFL settings where input and practice are basically limited to the classroom. Repetitions relate to discourse moves in terms of the functions they perform. Hence, all repetitions in this study were double coded with the functions they carried out. In this case, the functions of all discourse moves were determined first, and then if they were repeated, the type of repetition. In this subsection though, since repetitions are the focus of the analysis, they will be dealt with first, followed by details on the functions.

Two forms of repetitions, namely, self repetitions and other repetitions, were coded in this study. These largely subsumed the other four forms<sup>11</sup> mentioned in Long (1980, 1983). Self repetitions (SRep) occurred when a student repeated her/his own utterance partially or completely in the exact manner or paraphrase. Other repetitions (ORep) occurred when a student repeated the other's utterance partially or completely in the exact manner or paraphrase. As in the other analyses, these two forms of repetitions were divided according to the way they were done: spontaneously and by reading/partial reading, influenced by the task design.

Table 39 below shows how often the students used self repetitions compared to other repetitions in the jigsaw tasks. As can be seen, the total frequency of use of self repetitions was similar if somewhat less than that of other repetitions (308 compared to 321). While self repetitions were done more often by reading/partial reading (75.0%) than spontaneously (25.0%), other repetitions were almost always spontaneous (99.7% compared to 0.3% in reading/partial reading).

---

<sup>11</sup> These forms include partial or complete, and exact or semantic repetition (i.e. paraphrase)

Table 39 *Self repetitions and other repetitions in jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Jigsaw	Spontaneous		Reading/Partial Reading		Total
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
SRep	77	25.0	231	75.0	308
ORep	320	99.7	1	0.3	321

Table 40 below shows how often the students used self repetitions compared to other repetition in the decision making tasks. As can be seen, the total frequency of use of self repetitions was somewhat less than that of other repetitions (98 compared to 136). Both self and other repetitions were almost always spontaneous (94.9% and 97.7%, respectively), with occasional use of reading/partial reading (5.1% and 2.3%, respectively).

Table 40 *Self repetitions and other repetitions in decision making tasks (n=8)*

Decision Making	Spontaneous		Reading/Partial Reading		Total
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
SRep	93	94.9	5	5.1	98
ORep	133	97.7	3	2.3	136

Considering the use of self repetitions in the jigsaw tasks compared to that in the decision making tasks, the above tables show that self repetitions were used three times more often in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks (308 compared to 98). But while self repetitions were spontaneous only 25% of the time in the jigsaw tasks, 94.9% of self repetitions in the decision making tasks were spontaneous; and they were done by reading/partial reading much more often in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks (75.0% compared to 5.1%). Other repetitions also show differences across task types. As shown in above tables, other repetitions were used more than twice as often in the jigsaw tasks as in the decision making tasks (321 compared to 136). During

these tasks, other repetitions were almost always spontaneous in both jigsaw and decision making tasks: 99.7% and 97.7%, respectively.

Overall, the students made use of both self repetitions and other repetitions when working on both jigsaw and decision making tasks. However, they made use of both kinds of repetition far more often in the jigsaw tasks than in decision making tasks. They self repeated both spontaneously and by reading/partial reading in the jigsaw tasks due to the task design that employed reading materials, whereas other repetitions in the jigsaw tasks and both kinds of repetitions in the decision making tasks were almost always spontaneous. In the jigsaw tasks, since the students relied on information sharing from the different notes each had in order to fill out patients' information forms, they self repeated the most when they were reading/partially reading their own notes but repeated one another's comments spontaneously. In the decision making tasks, since the students relied on spontaneous discussion based on the same text in order to decide on patients' cases, they mostly used self and other repetitions spontaneously.

Self and other repetitions were used to perform a variety of discourse functions as shown in the next analysis. Table 41 below shows how often a move was carried out when the students self repeated or repeated the others in both task types. As can be seen, in both types of task, the students made the greatest use of both self and other repetitions for comprehension facilitation functions (clarification requests, confirmations, confirmation checks, comprehensions, comprehension checks, confirmation by reading, and comprehension by reading). For both task types, the students made use of self and other repetitions for confirmations (Conf), but especially other repetitions in jigsaw (153 times); to a lesser extent, this pattern can be seen for completions (Cmpl) as well. A

striking difference according to task was found regarding answers by reading (AR) carried out, for which self repetitions were very frequent in the jigsaw tasks. When they were answering by reading (AR), the students self repeated 132 times. Other striking differences were found regarding clarification requests (CRq), for which other repetitions were very frequent in jigsaw (105 times), and comprehension by reading (CompR), for which self repetitions were very frequent in jigsaw (78 times). In addition, a difference was also found regarding direct answers (A) carried out, for which both self and other repetitions were far more frequent in decision making than in jigsaw (14 to 1 and 10 to 1 for self and other repetitions, respectively).

Table 41 *Discourse moves carried out by self and other repetitions in jigsaw and decision making tasks*

Discourse Moves	Self Repetitions		Other Repetitions	
	Jigsaw Tasks	Decision Making Tasks	Jigsaw Tasks	Decision Making Tasks
Topic Initiation Questions (TIQ)	9	18	1	5
Topic Initiation Statements (TIS)	6	2	0	0
Topic Initiation Question by Partial Reading (TIQ PR)	0	1	0	0
Topic Initiation Statement by Reading (TIS R)	0	1	0	2
Direct answers (A)	1	14	1	10
Extended Answers (ExtA)	0	11	0	3
Comments (Com)	1	0	0	0
Answers by Reading (AR)	132	0	1	0
Extended Answers by Partial Reading (ExtA PR)	0	0	0	1
Clarification Requests (CRq)	6	1	105	5
Confirmations (Conf)	18	24	153	71
Confirmation Checks (ConfC)	1	6	26	28
Comprehensions (Comp)	25	5	0	0
Comprehension Checks (CompC)	0	2	0	3
Confirmation by Reading (ConfR)	21	1	0	0
Comprehension by Reading (CompR)	78	2	0	0
Self Corrections (SCor)	6	2	0	0
Peer Corrections (PCor)	0	0	2	1

Completions (Cmpl)	4	2	20	4
Extended Wh- Questions (ExtWhQ)	0	3	0	1
Extended Or Questions (ExtOrQ)	0	1	0	1
Extended Imperatives/Requests (ExtIm/Rq)	0	2	0	0
Uptake-P	0	0	8	1
Uptake-T	0	0	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>136</b>

Note: The shaded area indicates when the students did the moves spontaneously.

Table 42 and 43 below illustrate how self repetitions, done spontaneously or in reading/partial reading, were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers. Table 42 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 43 shows in the decision making tasks.

Table 42 *Distribution of self repetitions among participants in jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Student per Task	Self Repetitions			Discourse Moves
	Spon.	R/PR	Total	
F1 – T1	15	14	29	TIQ 3, TIS 1, CR 1, Conf 2, Comp 8; AR 4, CompR 10
F1 – T3	7	8	15	Conf 4, Comp 2, SCor 1; AR 4, ConfR 1, CompR 3
F2 – T1	6	7	13	Conf 3, Comp 3; AR 4, CompR 3
F2 – T3	0	15	15	AR 8, ConfR 1, CompR 6
F4 – T1	5	14	19	TIQ 2, CR 1, Conf 1, Comp 1; AR 12, CompR 2
F4 – T3	1	11	12	Conf 1; AR 4, ConfR 2, CompR 5
F6 – T1	1	30	31	Conf 1; AR 19, ConfR 6, CompR 5
F6 – T3	1	15	16	Conf 1; AR 4, ConfR 1, CompR 10
M1 – T1	0	9	9	AR 4, CompR 5
M1 – T3	0	11	11	AR 6, ConfR 4, CompR 1
M2 – T1	0	3	3	AR 2, ConfR 1
M2 – T3	2	15	17	CR 1, Conf 1; AR 10, ConfR 2, CompR 3
M3 – T1	7	18	25	Comp 2, Cmpl 4, SCor 1; AR 15, ConfR 2, CompR 1
M3 – T3	0	18	18	AR 13, ConfR 4, CompR 1
M5 – T1	22	36	58	TIQ 4, TIS 5, A 1, CR 2, Conf 2, ConfC 1, Comp 5, SCor 2; AR 19, ConfR 6, CompR 11
M5 – T3	10	7	17	Com 1, CR 1, Conf 2, Comp 4, SCor 2; AR 4, ConfR 1, CompR 2

Table 43 *Distribution of self repetitions among participants in decision making tasks (n=8)*

Student per Task	Self Repetitions			Discourse Moves
	Spon.	R/PR	Total	
F1 – T2	5	0	5	TIQ 1, A 1, Conf 2, ConfC 1
F1 – T4	18	0	18	A 5, ExtA 5, Conf 5, Comp 3
F2 – T2	4	0	4	A 3, Conf 1
F2 – T4	2	0	2	TIS 2
F4 – T2	2	1	3	A 1, Conf 1; ConfR 1
F4 – T4	2	0	2	TIQ 1, ExtA 1
F6 – T2	0	0	0	-
F6 – T4	0	0	0	-
M1 – T2	6	0	6	TIQ 5, Conf 1
M1 – T4	2	0	2	Conf 1, CompC 1
M2 – T2	1	0	1	Comp 1
M2 – T4	8	0	8	A 1, ExtA 1, Conf 3, Comp 1, Cmpl 2
M3 – T2	3	1	4	A 1, Conf 2; TIS R 1
M3 – T4	4	0	4	TIQ 2, Conf 1, ExtQ-Wh 1
M5 – T2	12	1	13	TIQ 1, A 2, ExtA 2, CR 1, Conf 4, CompC 1, ExtQ-Im/Rq 1; CompR 1
M5 – T4	24	2	26	TIQ 8, ExtA 2, Conf 3, Comp 5, SCor 2, ExtQ-Wh 2, ExtQ-Or 1, ExtQ-Im/Rq 1; TIQ PR 1, CompR 1

As can be seen from these two tables, the students self repeated while reading/partially reading more often than spontaneously in the jigsaw tasks, but they self repeated spontaneously more often than while reading/partially reading in the decision making tasks. Overall, all students did self repetitions in jigsaw, while all but one did them in decision making. Individual differences were fairly dramatic: out of 16 occasions (N=8, 2 tasks each of each kind), the total of self repetitions ranged from 3-58 in jigsaw and from 0-26 in decision making. The highest use of self repetitions in both task types was by M5 (while acting as the leader) with the greatest variety of moves (8 in jigsaw and 10 in decision making), and the least use of self repetitions was done by M2 in jigsaw and F6 in decision making. The second highest use of self repetitions in jigsaw was by F6 (31) who did not use any of them in decision making, and the second highest

use of self repetitions in decision making was by F1 (18). More specifically, spontaneous self repetitions ranged from 0-22 with 5 zeroes in the jigsaw tasks and from 0-24 with 2 zeroes in the decision making tasks, and self repetitions while reading/partially reading ranged from 3-36 with no zeroes in the jigsaw tasks and from 0-2 with 12 zeroes in the decision making tasks.

Related to students' role, the leaders tended to self repeat more often than the other members of the groups in the jigsaw tasks. However, in the decision making tasks, one leader (M3) seemed to self repeat only as frequently as the other members, and the other leader (M5) seemed to self repeat much more often than the other members. Overall, in both task types the leaders seemed to get more overt practice and use more varied moves. In terms of practice by doing self repetitions, in the jigsaw tasks the average among the leaders was 28.8 compared to that among the other members of 14.9 (almost twice as much); and in the decision making tasks the comparison was 11.8 to 4.3 (almost three times as much). In terms of the variety of moves, the average in the jigsaw tasks among the leaders was 5.0 compared to that among the other members of 3.9; and in the decision making tasks the comparison was even bigger, 6.0 to 2.2.

Table 44 and 45 below illustrate how other repetitions, done spontaneously or in reading/partial reading, were distributed in each task among the participants and how each participant's performance compared to her/his peers. Table 44 shows the distribution in the jigsaw tasks and Table 45 shows the distribution in the decision making tasks.

Table 44 *Distribution of other repetitions among participants in jigsaw tasks (n=8)*

Student per Task	Other Repetitions			Discourse Moves
	Spon.	R/PR	Total	
F1 – T1	29	0	29	CR 7, Conf 16, ConfC 4, Cmpl 1, Uptake-T 1
F1 – T3	19	0	19	A 1, CR 5, Conf 10, ConfC 2, Uptake-P1
F2 – T1	10	0	10	CR 5, Conf 2, ConfC 3
F2 – T3	29	0	29	CR 8, Conf 13, ConfC 1, Cmpl 5, Uptake-P 1, Uptake-T 1
F4 – T1	44	0	44	TIQ 1, CR 18, Conf 11, ConfC 6, Cmpl 5, PCor 1, Uptake-P 1, Uptake-T 1
F4 – T3	29	0	29	CR 17, Conf 8, ConfC 2, Cmpl 2
F6 – T1	28	0	28	CR 12, Conf 10, ConfC 1, Cmpl 2, Uptake-P 2, Uptake-T 1
F6 – T3	4	0	4	CR 1, Conf 3
M1 – T1	7	0	7	CR 1, Conf 4, ConfC 2
M1 – T3	10	0	10	CR 4, Conf 4, Cmpl 2
M2 – T1	2	0	2	CR 1, Conf 1
M2 – T3	4	0	4	CR 1, Conf 2, PCor 1
M3 – T1	22	1	23	CR 6, Conf 12, ConfC 2, Uptake-P 2; AR 1
M3 – T3	6	0	6	CR 2, Conf 3, Cmpl 1
M5 – T1	64	0	64	CR 16, Conf 44, ConfC 3, Cmpl 1
M5 – T3	13	0	13	CR 1, Conf 10, Cmpl 1, Uptake-P 1

Table 45 *Distribution of other repetitions among participants in decision making tasks (n=8)*

Student per Task	Other Repetitions			Discourse Moves
	Spon.	R/PR	Total	
F1 – T2	4	0	4	A 1, Conf 1, ConfC 2
F1 – T4	15	1	16	A 3, Conf 8, ConfC 1, Cmpl 2, Uptake-P 1; ExtA PR 1
F2 – T2	12	0	12	ExtA 1, Conf 11
F2 – T4	8	0	8	A 1, CR 1, ConfC 5, Cmpl 1
F4 – T2	6	1	7	Conf 3, ConfC 3; TIS R 1
F4 – T4	10	0	10	CR 2, Conf 3, ConfC 5
F6 – T2	1	0	1	ConfC 1
F6 – T4	3	0	3	A 1, Conf 1, ConfC 1
M1 – T2	6	0	6	TIQ 1, A 2, CR 2, PCor 1
M1 – T4	7	0	7	TIQ 2, Conf 1, CompC 2, Cmpl 1, ExtQ-Wh 1
M2 – T2	1	0	1	Conf 1
M2 – T4	2	0	2	Conf 2
M3 – T2	5	1	6	A 1, Conf 4; TIS R 1
M3 – T4	6	0	6	TIQ 1, A 1, ExtA 1, Conf 3
M5 – T2	19	0	19	TIQ 1, Conf 13, ConfC 4, ExtQ-Or 1
M5 – T4	28	0	28	ExtA 1, Conf 20, ConfC 6, CompC 1

As can be seen from these two tables, the students frequently repeated each others' comments spontaneously in each of the tasks, but only very rarely did they do it while reading/partially reading. They repeated each other more often in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. Other repetitions were variedly used by the students. Out of 16 occasions (N=8, 2 tasks each of each kind), the total of other repetitions ranged from 2-64 in jigsaw and from 1-28 in decision making. The highest use of other repetitions in both task types was by M5 (while acting as the leader), and the least by M2 in jigsaw and M2 and F6 in decision making. The second highest use of other repetitions in jigsaw was by F4 (44) with the greatest variety of moves (8), and the second highest use of other repetitions in decision making was by F1 (16) with the greatest variety of moves (6). More specifically, spontaneous other repetitions ranged from 2-64 with no zeroes in jigsaw and from 1-28 with no zeroes in decision making, and other repetitions while reading/partially reading ranged from 0-1 with 15 zeroes in jigsaw and from 0-1 with 13 zeroes in decision making.

Related to students' roles, the leaders tended to use other repetitions more often than the other members of the groups in the jigsaw tasks. However, in the decision making tasks, one leader (M3) repeated others' comments only as frequently as the other members, and the other leader (M5) repeated others' comments much more often than the other members. Overall, the leaders seemed to get more overt practice and use more varied moves. In terms of practice by doing other repetitions, in the jigsaw tasks the average among the leaders was 31.6 compared to that among the other members of 14.8 (somewhat more than twice as much); and in the decision making tasks the comparison was 14.8 to 6.4 (somewhat more than twice as much). In terms of the variety of moves,

the average among the leaders was 4.8 compared to that among the other members of 3.8; and in the decision making tasks the comparison was 3.8 to 3.0.

In sum, self repetitions and other repetitions were used to perform a variety of discourse moves in both task types. All students did self repetitions in jigsaw, while all but one did them in decision making, and all students did other repetitions in both task types. However, self repetitions and other repetitions were both used far more often in the jigsaw tasks than in decision making tasks. In both task types, self repetitions and other repetitions were variedly used by the students and the leaders seemed to get more overt practice and use more varied moves.

#### *Turns and Negotiation Cycles*

Another way of exploring the nature of the oral discourse generated through peer interaction using communicative tasks is to look at what is going on in the interaction. While completing the communicative tasks, the students were involved in interaction dealing with task management, task content, and lexical forms. This resulted in the students taking turns talking and playing the active roles of initiators and non-initiators (who responded) followed by further cycles of responses (in which roles were switched) in both task types. Here we can see how the nature of the tasks influenced peer interaction. As the jigsaw tasks required the students to share information to fill out a form and the decision making tasks required them to decide on patients' treatments, the students had to initiate, respond, and join in further cycles of responses in order to complete the tasks.

The data reveal that both task types (jigsaw in Communicative Tasks 1 and 3 and decision making in Communicative Tasks 2 and 4) generated interactive language where a student would spontaneously ask a question and somebody else would answer it. The students took turns in order to complete the tasks. They were told to assign among themselves who would be the leader of the group in the beginning of each task, except for Communicative Task 1 where a voluntary leader seemed to emerge for each group after some time. The leaders of the groups had the roles of initiators and in most cases took more turns. However, involvement of other students in the jigsaw tasks was different from that in the decision making tasks as can be seen in the way they took turns.

In the jigsaw tasks, each member of the group received different information on patients in a written note that s/he had to share in order for everyone to fill out a form. They usually did this by reading, and they worked together cooperatively in order to complete the task. Each member of the group had equal numbers of patients' facts to share. Thus they had an approximately equal distribution of turns. The turns were usually brief and to the point based on the information required, resulting in smooth exchanges among peers. From this turn taking we can see the kind of involvement they had in the interaction. Students usually knew when to interact/get involved, that is, when it was their turn to provide the required information.

Example 9 below shows a typical interaction of turn taking when the students were working on the jigsaw tasks. From this excerpt we can see how the students interacted with one another by asking and answering questions in turn. M3, who seemed to be the leader, had more turns than the others and initiated more topics (lines 1, 14, and 18). But the other members of the group also initiated at least once (M4 in line 4, F3 in

line 5, and F4 in lines 8 and 22), and they joined in further cycles of responses such as comprehension facilitation (lines 7-8, 10-13, 15-17, and 19-22) and completions (M3 or F4 in lines 8 and 13). (See transcription conventions in Table 4, page 53.)

Example 9 *Turn taking in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw), Group 2*

	M3: Patient five. What is her name?	{initiation}
	F4: He is <b>Robert James</b> .	
	M3: Robert James.	
	M4: Is he married?	{initiation}
5	F3: Is he married?	{initiation}
	M3: No. <b>He is single</b> .	
	F3: Single?	{comp. fc}
	F4: Single. What his occupation?	{comp.fc} {cmpl}, {initiation}
	M3: <b>He works in a big company</b> .	
10	M4: What?	{comp.fc}
	M3: <b>He works in a big company</b>	{comp.fc}
	M4: He works	{comp.fc}
	M3/F4: in a big company	{cmpl}
	M3: <b>as a computer programmer</b> . What his complain?	{initiation}
15	M4: <b>He's had a bad /shor/ throat. He's had a bad /shor/</b> .	{comp.fc}
	F4: had a bad?	{comp.fc}
	M4: <b>/shor/ throat, /shor/ throat</b> .	{comp.fc}
	M3: What did the doctor diagnosis?	{initiation}
	F3: <b>He's suffered from /tonsilleetis/</b>	
20	F4: He is?	
	F3: <b>/tonsilleetis/</b>	
	F4: <b>/tonsilleetis/</b> What the doctor's advise?	{initiation}
	F3: <b>to have an injection</b> .	

A different kind of involvement occurred in peer interaction when they were working on decision making tasks. A student took a turn and got involved when s/he was asked to by the leader or when s/he was inclined to do so. In the decision making tasks, all members of the group had access to the same information and needed to come up with a decision on patients' cases in order to complete the task. They needed to share their opinions to make a decision. So, unlike the information sharing in jigsaw that was fixed and rigid, the opinion sharing in decision making was more flexible and spontaneous, but

optional. The turns were not equally distributed among peers and not uniformly long or short, depending on students' opinions on the topic, and their inclination and ability to express it. In this case, personality seemed to play a greater role, too. Furthermore, due to the nature of the task, the students engaged more spontaneously in decision making tasks than they did in jigsaw tasks, where reading was part of the interaction.

Example 10 below illustrates the turn taking typical of decision making interaction. From the excerpt we can see that M7, who was the designated leader, took most of the initiatives and had more turns to keep the group going, which is a normal task for a leader. However, in the decision making task the leader usually asked a particular person a question (lines 2 and 8) and extended her/his question to get the reasons behind an answer (lines 6, 11, 16, and 22). While this person was talking, the other members might disrupt the turn unexpectedly if they wanted to express their opinions (F2 in line 15, and F1 in line 21). However, some members participated relatively little.

Example 10 *Turn taking in Communicative Task 2 Decision Making, Group 1*

M7: Number one. **A four years old boy with meningitis due to pneumococcus. He is allergic to penicillin.** How about you, M1? What you {question}

F1: What do you think?

M7: What do you think?

5 M1: I think the therapy is erythomycin.

M7: Why? {ext.question}

M1: Cause the patient is allergic to penicillin.

M7: And how about you, F1? {question}

F1: Um I think it, gentamicin *to (right?)*, in this he allergic to penicillin. In

10 gentamicin with penicillin.

M7: So? {ext.question}

F2: F1 is confused.

M7: Do you mean gentamicin with penicillin?

F1: But, but in this text

15 F2: I don't agree. {disruption}

M7: Why? {ext.question}

F2: Gentamicin indication ampicillin, eh penicillin. I think this is symptom, gives the co-trimoxazole because **old boy with meningitis due to pneumococcus.** Co-

20 trimoxazole indication **invasive salmonellosis**, I think his infection from *bakteri*  
*(bacteria)* the drug gives for the boy, the boy.  
 F1: I don't agree. {disruption}  
 M7: Why? {ext.question}  
 F1: In the indications tell **invasive salmonellosis**, but in case one the boy **with meningitis due to pneumococcus**. I think it's not.

In general, as reflected in the two excerpts above, the peer interaction that took place in both task types was mainly about the content of the task. However, the students were also dealing with task management (i.e. how to start a task, keep it going, and finish it) and linguistic forms (i.e. spelling and pronunciation of words required to do the task). In terms of word meanings, when the students did not understand them, they would get the answer from one another, the teacher, or a dictionary.

During task related interaction, misunderstandings frequently occurred due to the incomprehensibility of an interlocutor's utterance. This usually led to negotiation of meaning to resolve the problem. This type of negotiation has been extensively studied by Pica (1994) who defined it as interaction or exchanges between a listener and a speaker aimed at signaling and solving problems of message comprehensibility. In this research, the components of Pica's model of negotiation were coded, consisting of **trigger, signal, response, and closure**. Mackey (1995, p.70) defined **trigger** as the initial utterance which is not understood, **signal** as the utterance that lets the first speaker know that the message is not understood, **response** as the first speaker's reaction to the signal, and **closure** as the second speaker's response to the reformulated utterance, which can also serve as the trigger for another sequence.

As the interaction in both task types mostly dealt with task content, more such negotiations occurred when the students were dealing with content, compared to when they were dealing with task management and linguistic form. However, due to the task

design feature using small groups (instead of pairs as usual in the previous research), the components of negotiation were not always complete or in a fixed order of trigger-signal-response-closure cycle. A negotiation cycle was counted when there was a trigger which is the head of the cycle, followed by a signal and a response, so there were at least three turns in a cycle. The same signal, response, and closure might be repeated by other members in the group as they showed clarification, confirmation, and comprehension. Thus, some cycles might have complete and orderly components while others might not have a closure component, and yet others might have more than two signals, responses, and/or closures.

Example 11 below provides instances of negotiation cycles typical of those that occurred when the students were dealing with task content. In this excerpt, the first cycle took place in lines 2-7 with the utterance ‘/weer/’ as the trigger, followed by signal, response, signal, response, with no closure. The second cycle took place in lines 12-21 with the utterance ‘Hall’ as the trigger, followed by signal, response, a string of signals (lines 15-17), response (by another member, not the first speaker), and a string of closures (lines 19-21). The third cycle, which is complete and in order, took place in lines 24-27 with the utterance ‘thirty-two’ as the trigger.

Example 11 *Negotiation cycles dealing with task content in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw), Group 1*

	M1: What’s the doctor advice?	
	F1: <b>The doctor advised him to /were/, to /weer/ a bandage.</b>	{trigger}
	<b>/Weer/ a bandage.</b>	
	F2: /Weer/?	{signal}
5	F1: <b>/Weer/ a bandage.</b>	{response}
	F2: /Weer/?	{signal}
	F1: <b>/Weer/ a bandage.</b>	{response}
	(whispering in L1 - inaudible)	
	F1: Finished? Ok, patient two.	

10	F2: <b>Kevin.</b>	
	F1: His name is <b>Kevin</b>	
	M2: <b>Kevin Hall.</b>	{trigger}
	F1: Kevin?	{signal}
	M2: <b>Kevin Hull.</b>	{response}
15	F2: Hull?	{signal}
	F1: Hull?	{signal}
	F2: Hull?	{signal}
	M1: Hall.	{response}
	F1: Hall. Kevin Hall.	{closure}
20	M1: H-a-double-l.	{closure}
	F1: Kevin Hall. His name is Kevin Hall.	{closure}
	F2: How old is he?	
	[F1: How old is he?	
	[M2: <b>Thirty-two.</b>	{trigger}
25	F1: Thirteen?	{signal}
	M2: <b>Thirty-two.</b>	{response}
	F1: Thirty-two.	{closure}

With respect to negotiation of form, neither task type led to any negotiations dealing with grammatical form. Although the students made frequent grammar mistakes while interacting, for instance the omission of the verb ‘to be’ in a question, they kept on going since no misunderstanding seemed to interrupt them. The students only did self or peer correction when they were aware of a grammar mistake. In terms of lexical forms, such negotiation did occur, but in most cases the responding students simply pronounced or gave the translation of the word that seemed to be a problem. This is particularly the case for jigsaw tasks when they all had to write down the information from the others to complete the form. Example 12 below shows such an interaction. F1 who seemed to have a problem with the word ‘buttock’ asked for confirmation three times (lines 3, 5, and 9). On her third attempt when she tried to spell it out while confirming, M5 spelled it out the correct way, as he had the information from his note.

Example 12 *Negotiation dealing with lexical form in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw), Group 1*

- F1: What do you think the result?  
M5: It's me. **The /ras/ is on the buttock**  
F1: /Ras/ in the buttock? {conf.check}  
M5: **The /ras/ is on the buttock**  
5 F1: in, in the? {conf.check}  
M5: **buttock**  
F1: buttocks  
F6: buttocks  
F1: -b-a-? {conf.check}  
10 M5: **-b-u-t-, b-u-t-t-o-c-k-s-, buttocks, buttocks, and extensor surface**  
F6: and?  
M5: **and extensor surface of the arms and legs.** Ok, diagnosis?

As far as negotiation was concerned, rarely did it happen in either task type during task management. If it did, it was usually conducted mostly in the L1, like in the following example. In this task the group was asked to decide the ranking/order of seven patients to receive a heart transplant. M3 who was the leader of the group tried to manage and explain the procedure of the task as F2 and M1 showed lack of understanding, and he did this mostly in the L1 (lines 4, and 6-7).

Example 13 *Negotiation dealing with task management in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making), Group 2*

- M3: How about you with patient four?  
F2: Patient four?  
M1: Patient three *dulu (first)*.  
M3: *Kase berurut jo (Just rank them in order)*. {explanation in L1}  
5 F2: Hm?  
M3: *Se berurut jo yang paling penting (Just rank them in order who is the most important)*. More important. {explanation in L1}  
M1: Ok, I think patient three.

Overall, both task types did elicit negotiation of meaning. When the students negotiated meaning to obtain mutual comprehension, they used a variety of discourse moves such as comprehension questions, confirmation checks, and clarification checks.

Since the study employed two task types, they were compared in terms of total number of turns and negotiation cycles generated from the interactions of each type. Table 46 below shows a comparison between the jigsaw tasks and the decision making tasks in terms of the total number of turns, negotiation cycle turns (i.e. each time a student participated in a negotiation cycle), and the proportion of total turns that were negotiation cycle turns.

Table 46 *Total turns and negotiation cycle turns in proportion (n=8)*

Jigsaw			Decision Making		
Total turns	Negotiation	Proportion	Total turns	Negotiation	Proportion
1,356	712	52.5%	1,189	202	17.0%

As can be seen from the table, the proportion of negotiation cycle turns is much higher in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. This means that during jigsaw task completion, 52.5% of the interaction in the form of turn taking that the students made was dedicated to negotiation of meaning, compared to only 17.0% during decision making task completion. In other words, the jigsaw tasks proved to elicit much more negotiation of meaning turns than did the decision making tasks. However, as previously described, the length of turns was brief and to the point in jigsaw, while it was more flexible and creative in decision making.

With regards to individual participation, it is necessary to see how the total turns and negotiation cycle turns were distributed in each task among the participants, so that each participant's performance may be compared to her/his peers in the group. Tables 47 and 48 below show the distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in the jigsaw tasks. (The shaded area indicates when the student was the leader of her/his group.)

Table 47 *Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw) (n=8)*

Task 1	Overall turns		Negotiation cycle turns	
	Turns	%	Turns	%
<b>Group 1</b>				
F1 (leader)	89	40.8	29	37.2
F2	62	28.4	25	32.1
M1	47	21.6	17	21.8
M2	20	9.2	7	8.9
Sub Total	218	100.0	78	100.0
<b>Group 2<sup>12</sup></b>				
F4	95	28.1	55	28.3
M3 (leader)	91	26.9	48	24.7
Sub Total	338	55.0	194	53.0
<b>Group 3<sup>13</sup></b>				
F6	88	24.3	56	24.6
M5 (leader)	162	44.8	96	42.3
Sub Total	361	69.1	227	66.9

Table 48 *Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw) (n=8)*

Task 3	Overall turns		Negotiation cycle turns	
	Turns	%	Turns	%
<b>Group 1</b>				
F1	71	29.1	31	33.3
F6	33	13.5	10	10.8
M2	38	15.6	17	18.3
M5 (leader)	102	41.8	35	37.6
Sub Total	244	100.0	93	100.0
<b>Group 2</b>				
F2 (leader)	57	29.2	35	29.2
F4	48	24.6	33	27.5
M1	42	21.6	24	20.0
M3	48	24.6	28	23.3
Sub Total	195	100.0	120	100.0

As can be seen from the tables, the leaders of the groups in the jigsaw tasks tended to have more turns and negotiation cycle turns than the other members of the

<sup>12</sup> The other two members of Group 2 did not belong to the sample, so were not counted.

<sup>13</sup> The other two members of Group 3 did not belong to the sample, so were not counted.

group<sup>14</sup>. The distribution of total turns among the other members (out of 11 occasions) was relatively equal, ranging from 21.6% to 29.1%<sup>15</sup>. While all members engaged in some negotiations, the negotiation cycle turns among the other members of the group were not equally distributed, although with the two low exceptions (8.9% and 10.8%) the range was from 18.3% to 33.3%.

Tables 49 and 50 below show the distribution of overall turns and negotiation cycle turns among the students while they worked on the decision making tasks in small groups. The leaders of the groups in decision making had more total turns than the other members of the group, but not necessarily negotiation cycle turns. The distribution of total turns among the other members was relatively consistent, ranging from 16.9% to 29.2%, with the exception of M2's and F6's performance in both Task 2 and 4. The negotiation cycle turns among the other members of the group were far less consistent, with very low practice again from M2 and F6, and the range was from 2.1% to 33.3%.

Table 49 *Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making) (n=8)*

Task 2	Overall turns		Negotiation cycle turns	
	Turns	%	Turns	%
Group 1 <sup>16</sup>				
F1	54	18.9	10	20.8
F2	54	18.9	15	32.2
M1	54	18.9	5	10.4
M2	14	4.9	1	2.1
Sub Total	285	61.6	48	65.5
Group 2 <sup>17</sup>				
F4	27	21.1	9	32.1
M3 (leader)	34	26.5	7	25.0
Sub Total	128	47.6	28	57.1

<sup>14</sup> With the exception of M3's performance in Task 1.

<sup>15</sup> With the exception in three occasions of M2's performance in Tasks 1 and 3 and F6's in Task 3.

<sup>16</sup> The leader of Group 1 did not belong to the sample, so was not counted.

<sup>17</sup> The other two members of Group 2 did not belong to the sample, so were not counted.

Group 3 <sup>18</sup>				
F6	13	5.3	2	4.3
M5 (leader)	118	47.9	22	47.8
Sub Total	246	53.2	46	52.1

Table 50 *Distribution of total turns and negotiation cycle turns in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making) (n=8)*

Task 4	Overall turns		Negotiation cycle turns	
	Turns	%	Turns	%
Group 1				
F1	87	29.2	11	31.4
F6	36	12.1	4	11.4
M2	47	15.8	3	8.6
M5 (leader)	128	42.9	17	48.6
Sub Total	298	100.0	35	100.0
Group 2				
F2	39	16.9	10	22.2
F4	59	25.7	15	33.3
M1	53	23.1	6	13.3
M3 (leader)	79	34.3	14	31.2
Sub Total	230	100.0	45	100.0

In sum, the analysis of turns and negotiation cycles reveals that both task types generated considerable interactive oral language in the form of turn taking among peers working in small groups. As the students completed the tasks, interaction dealing with task content, task management, and lexical form took place, and negotiation of meaning sometimes occurred to solve a signaled problem for message comprehensibility. The leaders of the groups usually had more turns than the other members. Though the jigsaw tasks elicited more negotiation cycles than did the decision making tasks, overall turns among the members of the groups as well as the leaders in both tasks tended to be relatively well distributed, indicating a high level of practice by all members, with two exceptions (M2 and F6).

<sup>18</sup> The other two members of Group 3 did not belong to the sample, so were not counted.

### *Summary of Findings on Research Question One*

The nature of the oral discourse generated through peer interaction while completing two types of communicative tasks (jigsaw and decision making) was examined in three different perspectives: the amount of language generated, the kind of language generated, and the kinds of interactions that occurred. First, in terms of how much language was generated, both task types seemed to generate a considerable amount of language, though it seemed that the students talked somewhat less in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. The word count analysis shows that in the jigsaw tasks there seemed to be a balance between students' use of spontaneous language and reading aloud, while in the decision making tasks the students mostly talked spontaneously compared to the time spent reading. In addition, analysis of the use of L1 shows that the L1 was sometimes used in both task types to simply translate or to express ideas dealing with task management and task content. When dealing with task management in both task types, the students tended to use the L1 briefly to instruct the others or suggest that the others do something, and to use it extensively to figure out task procedures. When dealing with task content, they tended to use it briefly to negotiate meaning, which was typical in the jigsaw tasks, and to use it more extensively to discuss an issue, which was typical in the decision making tasks.

The second perspective used in examining the nature of the oral discourse generated through peer interaction was to describe the kind of language generated. This included identifying and categorizing discourse moves and repetitions. A taxonomy of the discourse moves observed was prepared, initially based on Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), and expanded to include sections covering reading-based language use. Analysis

of the discourse moves shows that the jigsaw tasks generated more discourse moves in total than the decision making tasks. Both task types generated both spontaneous and reading-based moves. Spontaneous moves were generated somewhat less frequently in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks, while reading-based moves were generated far more in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. Within the discourse moves categories, it seemed that comprehension facilitation, correction, and uptake were generated far more in jigsaw than in decision making, while extended questions were generated far less in jigsaw than in decision making. The other categories seemed to be generated as equally in both task types. (See Table 51 below for detail.)

Repetitions included self repetitions that might serve for practice and other repetitions that might serve for input and practice. Like the discourse moves, both kinds of repetitions were done spontaneously and by reading/partial reading. In addition, both kinds of repetitions were used to perform a variety of discourse functions. In the jigsaw tasks, while self repetitions were done more often by reading/partial reading than spontaneously, other repetitions were almost always spontaneous. In the decision making tasks, both self and other repetitions were almost always spontaneous, with occasional use of reading/partial reading. Though the students made use of both self and other repetitions when working on both jigsaw and decision making tasks, they made use of both kinds of repetitions far more often in jigsaw than in decision making.

Table 51 below summarizes and combines the findings on the frequency of the discourse moves observed during the implementation of both task types, and the findings on the frequency of both self and other repetitions done within the discourse moves during communicative tasks.

Table 51<sup>19</sup>

Summary of findings on the frequency of discourse moves and of self and other repetitions observed during communicative tasks

Discourse Moves	Jigsaw			Decision Making		
	Total	Self Repetition	Other Repetition	Total	Self Repetition	Other Repetition
Topic Initiation Questions	157	9	1	128	18	5
Topic Initiation Statements	53	6	0	21	2	0
Topic Initiation Question by Partial Reading	0	0	0	3	1	0
Topic Initiation Statement by Reading	9	0	0	16	1	2
<b>Sub total of Topic Initiations Category</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>7</b>
Direct Answers	29	1	1	213	14	10
Extended Answers	27	0	0	146	11	3
Comments	5	1	0	8	0	0
Answers by Reading	295	132	1	7	0	0
Extended Reading	56	0	0	2	0	0
Answers by Partial Reading	0	0	0	12	0	0
Extended Answers by Partial Reading	0	0	0	19	0	1
<b>Sub total of Responses Category</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>
Clarification Requests	142	6	105	23	1	5
Confirmations	222	18	153	136	24	71
Confirmation Checks	42	1	26	44	6	28
Comprehensions	26	25	0	14	5	0
Comprehension Checks	9	0	0	18	2	3
Decomposition	3	0	0	0	0	0
Left Dislocation	2	0	0	0	0	0
Confirmation by Reading	33	21	0	4	1	0
Comprehension by Reading	68	78	0	2	2	0
<b>Sub total of Comprehension Facilitation Category</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>107</b>
Self Corrections	17	6	0	16	2	0
Peer Corrections	12	0	2	8	0	1
Self Corrections while Reading	6	0	0	0	0	0
Peer Corrections while Reading	1	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Sub total of Correction Category</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Completions	31	4	20	25	2	4
<b>Sub total of Completion Category</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
Extended Wh- Questions	4	0	0	29	3	1
Extended Yes/No Questions	2	0	0	1	0	0
Extended Or Questions	2	0	0	5	1	1
Extended Imperatives/Requests	11	0	0	13	2	0
<b>Sub total of Extended Question Category</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
Uptake-P	9	0	8	1	0	1
Uptake-T	9	0	4	0	0	0
<b>Sub total of Uptake Category</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Sub total of spontaneous moves</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>Sub total of reading based moves</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total of moves</b>	<b>1282</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>136</b>

<sup>19</sup> The shaded area indicates when the students were speaking spontaneously rather than reading.

The third perspective used in exploring the nature of the oral discourse generated through peer interaction was to investigate the kinds of interactions that occurred during communicative tasks. This included turns and negotiation cycles. Examination of turn taking shows that in the jigsaw tasks all the students in a group had approximately equal distribution of turns. The turns were usually brief and to the point based on the information required resulting in smooth exchanges among peers. In the decision making tasks the turns were not equally distributed among peers and not uniformly long or short. Turn distribution and length rather depended on students' opinion on a topic, and their inclination and ability to express it. Furthermore, due to the nature of the task, the students were engaged less spontaneously in the jigsaw tasks where reading was part of the interaction than they were in the decision making tasks.

As the students completed the tasks, interaction dealing with task content, task management, and lexical form took place, and negotiation of meaning sometimes occurred to solve a signaled problem with message comprehensibility. Analysis on turns and negotiation cycles shows that the jigsaw tasks elicited more turns and negotiation cycle turns than did the decision making tasks. However, in both task types the overall turns among the members of the groups (except for the leaders who usually had more turns) tended to be relatively well distributed, indicating a high level of participation by most members.

## *Research Question Two*

*What are the main features of discourse used by the NNS teacher and what are the roles of her discourse during class sessions when the tasks were implemented?*

The teacher in this study was an experienced English teacher who shared the same L1 with the students. However, she almost never used the L1 when interacting with the students and her English command was near native like. In addition, she was familiar with and had used communicative activities in her speaking classes. This section considers the main features and roles of her discourse while managing two types of communicative tasks, jigsaw and decision making, and differences in her discourse by task type. The data were from four teacher transcripts, collected while she was implementing the four communicative tasks, which included her discourse in small group and whole class settings. The data were analyzed inductively through repeated readings in order to describe the main features and roles of her discourse, and to compare its differences between jigsaw and decision making.

This section is divided into four subsections. The first part on the main features of her discourse deals with her unique characteristics in interacting with the students through her talk. The second part on the roles of her discourse concerns the impact of her talk on the students. The third part on task differences in her discourse considers the contrast of her talk in the jigsaw tasks with that in the decision making tasks. For each subsection, examples of teacher talk from the transcripts will be presented to support its analysis. The final subsection summarizes the findings of this research question.

### *Main Features of Teacher Discourse*

The teacher's characteristic ways of using language while interacting with the students during task implementation were found throughout the data. There were five distinct features that characterized her discourse. It was

- interactive,
- collaborative,
- supportive,
- indirect, and
- spontaneous.

Each of these features is examined below with supporting examples from the teacher transcripts.

Interactive nature: The teacher was very interactive in the way she used the language. She tended to be as interactive as possible from the beginning of the class to the end of it, either in the jigsaw tasks or in the decision making tasks. She had a routine interaction at the beginning of the class, asking students about their well being before starting the lesson, as part of getting everybody started. Example 14 below shows this routine interaction; in this case it was in a decision making task. (See transcription conventions in Table 4, page 66.)

#### Example 14 *Routine interaction in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

- T: Good morning, class.  
Ss: Morning.  
T: How are you feeling today?  
Ss: Fine  
5 T: O you've been away for two weeks, eh, ya? Ha ah, did you enjoy those two weeks?  
Ss: Yes.

- T: I thought you had midterms or something like that? Did you really enjoy it?  
Hah?
- 10 S: Yes  
Ss: No
- T: No? Now, today um if you look at your book on page twenty-three, we will do a special project. Page twenty-three, please. Twenty-three, please. Um, ya.

The teacher did much of the talking while dealing with task management.

However, when giving instructions and directions to the students, she was interactive about it. She continually asked questions (content, rhetorical, or tag questions), repeated or reiterated the instructions, and made use of comprehension checks to make sure that the students had understood what she said. One typical comprehension check was the use of the L1 word “ya” which means “yes” or “ok”. In addition, when interaction with the students occurred during task management because of her questioning, the teacher also made use of clarification requests and confirmation checks. Here we can see how she interacted with the students with the language including formulaic expressions such as “Are you with me?” Example 15 below shows her typical way of dealing with task management using those features, as underlined.

Example 15 *Dealing with task management in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw)*

- T: Now, let’s start with the pre-task, pre-task, why don’t you look at your handouts. First page, please. **Look at the case notes and several possible diagnoses for the patient below. Work with a partner and order the diagnoses so that the most likely diagnosis is the first and the least last.** Thus
- 5 your task is, you have to order the diagnosis from the most possible until the least possible. And then **exclude any which seem very unlikely**. So, if you think A is not possible, just exclude it, ya? Now, why don’t you look at the table, you have **surname Nicol**, thus look at the data, you have the **first name, age, and then marital status, occupation, and then present complaint**, complaint, ya? Present
- 10 complaint, -n-t, look at that, -n-t-. And then, **headaches, um three and then slash fifty-four, fifty-two, what does it stand for?**
- Ss: (inaudible)
- T: Pardon? Ah ha, so how many weeks?
- Ss: Three weeks

- 15 T: Three weeks. That's right. Three weeks, and **unrelieved by aspirin**. Hm hm. **Initially flu-like symptoms, unable to sleep, slight weight loss, feels weak and tired**. Now on examination, **O/E**, you have the **general condition**, you have to read this, ah you still remember what **CVS** stands for, right? What does CVS stand for?
- 20 S: Cardio  
T: Cardio?  
S: Vascular  
T: Vacular System. And CNS?  
Ss: Central
- 25 T: Central Nerve System. That's right. Um, **BP? BP?** You have  
S: Blood pressure.  
T: Blood pressure. Ok. **HS?** Heart sound. Heart sound. Ok. Why don't you read this again and you have to work in pairs. You have the possible diagnoses below, ya? And then read the possible diagnoses, consider the present complaint, and um
- 30 the results of the examination, ya? And then try to order the, your diagnoses, ya? Are you with me? Is it clear? Yes. So, work in pairs. What about M13 and probably M9, if you have difficulties, why don't you sit over here, so at least you can work in pairs. Otherwise, you have to work in a group of three. M9 over here. You are in pairs. Yes? What about two, to do, now the three of you can work together, ya? Ok. Yes, please. Ya? Thus try to work in pairs, so you can talk about the what is it, the most likely diagnosis is the first and then the least is the last, ya? You have to rearrange these things. Ok. Hm hm, work in pair, in pairs please.
- 35

Not only was she interactive in dealing with task management, but she was also very interactive in dealing with task content. All four tasks used in the study had a pre-task followed by a main task. The pre-task was done in pairs and the main task in small groups. In each occasion, after the students did the tasks, either the pre-task or the main one, the teacher would ask them to check their answers together. When she did this, interactions with the students occurred due to her use of questions. Examples 16 and 17 below illustrate how interactive the teacher was when dealing with the task content. Example 16 shows a typical interaction when the teacher and the students were dealing with the content of a pre-task, and Example 17 with the content of a main task.

Example 16 *Dealing with task content of the pre-task in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)*

- T: Could we check now? Number one, it's done for us. **What's the patient's name?** Or we can say: What's his name, what's her name? What about number two? F4?
- F4: What is (inaudible)
- 5 T: Pardon. What's his age? Another way of asking to get information about um age. F4 said, What's his age? Do you have the same or different?
- Ss: How old are you?
- T: Yes, M5, say it again?
- S: How old
- 10 T: How old is he? How old is he? That's right. What about marital status? M12?
- M12: Is he married?
- T: Is he married, ya? Is she married? That's fine and then number four. Ah F2, occupation, F4?
- 15 F4: What's his occupation?
- T: What's his occupation, or what's if a lady, what's her occupation?
- S: What does he do?
- T: What does he do? That's right. What does he do? Ha ah.

Example 17 *Dealing with task content of the main task in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

- T: So, I guess you've already written down your groups' decisions, ya? So, let's start with um, let's look at what is it, page fifty. Let's start with group one, group one, ah thus you've already ranked the patient organ recipient, group one, who do you think is the first to receive the heart?
- 5 F1: (inaudible)
- T: Yes, F1, ya? On behalf of your group, that's fine.
- F1: Kim
- T: Ah ha, come on.
- F1: Soohan Kim
- 10 T: M2, then? Oh F1?
- M5: F1
- T: F1 then? Come on, F1. Yes.
- F1: Our group think Soohan Kim.
- T: Ah Soon, Soon
- 15 F1: Soohan Kim
- T: Soohan Kim ha ah, what do you think, group two? Who's the first to receive the heart?
- S: Soohan Kim
- S: Patient two
- 20 T: Patient two. So, Soo, Soohan, Soohan. Group three? You're group four. Group three? What do you think?

Collaborative nature: The teacher supported group collaboration through her language. She made sure that everybody gave their points or had the chance to answer questions. Thus, even though a student had answered a question, she would ask others to give their opinion as well such as “Do you agree?” or “What do you think?” This collaborative feature usually occurred when the teacher asked the students to check their answers after they had completed the pre task or the main task of both the jigsaw tasks and decision making tasks. Examples 18 and 19 below illustrate how collaborative the teacher was when interacting with the students during this occasion. Example 18 shows a typical kind of collaboration in the jigsaw tasks, and Example 19 in the decision making tasks.

Example 18 *Being collaborative in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw)*

- T: the diagnosis?  
M8: **the diagnosis is the patient must have mononucleosis, glandular fever.**  
T: Glandular fever. Yes. Is that alright?  
S: No.  
5 Ss : Yes.  
T: Ah M5, why not? Oh it is alright. Ok. Now, we can move to group four then. Group four, group four. Yes, M11? Speak up.  
M11: Patient four is, patient four is **forty years old** and she's **female**, and she **complain of nausea and episodes of pain in the right /heepochondrium/**  
10 T: Hypochondrium. Ha ah.  
M11: And from **finding on examination, the pain associated with dietary indiscretion and Murphy's sign is positive, and there is mild jaundice.**  
T: Jaundice.  
M11: And from **the results of the investigation, the lab tests show alkaline /phosphotase/ one hundred sixty per liter, cholecystography shows a non-**  
15 **functioning gall bladder, and the diagnosis is the patient must have cholelithiasis.**  
T: Cholit-lethiasis. Do you agree?  
Ss: Yes.  
20 T: Yes. And last but not least, group five, yes please. Group five.

Example 19 *Being collaborative in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

- T: Yes, M11? What is it? So, besides his responsibility is bigger than Sohan, Soohan's, what else that makes you choose Leonid? Yes, you mentioned as a researcher, **he works as a researcher for the CIA**, ya? So, he has a good, good ah position for the country, ya, for his country. So, based on his position, a
- 5 **Kremlinologist, Soviet expert**, he's an expert, ha ah, secondly. Ah that's the second, first you mentioned his responsibility because of having three children. Now, what do you think their reason for choosing Leonid, group one? Maybe you can ah say your reasons for choosing Soohan, ya. Ya? M2 or anybody? Ya? And then we move to M1's group, yes?
- 10 M5: We think the, we choose Soohan Kim for the first is according to condition, dramatically, and he's younger.  
T: And?  
M5: He's younger.  
T: He's still young. He is still young. Thus, because of age you think. Ha ah?
- 15 M5: Leonid Gromykovitch thirty-four  
T: Thirty, in his thirties and?  
M5: And  
T: Soohan is  
M5: if we compare, we will choose Soohan Kim.
- 20 T: Soohan Kim is still a teenager. What about group two, why did you choose, yes anybody, why did you choose Soohan? Come on, yes?  
M3: We agree with M5.  
T: M5? For the same reason? F2, no other reasons, just the same?  
F2: I agree.
- 25 T: Ah ha, group four why did you  
S: Same opinion.  
T: Same opinion. Ah so, how would you defend your choice? They've, they've already mentioned the same reasons. There are two reasons. Did you catch it, catch them? Ya? There are two reasons. Ok.

Supportive nature: This is in the sense that she set a model for the students through her language. She modeled the language in alternative ways and gave feedback when necessary. In terms of feedback, she usually did this by correcting a mispronounced word or a grammatical mistake. In so doing, she provided the students with good input that was important in this EFL setting since exposure to the oral language was limited in this setting. Example 20 and 21 below illustrate how supportive her language was to the students as she presented a model and provided some feedback.

Example 20 shows her way of modeling the language during a jigsaw task, in this case the alternative ways of asking questions, and Example 21 shows her way of providing feedback during a decision making task, in this case by correcting the mispronounced word 'meningitis.'

Example 20 *Modeling the language in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)*

T: What did the doctor suggest him? Yes. Any other way of asking? F3? What did the doctor suggest him? Or, what did the doctor tell, what did the doctor tell him? Ya? M2? If you use the word advise, what did?

M2: (inaudible)

- 5 T: No, no, you ask um um by using thus another way of asking what did the doctor suggest, what did the doctor tell him? Oh, F4 then, yes? What did? Use the word, use the word advise. What did the doctor? Advise. What did the doctor suggest? What did the doctor advise? You can also ask: what did the doctor tell him? Ya? Now you will be using all these things in a group work, ya? That we  
10 will have right now. Thus, try to use all these questions. Thus, how old is he, how old is Mr. Blah blah blah, how old is Miss blah blah blah, what's his age, etc. So, um if for instance about the doctor's diagnosis. What did the doctor diagnose? Usually we say oh he's suffered from blah, blah, blah, ya? He's suffered from tonsillitis, for instance. What did the doctor advise? Or what did the doctor tell  
15 him? For instance, oh the doctor told him to um take a rest, to take a rest. Ya. The doctor suggests him to take a rest, ya? Thus, you try to use all these expressions. Are you with me? Yes? Yes. Could we continue with the second task? Yes?

Example 21 *Providing feedback in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

T: Ah ha, group one, why don't you listen again why they disagree? Ha ah.

S: Because the patient is with /meningeetis/

T: meningitis

S: ningitis and the medicine indication is not say about /meningeetis/

- 5 T: meningitis, meningitis, erythromycin, ya? So, it is alright? Ya? So, gentamicin. Gentamicin. Now let's, let's what is it? M7, you have, yes, say it, say it, please. Ha ah?

Use of indirect formulations: The teacher used indirect formulations, since she was continually asking questions in her management. Thus, instead of telling the students what to do, she would ask them. This might show her politeness and respect for the students. For example, when she thought that the students had almost finished

working on a task, she did not say, “You only have two more minutes.” But she would say, “Can I say two more minutes, two more minutes?” Another example of her indirect characteristic was the use of request questions such as “Why don’t you ...?” and “Shall we ...?” instead of direct instructions in giving guidance or instructions to the students.

Spontaneity: In addition to spontaneous questions that can be seen in the examples so far, she also created or joined in spontaneous little jokes while interacting with the students. In terms of spontaneous questions, some of them went above and beyond the tasks themselves. We can see that in this way the teacher used the language to communicate not only for lesson content but also spontaneously. Examples 22 and 23 below capture the teacher’s spontaneity in using the language while conversing with the students. Example 22 shows her joining in a spontaneous little joke triggered by other students toward M1 (about his potential romance with F2, not known by the teacher) during a jigsaw task, and Example 23 shows a spontaneous question that was beyond the task during a decision making task.

Example 22 *Joining in a spontaneous joke in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw)*

T: ... So, let me divide you into groups. Group one, ah consists of M2. M2, yes? M2, F1, F1, M5, and F6. You belong to group one. Group one over here. Ya. And then group two, M3. Yes, M3. F4, F4. F2, F2. And then M1 is here, M1.  
Ss: Hu uh (laughing)  
5 M1: yes, ma’am  
T: Yes M1?  
Ss: (laughing)  
T: So, there must be something, ya? Why did, why did they cut their  
S: (inaudible)  
10 T: Pardon?  
S: relationship, ma’am  
T: O relationship. Why? Um do you any objection?  
Ss: (laughing)  
T: Do you have any objection?  
15 Ss: No.  
T: Or do you support him?

- Ss: Of course.  
 T: Yes. Very good.  
 Ss: Hu uh (clapping hands).  
 20 T: They like teasing. Me, too. Ok, ya? So, again group two, ah again M3, F4, F2,  
 and M1.

Example 23 *Asking a spontaneous question in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

- T: Yes. Yes? Shall we try to check? Now, by the way, what do you understand by pharmacology? What is pharmacology?  
 Ss: (inaudible)  
 T: Anybody? Don't answer in chorus. Yes, M5?  
 5 M5: (inaudible)  
 T: Pardon?  
 M5: Study of  
 T: Study of?  
 M5: Drugs  
 10 T: Drugs? Medicines? Yes? Do you agree with M5?  
 Ss: Yes.  
 T: Yes, yes. Thus pharmacology, ha ah that's scientific study of the action of drugs on living systems, ya? That's right. Now, um let's look at question one, **what's a, what's a phar, pharmacology reference?** Anybody wants to answer?  
 15 Number one? **What's a pharmacology reference?** F1?

Overall, the teacher was very interactive, collaborative, supportive, indirect, and spontaneous in the way she used the language while managing both task types. This was mainly accomplished through her use of questions. In so doing, she set a good model for interaction through her discourse: using language not only for task implementation but also for spontaneous communication with the students. The next subsection looks at the roles of her discourse in students' task completion.

*Roles of Teacher Discourse*

The teacher had two prominent roles in the implementation of both task types. She played these roles through the use of language. This subsection examines the roles

of her discourse in terms of the impact it had on students' task completion. The two major roles of her discourse were as follows:

- role in task management (dealing with her initiation of the interaction with the students), and
- role in ensuring task content comprehension (dealing with her support in the interaction among the students).

In both roles, she set a model for an interactive language as she made use of questions during task implementation.

Role of teacher discourse in task management: The teacher initiated the interaction and guided the students in what they were to do: listen, pay attention, and respond. This occurred when she gave directions on task procedures in both task types. Though there was not much interaction per se, in terms of exchanges between the teacher and the students during this kind of interaction, through her discourse the students were listening, paying attention, and responding to what she said. Example 24 and 25 below illustrate how the teacher did this through her language. Example 24 shows how her discourse required the students to pay attention and respond to her during a jigsaw task. In this case some students had to move in order to work in pairs, and as observed, they paid careful attention to her directions and responded positively by moving over.

Example 24 *Requiring students to listen, pay attention, and respond in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)*

T: Ah ha, now the pre task runs like this. Every body has got one? Yes? Thank you. **What questions should you ask to get a patient's information below? Write your questions and compare them with a partner.** So you work in pairs. Are you in pairs? Two, two, two. Um M1, maybe you work with M2, ya? Just two, M6 why don't you move over there? M1 move over here, ya? You work in pairs, two, and um what is it, F6, F6, oh yes. So, M5, you just try to work with F6, F6 and F5, F5, ya? Now let's look again at the pre-task, pre-task ...

Furthermore, when dealing with task procedures, the teacher made sure that the students knew exactly what to do. Thus, she usually reiterated directions and gave examples to the students. Again, the students were required to listen and respond in action to what she said. Example 25 shows how her repetition of directions and examples during a decision making task made the students listen and respond accordingly.

*Example 25 Requiring students to listen, pay attention, and respond in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

- T: ... Thus class, class, before you start discussing, listen please. Before you start discussing, why don't you try to tell about your group. Um this is group one, the chair is this, the secretary, and the members are, ha ah. Say your name, say your name, please. Thus choose the chair person and the secretary.
- 5 M7: M1  
M1: M7. M7.  
T: Ya? And then is it already on? Not yet?  
Ss: Not yet, not yet.
- 10 T: Ah thus you start with um what is it, informing your group, this is group one, the chair will speak this is group one, and the chair, and the chair person and the secretary is this and the members, ya? Or you can, you can tell your own name, I am ta ra ta ra, my name, ya?

Role of teacher discourse in task content: Through her language, the teacher helped students in their interactions while dealing with task content. There were three ways in which her discourse potentially affected the students positively. First of all, the students were provided with a model of the language; secondly, they were encouraged to get involved in the interaction; and thirdly, they were encouraged to collaborate to reach a decision. All these occurred when she walked around to monitor the students while they were working in small groups to do the tasks and when she checked answers as she led the whole class discussion after the students finished working in their small groups.

In terms of providing a model of the language, when deemed necessary she would correct, complete, or model an utterance for the students. This might include

pronunciation, grammar, and formulaic expression, and occurred in both task types.

Example 26 below shows how she provided a model of a good request to the students in a jigsaw task while a small group was discussing.

Example 26 *Providing students with a model in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)*

- M3: He gets the pain when?  
F4: **when he bends over**  
M4: bends over?  
F3: what?  
5 F4: **when he**  
T: Say could you say it again? Like that.  
F3: Could you say it again?

Regarding encouraging students to get and keep involved in the interaction, when a student had answered a question or made a point, she would ask the others' opinions as well. This kind of support occurred in both task types, particularly as she led the whole class discussion. She tried to get the students to speak, no matter whether an answer had been given or not. She made it important not just to get the right answer, but that everybody said what their answer was. She also encouraged them to speak up if they did not agree on a point. Example 27 shows how the teacher encouraged the students to get involved in making a decision on the most appropriate antibiotics for a patient in the whole class discussion.

Example 27 *Encouraging students to get involved in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

- M7: Um group one think the therapy for number one is benzylpenicillin.  
T: Say it again, please, so they can listen well.  
M7: The therapy for number one is benzylpenicillin.  
T: Ah what do you think about the result?  
5 Ss: No.  
T: No. Ah. Now  
M7: Benzylpenicillin  
T: Who has objection? Which group has objection? Group? Yes? Group three.  
Why don't you listen to group three.

Concerning reaching a decision through collaboration, she would encourage the students not only to give their answers but also to defend them, then together try to find out the common ground. This kind of support particularly occurred in the decision making tasks when she led the whole class discussion. She usually became the mediator, summarizing the points that the students had made, asking for more opinions, and trying to reach an agreement. Example 28 below shows how she operated during a decision making process among the students as they discussed which patient should receive the heart transplant in the whole class discussion.

Example 28 *Encouraging students to collaborate in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

- T: Could you agree with their opinion that should be Peter Jacobsen instead of Alicia. Remember Alicia has kidney failures, ya? That, that's dangerous, ya?  
So, yes, M5?
- 5 M5: If we choose Peter Jacobsen, the patient (inaudible) will be /wors/ because  
T: worse, will be worse because?
- M5: Peter Jacobsen **has already had one heart transplantation operation.** And **his body rejected.** And if we give the heart  
T: the second chance  
M5: the second, the heart will be rejected again.
- 10 T: Ok. So, they object because there is the likelihood that his body will reject.  
M5: Give to Martha  
S: But  
T: So  
S: if you give to Martha, because the primary trouble, it's been um
- 15 T: the scarlet fever  
S: scarlet fever  
T: the scarlet fever  
S: If you give the new heart she will have the same condition with the first, first (inaudible) will make the heart (inaudible)
- 20 T: So, what do you think? What do you think? They are for Peter and then they are for Martha. What do you think? Whom would you side with? Martha? For what reasons? And you, think about Peter or Martha, ya?  
S: Choose Martha because  
T: Ah ha, listen, please, M8's group, M8, they side with Martha because
- 25 S: has four child and  
T: Martha has four children, you mean.  
S: but (inaudible)

T: How many? Ah, so, they are thinking of Martha's responsibility.

S: Yes.

30 T: Four children while Peter is still unmarried. So, um no dependents, ya? So, let's accept Martha then, ya? Now, let's move. So, Martha is the? Fourth?

S: Yes.

As mentioned previously, her support in reaching a decision through collaboration was specific to the decision making tasks, which required the students to pool information they each had. Hence, the next subsection is concerned with task differences in her discourse.

### *Task Differences*

While the teacher was implementing the two task types, there were differences in the way she used language. As can be subtly seen from the examples of the two previous subsections, the teacher operated rather differently in the jigsaw tasks compared to the decision making tasks. Although her main features of discourse (interactive, collaborative, supportive, indirect, and spontaneous) were found in both task types, her spontaneity in commenting and asking questions was more obvious in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks. In addition, of her discourse roles, one was solely played out in the decision making tasks, that is, encouraging students to collaborate in order to reach a decision. Thus, she seemed to be more engaged in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks. This subsection looks at task differences in terms of why and how she was more engaged in the decision making tasks.

As for the reason for her high engagement in the decision making tasks, this was mainly due to the nature of the tasks. Compared to the jigsaw tasks where the students were provided with different notes regarding patients' different information and they just

had to share the information in order to complete the task which was to fill in the patients' information table, in the decision-making tasks, the students were provided with the same reading text on which their decision was based regarding patients' treatments. In other words, students' information sharing attracted less teacher involvement than students' expression of opinion in order to reach a decision. Consequently, the teacher was more engaged when the students were working on the decision making tasks than when they were on the jigsaw tasks.

In terms of the ways in which the teacher seemed more engaged in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks, four things were obvious in her discourse. First, she made spontaneous comments on task procedures and task content more obviously in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks. Example 29 and 30 below capture her spontaneous comments while the students were working on a decision making task. Example 29 shows her spontaneous comments on task procedures and Example 30 on task content.

Example 29 *Spontaneous comments on task procedures in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

T: ... Five, **listen carefully to your classmates' opinions, but do not be afraid to disagree with those opinions**, ya? Thus, don't be a yes man, ya? Try to defend your own opinion, ya? And then six, **try to reach a consensus on the ranking of the patients, from the first to receive the heart to the last**, ya? Thus you try to talk, to discuss in the group, and you try to reach a conclusion, a consensus, who has to ah get the heart first until the last ...

Example 30 *Spontaneous comments on task content in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

T: Ah ya, ya, ya. So, because of age. So, age should be under consideration, too. Ok. So if the groups agree that, so the sixth is Amegneza, and the seventh? What's the seventh?  
Ss: Peter Jacobsen

- 5 S: Peter  
 T: Peter. Why Peter? Oh poor Peter.  
 S: Because (inaudible)  
 T: What's Peter? Ha ah?  
 S: **His body rejected the heart three weeks ago.**
- 10 T: Ah  
 S: So, maybe need a lot of time to do heart transplantation again.  
 T: Ah so, do you agree that the seventh will be Peter, poor Peter? You, too? You agree? Oh poor Peter.

Second, she asked spontaneous questions that went above and beyond the task itself in the decision making tasks. Example 31 below illustrates how her spontaneous questions went beyond the task. In this case, she wanted the students to recognize the consequences of giving the wrong medicine and so to apply caution in choosing one.

Example 31 *Spontaneous questions going beyond the task in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

- T: ... Thus you will have uh ten patients, you try to solve, ya, uh read what they are suffering from, and then try to give the best antibiotic, ya? The most appropriate, don't give uh wrong, wrong antibiotic. What will cost if you give the wrong medicine? Remember, antibiotics, hm? So, what will happen?  
 S: (inaudible)  
 T: Yes? The patient, yes, M5, say it again. The patient will be dead. That's one of the possibilities, ya? So, it's very important you know, the what is it, the pharmacology, pharmacology reference well, so that you can choose the most appropriate antibiotics ...

Third, she got very involved in the decision making process of the students as they tried to reach an agreement. Not only did she encourage the students to collaborate (like in Example 28), but she also expressed her own opinion on the topic of discussion. This only occurred in the decision making tasks. Example 32 below captures her involvement as she expressed her opinion on which patient to receive the heart transplant in a decision making task.

Example 32 *Getting involved in making a decision in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

- Ss: Amegneza  
T: Ah patient number?  
S: Number one.  
T: Amegneza. Why, why Amegneza instead of um Alicia then? Why  
5 Amegneza? Hm hm? Why Amegneza instead of um Alicia, number six?  
S: Number six?  
T: Yes.  
S: Because Alicia (inaudible)  
T: I was thinking, what do you think, do you agree that the sixth to receive the  
10 heart is Alicia, the fifth, and the sixth is Amegneza? My question is why don't  
you give the heart better to Ali, um to Amegneza instead of to Alicia? Because  
Alicia has kidney failures, so that's dangerous. Don't you think so? What do you  
think? What do you think? Thus you prefer Alicia to Amegneza? So

Finally, she showed appreciation of the students' accomplishment more strongly in the decision making tasks. Unlike in the jigsaw tasks where she ended the class with a simple expression of appreciation for their accomplishment, in the decision making tasks she was more enthusiastic in her appreciation, asking the students to clap their hands for their accomplishment. Example 33 below shows her great appreciation of students' accomplishment in the decision making tasks.

Example 33 *Appreciating students' accomplishment in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

- T: ... Ok. So, you know what it is. Yes? I think you've done it very well, both tasks, um I think all of you will become good doctors, ya.  
Ss: Yes.  
T: And ya, good doctors. So, let's give to us big hands.  
(all clapping)

In sum, the differences in teacher discourse between jigsaw and decision making were caused by the teacher's high engagement in the decision making tasks, which was primarily due to the nature of the tasks. Students' information sharing in jigsaw seemed to attract less teacher involvement than their expression of opinions in decision making.

### *Summary of Findings on Research Question Two*

In terms of the main features of the teacher's discourse, there were five distinct features that characterized her discourse in both task types. First was its interactive nature. The teacher was very interactive in the way she used the language from the beginning of the class to the end of it. Second was its collaborative nature. She supported group collaboration through her language use. Third was its supportive nature. She modeled the language in alternative ways and gave feedback when necessary. The fourth feature of her discourse was that she used indirect formulations, since she was continuously asking questions in both her classroom and lesson management. The fifth feature was its spontaneity. In addition to asking spontaneous questions, she created or joined in spontaneous little jokes while interacting with the students.

In terms of the roles of her discourse in task implementation, the teacher had two prominent roles. First of all, when dealing with task management, she initiated the interaction and guided the students in what they were to do: listen, pay attention, and respond. Secondly, when dealing with task content, she supported the students in their interaction by providing them with a model of the language, encouraging them to get involved, and particularly in decision making, encouraging them to reach a decision.

As the teacher implemented the two task types, there were differences in the way she used the language. Although the main features of her discourse were distributed over both task types, her spontaneity in commenting and asking questions was more obvious in decision making than in jigsaw. Furthermore, of her discourse roles, encouraging students to collaborate in order to reach a decision was solely played out in the decision making tasks. Her high engagement in this task type was mainly due to the task nature.

### *Research Question Three*

*What are the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes with respect to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method? Is there evidence of change in their perceptions and attitudes over the course of the semester?*

The study involved one section of the Communicative Skills course for premedical students. The course was based on a textbook of nine units, updated from the previous course and compiled by the teaching staff. During this one semester the students participated in four communicative tasks, adapted from certain units of their textbook. Each was implemented in one two-hour session, including the pre- and post-task, and involved peer interaction in a small group discussion. The other sessions were devoted to more traditional activities.

The previous two sections have described how the students and the teacher implemented two types of communicative tasks, jigsaw and decision making, in this setting. This section looks at their self-reported reactions to the tasks. The data, based on the eight student participants and the teacher, were from two sets of student debriefings, the teacher interview, and their reflective written comments and questionnaires. Focused content analysis was undertaken involving repeated readings and coding of emerging categories. This section is divided into three subsections. The first subsection compares the participants' perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method. The second subsection compares the participants' perceptions and attitudes with respect to jigsaw tasks vis-à-vis decision making tasks. The third subsection summarizes the findings of this research question.

*Participants' Attitudes and Perceptions with regard to Communicative Tasks vis-à-vis  
Teacher-Fronted Tasks*

As the communicative tasks used in the study were adapted from the course textbook, they were designed specifically to employ reading materials. The reading texts used as a basis for oral discourse generation provided students with vocabulary used in different medical contexts as well as information that stimulated and enriched their conversational discourse. The students working in small groups were encouraged to talk about the topics in the texts, and needed to work together with others to solve problems and to get their meaning across through interaction. In other words, the task design, while involving reading, also elicited spontaneous interactive language. The students had not used the selected communicative tasks for this specific course prior to the study.

This subsection explores the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of such communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method (which employed a more teacher-fronted approach). The primary data were from two sets of student debriefings on the two task types and a teacher interview, supplemented by students' and teacher's reflective written comments and questionnaires.

Seven themes emerged from the data analysis:

- attitudes toward communicative tasks compared to teacher-fronted tasks,
- perceptions about different aspects of language learning in communicative tasks,
- attitudes and perceptions regarding peer interaction in communicative tasks,
- reasons for L1 use in task completion,
- perceptions regarding other task-related issues,

- perceptions of the relevance of communicative tasks to medical studies, and
- changes in perceptions/attitudes regarding communicative tasks over time.

Each of these themes is presented below in detail supported by quotations from the participants taken from the data.

*Attitudes toward communicative tasks compared to teacher-fronted tasks*

The debriefing and interview data revealed the students' and teacher's self-reported attitudes toward communicative tasks compared to teacher-fronted tasks. In general, participants<sup>20</sup> had a more positive attitude toward the communicative tasks than toward the teacher-fronted ones. This more positive attitude toward the communicative tasks was reflected in the data through the participants' expressed opinions regarding the following three matters:

- engagement/motivation,
- causes of interest/liking, and
- L2 instructional preferences.

Engagement/motivation: The participants tended to be more engaged and motivated when doing the communicative tasks than the teacher-fronted tasks. They thought that the communicative tasks were better and able to engage them more than the teacher-fronted ones for three main reasons. First of all, the students became active or got involved while doing the communicative tasks, and they talked more, compared to the teacher-fronted tasks, in which the teacher was the one who talked or did much of the talking. This was true for all eight students who commented on this point, and the teacher. Table 52 below illustrates this point.

---

<sup>20</sup> "Participants" in this section refers to both students and teacher when they express similar views.

Table 52 *Students were more active and talk more in communicative tasks*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary <sup>21</sup>
Student Debriefing 1	M2: "This (the jigsaw task) is much better. Because usually it's only the teacher who speaks, the teacher who is active. Here we were forced/encouraged to be active."
Student Debriefing 2	F2: "Because in this kind of task (decision making) each one of us can give our opinions. In teacher-fronted activities, it's only one way, we're passive not active. When we use dialogue like this, we become active, all of us. When it's only the teacher explaining in the front, only the teacher, we just become listeners."  F4: "Oh. Actually it's good when we talk, express opinion. First of all, I became more confident/braver in speaking. Because if the teacher keeps talking and sometimes asks questions, oh we have questions like that, it seems that we get lazy to ask because we just keep silent. So, we are more passive compared to this expressing opinion when we ourselves who did more of the talking."
Teacher Interview	T: "I think the tasks that you assigned ... are more effective in the sense that you use small groups, we [were] used to pair work, but I noticed that small group ... is very, very helpful to make the students more involved in the task ... And I like to see that they get more involved in the task."  T: "Oh of course, these two types of tasks they are more student-centered I think, ya, instead of the teacher talking most of the time, so the students talk more than the teacher."

Second, compared to when the teacher just gave explanations at the front of the class, which often bored the students, they were motivated to do the communicative tasks because they were interesting. Hence, the students paid attention to and enjoyed doing them, which was beneficial for their learning. Five students and the teacher commented on this point and Table 53 below illustrates this.

<sup>21</sup> Comments for this column and the following tables include direct quotations from participants, indicated with semicolons after participant identification and with quotation marks, and third person statements from researcher's notes.

Table 53 *Students became motivated and enjoying doing communicative tasks*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M1: "When it's just a communicative activity like this, it's good, I like it. When the teacher explains in the front of the class, it's very boring."  M5: "... we can express opinions. Well when it's with friends I feel motivated or challenged like that."
Teacher Interview	T confirmed that the topic was interesting for the students.  T: "I think the most important thing is because they enjoyed it. Now if students enjoy the teaching, the lessons, then usually it's more functional."

Third, compared to the teacher-fronted tasks where the students often felt shy and afraid of making mistakes, the students reported not feeling this way while doing the communicative tasks because they were working with peers. As they worked together in small groups with their classmates, these feelings disappeared. Three students admitted this point as illustrated in Table 54 below.

Table 54 *Students were not shy or afraid of making mistakes while doing communicative tasks with their classmates*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F1: "The teacher just sees us, sometimes when we speak, we are afraid of making mistakes. Here it was just with friends, so it's ok if we made mistakes."
Student Debriefing 2	M2 confirmed that he didn't feel shy or afraid of making mistakes when doing the activity.

This kind of engagement in the communicative tasks (being active, getting involved, talking more, getting motivated, enjoying the tasks, and not being shy or afraid

of making mistakes) were also observed as the students worked in their small groups and more particularly as the teacher resumed the class to check on their work. As observed, the students got very involved when there was a disagreement among the groups. It seemed that their engagement in the small group discussion was carried out in the subsequent whole class discussion as well, which was not the case in the teacher-fronted activities.

Causes of interests/liking: There are three reasons why the participants liked the communicative tasks more than the teacher-fronted tasks. First of all, it was due to the perceived benefits of the communicative tasks. The students thought that the tasks helped them in their learning, particularly in speaking, listening, and writing skills, and the teacher thought that the students learned from the tasks since they enjoyed doing them. Such benefits made the participants like the tasks. This was expressed clearly by three students and the teacher as illustrated in Table 55 below.

Table 55 *Students liked communicative tasks due to their benefits*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F2 reported that she likes the activity because "It increases my speaking skills in English; I become more fluent in speaking."  M5: "Because we could listen to the others A, B, C, D, talking and our ears tried to catch it, so we could write it down. So, I think that is the benefit. There's listening and speaking and writing."
Teacher Interview	T thinks that the students like the tasks very much as they seemed to enjoy doing the tasks: "Sometimes they couldn't help teasing one another, something like that, thus, and I've been thinking probably they didn't want to wait until the other members are already finishing answering their questions individually, because as a group they are very enthusiastic, they want their group to be number one."

The second reason the participants liked the communicative tasks was their differences from the teacher-fronted tasks. As the students worked together in small groups to complete the communicative tasks, they became more involved, which they liked. Here, the students were more active compared to when the teacher dominated the class during the teacher-fronted tasks. Three students and the teacher expressed this point as captured in Table 56 below.

Table 56 *Students liked communicative tasks due to their differences from teacher-fronted tasks*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M3: "It was much better working with groups."  F6: "I like it probably because it is different. I'm bored with only explanations or with something passive like, you know. This activity is really good."
Teacher Interview	T: "... they are not patient enough to wait. They want to work in group. For instance the last teaching, we assigned them to teach ah to answer individually first the questions, but sometimes they couldn't wait, they wanted to work as a group."  T: "The most important thing is I like because the students, they got more involved. And each student I noticed that he or she feels that he or she's somebody instead of just the teacher dominates the class and then one way communication, see."

The third reason causing the students to like the communicative tasks was the topics covered. The topics related closely to their field of study and had direct applications. Although these topics were the same as in the teacher-fronted tasks, the activities on which the topics were dealt with were different, which relates to the second reason. Four students particularly commented on this point as captured in Table 57 below.

Table 57 *Students liked communicative tasks due to topics related to students' field*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M3: "Very good, because we were trained to, specifically as students of the Faculty of Medicine, to be able to diagnose in English, to know causes of illnesses, to know the relationship between the causes of illnesses and the occupation or status of the patient."
Student Debriefing 2	F2 confirmed her comments in the post task that she likes the task because she is able to classify the medicines and to communicate more fluently in English.  M2 confirmed his comments on the post task that he likes the task because it gave him more knowledge about the medicine.  M5: "The goal, because my basic is in medical then I could, from this activity I could know how to choose which medicine to give."

L2 instructional preferences: Most of the students said they would like to have communicative tasks in their future L2 instruction, and they would like to have both task types interchangeably. The teacher also had the same feeling and she was willing to adapt her future teaching materials to a communicative task-based approach. Six students and the teacher expressed this point as illustrated in Table 58 below.

Table 58 *Preferences for communicative tasks in L2 instruction*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F1: "I like to have it more often, but not monotonous all the time."  F6 likes both communicative tasks and likes to use both for future English lessons, interchangeably.  M5: "For the future, yes I prefer this kind of activity."
Teacher Interview	T thinks that she will use these types of tasks because they are more effective, but "of course not every time like this."  T is willing to adapt or modify teaching materials to be task-based, and understands the consequence of having to prepare them ahead of time.

*Perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in communicative tasks*

The debriefing and interview data revealed the students' and teacher's self-reported perceptions of the different aspects of language learning that took place during communicative tasks. Two issues came up regarding beneficial features of the tasks:

- multi-modal processing of language, and
- written support from texts.

Both of these were believed by the participants to have helped the students in their language learning.

Multi-modal processing: The tasks integrated all language skills and the students believed that the tasks had helped them to improve their knowledge and skills, including vocabulary, speaking, listening, and writing skills. Among these four modalities, the primary ones mentioned were vocabulary and speaking. The students had a lot to say regarding their perceptions of multi-modal processing. In fact all eight students and the teacher expressed this point as illustrated in Table 59 below.

Table 59 *Multi-modal processing in communicative tasks: vocabulary, speaking, listening, and writing*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F1 confirmed that her vocabulary was increased with this activity: "Yes, it's increased; my knowledge is increased, too."  F2: "The benefits, with this activity we become, we can communicate in English, do conversation, we get to know the words that we didn't know before, we get to know the difficult words, we can practice talking in English."  M2: "In my opinion, it helps us to increase our speaking and listening."
Student Debriefing 2	M1 thinks that the tasks have increased his vocabulary, speaking and listening skills.

	F4 thinks that the activity helped her to speak in L2, particularly in terms of pronunciation: “Because often times the way we pronounced the words was not as they should be. So, when we said them we knew that was wrong, the correct one was supposed to be like this.”
Teacher Interview	T confirms that the communicative tasks are more effective in improving students’ speaking skills and vocabulary.

However, since the students were at different levels of English proficiency and benefited from the tasks differently, there were a couple of comments counter-indicating the above positive comments, particularly regarding vocabulary learning. In Student Debriefing 1, M3 (a relatively stronger student) reported that he wanted to ask the others about the new words, but didn’t due to time constraint. He also reported that during the task completion, he didn’t want to know the meaning of the new words, just to write them down (i.e. complete the task). Thus, it seemed that the task did not motivate him enough to learn the word meaning. In Student Debriefing 2, F4 (a relatively weaker student) reported that the activity did not do much for her vocabulary development, except for practice which is for the purpose of learning: “In that case, maybe [my vocabulary was] not that much improved. Because, unless you have a friend whose English is outstanding, then it’ll be improved. But usually not much improved.”

Written support from texts: The students particularly saw the written texts as an advantage and made use of them in their practice while completing the tasks. They referred to the texts as necessary for practicing their language skills or when difficulty arose in task completion. This kind of support made them more confident, particularly in the decision making tasks. Six students specifically expressed their positive view of written support from the text in their learning as captured in Table 60 below.

Table 60 *Written support from the text in communicative tasks*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F1 thinks that the task is better compared to usual activities like when the teacher is in the front due to the written text that makes it more understandable, the speaking much easier, and makes her more confident, "because it is in the text".</p> <p>M1 confirmed the written support from the text, particularly for Communicative Task 2, so that he can give opinions and due to the fact that all group members had all information in the written text: "Yes. So, we won't get mixed up. Sometimes we say it incorrectly, mispronounce it."</p> <p>F6 confirmed that she could understand most of the discussion because of having the text.</p>

*Attitudes and perceptions regarding peer interaction in communicative tasks*

The debriefing and interview data revealed the students' and teacher's attitudes and perceptions regarding peer interaction in communicative tasks. In general, the participants have positive attitudes and perceptions regarding peer interaction, as reflected in the data when they talked about the following three issues:

- benefits of practicing with peers,
- kinds of influence from the group members, and
- group size.

Benefits of practicing with peers: Three specific benefits were extracted from their commentary. The first benefit related to the students' confidence building. As they worked with peers in small groups to do the communicative tasks, their confidence was built up and increased. They became more confident and braver in speaking or expressing

their ideas. Five students and the teacher commented on this point as illustrated in Table 61 below.

Table 61 *Students' confidence building as a benefit of practicing with peers*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M3 reported that he became more confident in speaking with this activity.
Student Debriefing 2	M2: "We became more confident in discussion. Because we were more active, we became more talkative."  F2: "More confident because it was only among us, right, when it is in the front, for example when the teacher is in the front and then one of us goes in the front or does something, we feel you know."
Teacher Interview	T: "... the students they also, they get to participate more, they get to participate more and because they are peers so they feel yes ..."  T: "Yes. So, they get their self-confidence gradually."

The second benefit of practicing with peers concerned the less threatening atmosphere created during the communicative tasks. The students felt much more relaxed working with peers. They were not nervous because they were working together among themselves. The teacher also noticed this more relaxed atmosphere. Furthermore, as observed above, there were a few occasions in which little jokes were thrown out by or to specific students either in the small group discussion or the whole class discussion, and the students and the teacher laughed together. This unthreatening atmosphere was believed by the participants to be conducive to learning. Three students and the teacher commented on this benefit as illustrated in Table 62 below.

Table 62 *Unthreatening atmosphere as a benefit of practicing with peers*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F1 confirmed that she felt more relaxed because of working together with friends.
Student Debriefing 2	F2: "[not] nervous or you know. When it's only among us friends talking, it's normal."
Teacher Interview	T: "Sometimes they couldn't help teasing one another, something like that, thus, and I've been thinking probably they didn't want to wait until the other members are already finishing answering their questions individually, because as a group they are very enthusiastic, they want their group to be number one."

The third benefit of practicing with peers dealt with indirect learning from peers. This even extended to listening to the others while they were talking. In this way, they could sometimes get the right pronunciation, spelling, and meaning of certain vocabulary. Though only two students specifically expressed this point in their commentary, as illustrated in Table 63 below, it would seem likely that others also benefited from indirect learning.

Table 63 *Indirect learning as a benefit of practicing with peers*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F6 confirmed that she understood the others when they were arguing, and by listening to them it helps improve her English.

In spite of these benefits of practicing with peers, it should also be noted that one student expressed his less positive perceptions regarding this matter, particularly in Student Debriefing 1. M5, who was one of the stronger students, felt that he did not learn much from his peers and that his confidence was not much improved, either, because his

partners were not what he called “compatible,” or were at different proficiency levels. This negative feeling seemed to change when he said in Student Debriefing 2 that he became more confident as he expressed his thoughts among friends.

Kinds of influence from group members: Three issues were extracted from the data. The general issue of group members’ influence was brought up by the students and the teacher, and two specific issues were brought up exclusively by the students. The general issue was concerned with the fact that the group members influenced one another in the way they handled the tasks, whether actively or passively. The influence could be either positive or rather negative. The more active students could motivate the less active students to talk, but too active students could shun away the others and too passive students could discourage the others as well. Five students and the teacher addressed this point as illustrated in Table 64 below.

Table 64 *Influence from the more or less active peers*

Data Source	Participants’ Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>M2: “Of course, definitely influential. For example, when our information is not enough, we need to ask. If nobody responds, we keep asking.”</p> <p>F4 also confirmed that when the others just kept silent she would keep silent.</p> <p>M3: “For example, there were some who were not that active, just said yes, following the others’ opinion. There were some who were active, and this could motivate us to be more active, more fluent.”</p> <p>M5: “Obviously when for instance I talked in English and the others didn’t respond or didn’t understand, obviously I became reluctant in expressing my next thoughts. In the contrary, when we were talking with our friends, and they talked too much, it would be difficult for us to talk, too. I also notice in my group this morning, someone was passive. Maybe it was because the others talked too much or the opportunity to speak was small or I don’t know the other reason. Or maybe s/he just didn’t want to talk.”</p>

Teacher Interview	T: "Thus they work, I mean they work together well. Thus they influence each other for instance one, let's say for instance one is reserved, but when they have to fill in, they ask for information, she has to speak, so she is forced to speak. In that case I think it's a group influence, especially those who don't want to talk."
-------------------	---

The two specific issues concerning group members' influence brought up by the students were the influence in L1/L2 use and the influence of having "new" vs. "old" peers. The students were forthright in expressing their opinions regarding group members' influence in L1/L2 use. They reported tending to follow the conventions of the groups. On one hand, when one student used the L1 as a response to a perceived difficulty, the others would tend to do the same. On the other hand, when the leader of the group did not allow L1 use during task completion, the others would try their best not to use it. In other words, the use of L1/L2 depended on group leadership and group members' cooperation in dealing with perceived difficulties and on their speaking skills. Five students addressed this specific issue as illustrated in Table 65 below.

Table 65 *Influence of L1/L2 use*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F1: "Yes, they did, when they used Indonesian, I got to use it, too. When they responded in English, finally I got to speak in English, too, like that."</p> <p>F2: "It would depend on the togetherness/cooperation of the group members. If for instance one of us is talking in English, but the other one doesn't understand, then obviously we have to use Indonesian. If for instance little by little in English, just trying, but the important thing is that all should try to talk in English, it will work."</p> <p>F6: "So far I followed, you know I was always with M5 in the groups, he didn't allow us to talk in Indonesian. So, when the task was finished then we all asked each other and then we could use Indonesian, except when we spontaneously responded in Indonesian but just a little."</p>

The other specific issue concerning the group members' influence was that of having "new" vs. "old" peers as members of the groups. Only a couple of students brought up this specific issue, but the others might have more or less similar experiences when they worked with different peers. Since they had not been as accustomed to the "new" peers as they had been to the "old" ones, they might feel shy or unusual at the first time they worked together. They preferred to work with familiar peers. This point is illustrated in Table 66 below.

Table 66 *"New" vs. "old" peers*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F2: "But when for instance we are separated. Got mixed up, so I feel like shy when talking, because we don't know the others quite well."  M2 has the same feeling as F2, and confirmed to feel different working with new peers.

Group size: The participants' attitudes and perceptions regarding peer interaction in communicative tasks were also reflected from the commentary regarding the formation of the small groups. One particular student and the teacher addressed this matter and thought that the group formation of four students was good since all the group members were encouraged to be active and participate more, and the teacher could monitor better. This point is illustrated in Table 67 below.

Table 67 *Group size of four students*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	M3: "I think this one is better because the students were divided into several groups. One group had four people and this made all of them active compared to the regular, in which when some students got bored, they didn't pay attention anymore."

Teacher Interview	T: “Yes, we have also used group, small group, small group technique, but I noticed four, you kept using four members only and I think that’s the number that’s very good ... in these small groups I think teachers, the teacher can also monitor better and the students they also, they get to participate more ...”
-------------------	---

The teacher also thought that the grouping should consider students’ levels of proficiency. Too high and too low together is difficult, low and low is not good: “There must be somebody who is higher ... Otherwise they will be kept low, low in profile, low in performance.” As designed, this study had considered and applied this matter as much as possible.

*Reasons for L1 use in task completion*

There were four main reasons given as to why the participants, in this case the students, used the L1 during task completion:

- limited L2 proficiency,
- habit/spontaneity/L1 environment,
- to move along, and
- unintelligible pronunciation/lack of comprehension.

Limited L2 proficiency: All eight students expressed the view that there were times when they had to use the L1 in order to complete the tasks because they were limited in their L2 proficiency, and the teacher also thought the same. When they got stuck and did not know what to say in the L2, particularly when arguing, reasoning or defending their ideas, they eventually had to use the L1. This point is illustrated in Table 68 below.

Table 68 *Limited L2 proficiency as a reason for L1 use in task completion*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	<p>F1: "Well actually no, there is no need to use Indonesian. But because my English is still limited, well I have to. But actually, it's much better to use English only."</p> <p>M1: "It's difficult to get the right words that we want, yes. I thought how should I say it, eh? So, I just used Indonesian."</p>
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F4: "Right. That's due to the language. I actually wanted to talk more, but most of the time we just mentioned the name of the medicine, oh the medicine is this one like that. But to argue for it, considering its complications this and this, that's the difficulty."</p> <p>M3 reported that L1 was used due to different opinions and it was difficult to support or defend their opinions.</p>
Teacher Interview	<p>T thinks that students would speak in L1 when they got stuck but would use L2 as long as they could even without the tape recorder.</p> <p>T confirmed that one of the reasons for students' use of L1 was due to their limited L2 proficiency.</p>

Habit/spontaneity/L1 environment: The students were used to talking with each other in the L1 since they all shared the same L1. It was their habit, which proved difficult to completely eliminate, and at times was unleashed subconsciously or spontaneously during task completion. In other words, the environment supported the students in using the L1 as it created the condition to do so. Seven students expressed this point as illustrated in Table 69 below which was confirmed by the teacher.

Table 69 *Habit/spontaneity/L1 environment as a reason for L1 use in task completion*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	<p>F4 confirmed that she used L1 spontaneously, didn't think of it anymore: "It was unleashed."</p>

	F6 confirmed that L1 use was due to the environment, having the same L1 as the others.
Student Debriefing 2	M1: "Well, it's a habit, cannot be changed."  M3: "It's because we're accustomed to using it, it came out spontaneously when we got stuck, when we didn't know what to say, it just came out spontaneously."
Teacher Interview	T confirmed that one of the reasons for students' use of L1 was due to the context/environment where everyone speaks the same L1.

To move along: The students felt the need to use the L1 when they had difficulty expressing ideas in L2, so they could keep on going with the task at hand and move faster, considering the time limitation in completing the tasks. Five students and the teacher commented on this point as illustrated in Table 70 below.

Table 70 *To move along as a reason for L1 use in task completion*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F4 confirmed that L1 was used to move on when there was silence and no body wanted to start asking.  M3: "When there was trouble, we used it to move along."
Student Debriefing 2	M3: "Get stuck, for example to talk, I don't know what to say in English. So, I used it spontaneously to get the discussion going."
Teacher Interview	T: "... The only thing as I told you sometimes one or two they were forced to speak Indonesian probably it's faster and they could understand right away."  T: "Yeah, keep silent. And that's not good when you keep silent, ya? So, probably to avoid the silence then they just used [Indonesian] and sometimes Manadonese."

Unintelligible pronunciation or lack of comprehension: At times the students used L1 because the others did not understand what they meant when they were talking in L2. Four students particularly expressed this point as illustrated in Table 71 below.

Table 71 *Unintelligible pronunciation/ lack of comprehension as a reason for L1 use in task completion*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M2: "Because when someone talked in English, those who listened sometimes didn't understand."  F6 confirmed that she used L1 when after saying it in L2, it was still unclear for the others.
Student Debriefing 2	M3 confirmed that when they had different opinions in discussion, but the others didn't understand, they used L1.

L1 use after task completion: In addition to the four main reasons given for L1 use in task completion, it was used also after task completion for two different reasons. On one hand, it was used by the weaker students to understand what they had missed, as expressed by F6: "It was after all the activities were finished, I asked him." On the other hand, as observed and demonstrated in the small group discussion transcripts, L1 was used occasionally by the students to double check their groups' work before the teacher resumed the class for whole class discussion.

*Perceptions regarding other task-related issues*

During the debriefings and interview, the participants expressed their perceptions regarding other task-related issues. Four specific task-related issues were identified from their commentary:

- lack of concern about the process/attention focused on the product,
- sense of time pressure,
- unfamiliarity with the tasks, and
- need for teacher's support.

Lack of concern about the process or attention focused on the product: They believed that their main goal was just to complete the tasks, so whenever they stumbled on new words, they usually did not bother to try to understand them right away since their attention was focused on the product. Three students particularly expressed this point as captured in Table 72 below.

Table 72 *Lack of concern about the process/attention focused on the product*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F6: "Well I didn't, I mean it's quite ok, because the important thing was that I could do or finish the activity."
Student Debriefing 2	M3 confirmed that he just went on even when there were new words, he thought the important thing was to complete the task.

Sense of time pressure: As the students were given specific time periods to work on the tasks in their small groups, students felt obligated to finish within the time limit. So, even though they had some questions to ask some of them did not do that because they sensed the time pressure. Relating to this matter in a slightly different way, the teacher also noticed that the students sometimes were not patient enough to complete the tasks, wanting to be the first group who finished the tasks. This point is illustrated in Table 73 below.

Table 73 *Sense of time pressure*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F6: "At that time the important thing was to finish the activity."
Student Debriefing 2	M3: "I didn't have time to ask at that moment."
Teacher Interview	T: "...they are not patient enough to wait." T: "... Because I was thinking they wanted to be number one."

Students' unfamiliarity with the tasks: Particularly when the tasks were first implemented, there was a tendency that the students needed to get used to them to feel encouraged to participate. A couple of students especially expressed their feelings regarding this matter as captured in Table 74 below.

Table 74 *Unfamiliarity with the tasks*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F4: "Because at that time I didn't understand because I wasn't accustomed to listen to it ..."
Student Debriefing 2	F6 thinks the activity didn't really force her to speak English, "Maybe because it was new."

Need for teacher support: As one particular student expressed it, she particularly needed the teacher's support due to her lack of vocabulary. The teacher also expressed this matter as she admitted that she should have given more support to the students while they were working on the tasks. This point is captured in Table 75 below.

Table 75 *Need for teacher support*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F4: "I think so (L1 use is still needed), especially when I don't know how to say it. This is for instance when we're talking and there was still Indonesian used, but because we didn't know what to say it in English, so the teacher could say like this oh the English word for that is this, so we could know it."
Teacher Interview	T: "... I should have more returned and then helped them with the difficulties, to overcome their difficulties. So, that's my weakness."

*Perceptions of the relevance of communicative tasks to medical studies*

The debriefing data revealed a more specific issue regarding the relevance of communicative tasks to medical students. Since the topics were very closely related to the students' studies, the students believed that they learned two things at the same time. They learned some knowledge of medical studies and the language to use it for communication. Both of which could later be applied in their professional career. The students elaborated on these points as they expressed their opinions on:

- relevance of content, and
- language use in professional situation.

Relevance of content: The students thought that through the tasks they were learning for instance how to make a diagnosis and give the appropriate treatment. Five students commented on this point as illustrated in Table 76 below.

Table 76 *Relevance of content*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F2 confirmed her comments on the post task that she got something positive from the others in terms of the content of the text: "how to give an appropriate medicine."

	<p>F6: “I think this task is better and we can see its advantages directly, more beneficial, particularly because it dealt with medicines, when it just deals with dialogues, it’s just to practice conversations. But this one maybe has double functions, there’s conversation and there’s more for our own studies.”</p> <p>M3: “Good. Because I got to know like, for instance this illness, with the available medicine, doses, and side effects, I can choose which one is appropriate.”</p>
--	--

The teacher also saw this advantage as she wrote a similar note in her reflective comments: “Students have the chance to argue which antibiotics are the most appropriate and why.”

Language use in professional situation: The students thought that they learned the specific language they would need for their future career. They believed that through the tasks they were being trained to do their later work in the real world. In other words, the tasks were practical and meaningful for them. Three students specifically expressed this point as illustrated in Table 77 below.

Table 77 *Language use in professional situation*

Data Source	Participants’ Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M1: “So, for instance when we have become doctors and have patients who are you know [foreign], we can communicate in English.”
Student Debriefing 2	M2: “To practice speaking and get to know more meaning (inaudible) for work.”

*Change of perceptions/attitudes over time*

So far we can see that the participants’ attitudes and perceptions regarding the communicative tasks are generally positive. However, further elaboration in the

debriefing and interview, supplemented by the students' post questionnaires, revealed an element of change in the students' and teacher's perceptions/attitudes over time. In terms of the students' perceptions/attitudes over time, overall, all were positive at the end. Two categories were identified, however, each applying to different students. In terms of the teacher, one category was determined. The three categories were as follow:

- change in students' perceptions/attitudes: from negative to positive
- no change in students' perceptions/attitudes: positive from the beginning
- change in teacher's way of teaching.

Change in students' perceptions/attitudes, from negative to positive: Five students admitted this change as they commented on the matter and they were consistent in their position in this category when they answered the post questionnaires. The teacher also noticed this change, from negative to positive, in students' attitudes in general. This point is illustrated in Table 78 below.

Table 78 *Change in students' perceptions/attitudes: from positive to negative*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F1: "The first time when I saw this, what is this, but after having read it, oh it's much fun, interesting."  M2: "Oh for me, at first I felt this, at first I thought it would be boring, you know just talking like that, but then after some time doing it, I found lots of benefits. So, I became to like it."
Teacher Interview	T: "... if in the very beginning they were afraid ..., they seemed to be a little bit ... reserved, but later on that there's much growing self confidence. And I like to see that they get more involved in the task."

No change in the students' perceptions/attitudes, positive from the beginning:

Three students reported that they were always positive from the beginning to the end.

However, unlike the first category where the debriefing comments were consistent with the answers in the post questionnaires, this category was rather ambiguous. The two students who particularly positioned themselves in this category when asked in the debriefing, which is captured in Table 79 below, also positioned themselves as having the element of change from negative to positive in the post questionnaires. The other student did not specifically comment on this matter in the debriefing, but positioned himself to this category in the post questionnaires.

Table 79 *No change in students' perceptions/attitudes: positive from the beginning*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F6 confirmed that she had no change in perception, she liked it from the first time she saw it. She was interested right away.  M3: "I don't think so; I liked it from the beginning to the end."

Change in teacher's way of teaching: The teacher expressed her appreciation of the communicative tasks and therefore willingness to change in her way of teaching. She was particularly impressed with the effectiveness of small group work and communicative tasks, and willing to use them in her future lessons. This point is captured in Table 80 below.

Table 80 *Change in teacher's way of teaching*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Teacher Interview	T: "Yes, we have also used group, small group, small group technique, but I noticed four, you kept using four members only and I think that's the number that's very good you know. So maybe next time I would like to try this same technique ..."  T: "But at least I now want to change a little bit about my way of teaching, thus try to use small groups and communicative tasks."

	<p>T: “Yes, I mean the way of teaching, I would like to change it, my way of teaching then, seems that there’s always a gap in communicative tasks and that who will fill the gap? The students. So, that’s interesting. Most of the students. Now in traditional way of teaching, the teacher leads so I think the communicative task that you used is worth using.”</p>
--	---

*Participants’ Attitudes and Perceptions with regard to Jigsaw Tasks vis-à-vis Decision Making Tasks*

The two types of communicative tasks employed in the study were jigsaw and decision making. As pointed out in the literature review, jigsaw tasks provide each student with part of information in a text that each must share with the others to complete the task with a single outcome, while decision-making tasks provide each student with information needed to complete the task, with a number of possible outcomes. For the jigsaw tasks in this study each student was provided with different written information regarding each patient. They had to share this information with the others so that all group members could fill in each patient’s information table. In the decision-making tasks, all students were provided with the same reading texts about patients’ cases on which their group decision on appropriate treatment would be based. Each task began with a pre-task with several open-ended questions to activate students’ background knowledge regarding the specific topic of the task, and ended with a post-task, always the same open-ended questions for students to reflect on their learning during the particular task. (These could be answered in the L1.)

This subsection explores the students’ and teacher’s perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of jigsaw tasks vis-à-vis decision making tasks. The primary data were

from one set of student debriefings (Students Debriefing 2) and a teacher interview, supplemented by the other set of student debriefings, students' and teacher's reflective written comments and questionnaires.

Five themes emerged from the data analysis:

- attitudes toward jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks,
- perceptions of jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks,
- perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks,
- attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of students in each task, and
- attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of the teacher in each task.

Each of these themes is presented below in detail, supported by quotations from the participants.

*Attitudes toward jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks*

The debriefing and interview data revealed the students' and teacher's attitudes toward the jigsaw tasks compared to these toward the decision making tasks. In general, the participants reported positive attitudes toward both task types. However, the students, particularly, tended to be more positive toward the decision making tasks than the jigsaw tasks, as reflected when they talked about these two issues:

- engagement/motivation (created less vs. more interesting discussion and one-way vs. two-way interaction in terms of responding), and
- feeling of interest/liking (less vs. more preferred by students and similarly preferred by the teacher).

Engagement/motivation: Two different kinds of engagement were extracted from their commentary. The first was the kind of discussion that both task types created. The students thought that the decision making tasks created more interesting discussion than the jigsaw tasks. As they needed to exchange ideas or opinions when doing the decision making tasks, they became more involved in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks. Three students specifically expressed this point, as illustrated in Table 81 below.

Table 81 *Less vs. more interesting discussion*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F2 confirmed that the topic of Communicative Task 2 (decision making) was more interesting and created more interesting discussion.  M3: "Because in this one (decision making) we could make a diagnosis and choose which medicine was appropriate. In the other one (jigsaw) the information was written on the notes, we just needed to read it."

The second kind of engagement that led to more positive student attitudes toward the decision making tasks was the kind of interaction that went on in terms of responding during task completion. The students thought that the jigsaw tasks created more one-way interaction while the decision making tasks created more two-way interaction. In responding to a speaker, often only listening and writing were involved in the jigsaw tasks, but in the decision making tasks there were also direct oral responses. Two students specifically expressed this point, as illustrated in Table 82 below.

Table 82 *One-way vs. two-way interaction in terms of responding*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F2: "Here (decision making) we talked directly, so we know for instance the indication, oh this patient is sensitive to penicillin or whatever, so we got to know better about the vocabulary. The other one (jigsaw) when

	<p>we listened and wrote down, we just listened and wrote it down, listened and wrote down, no other response you see.”</p> <p>M5: “Yes, yes. In terms of the discussion, this one (decision making) is more interesting. Because someone can do dialogue when there is a response from the other, the other also talks. The previous task (jigsaw) I think [no dialogue], this one is better.”</p>
--	---

Feeling of liking/interest: The participants liked both task types; however, there was a difference in terms of preferences. As implied in the previous commentary and expressed directly in the debriefings, the decision making tasks were preferred in comparison to the jigsaw tasks. This is because the students were able to talk more in the decision making tasks as they gave their opinions regarding medical situations, “so it was just like the real doctor.” They felt they could practice their speaking more and the dialogue was more focused in the decision making tasks. Six students expressed this point, as illustrated in Table 83 below, and all eight students stated this same preference in the post questionnaires.

Table 83 *Less vs. more preferred task type by students*

Data Source	Participants’ Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>M1 prefers Task 2 because he can give opinions and due to the fact that all group members had all information in the written text: “Yes. So, we won’t get mixed up. Sometimes we say it incorrectly, mispronounce it.”</p> <p>M2 prefers Task 2 because “This has, you have the disease, diagnosis, allergy and medication. So, we practiced the language and got an experience of giving medicine.”</p>

The teacher, on the other hand, did not prefer one task type over the other. She was neutral in her preference since she saw the benefits of both in terms of their different levels of difficulty. She agreed that the jigsaw task, assumed to be easier for the students,

should be done first and then the decision making task. This point is captured in Table 84 below.

Table 84 *No preference in task type for the teacher*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Teacher Interview	T: "Both are interesting; I think it depends on the level. Thus we started with jigsaw, because this shares information, but when we moved on [we did decision making], so jigsaw should go first and then ... decision making, not decision making and then jigsaw."

*Perceptions of jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks*

The debriefing and interview data revealed the students' and teacher's perceptions of the jigsaw tasks compared to the decision making tasks. In general, their perceptions can be divided into three topics:

- the nature of the tasks (sharing information vs. expressing own ideas),
- the shortcomings of the tasks (simply reading vs. more use of L1), and
- who benefited most (lower proficiency students vs. higher proficiency students).

Nature of the tasks: Both the students and the teacher understood that the nature of the jigsaw tasks was to share information and the nature of the decision making tasks was to express their ideas. Due to this, the students tended to think that the decision making tasks were better in improving their speaking skills, but the teacher thought that both were useful in their own ways. Six students and the teacher expressed these respective points, as illustrated in Table 85 below.

Table 85 *The nature: sharing information vs. expressing own ideas*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F2: "This one (decision making) is better than the information exchange (jigsaw). In the information exchange, only, I mean we didn't know the whole thing, only the part that the others read, we listened to it, and we jot it down. But in here, we could share our opinions."</p> <p>F6: "It (decision making) made me more confident, it made me more spontaneous. The dialogue in the other task (jigsaw), we just looked at the notes. In this task we thought more to express our own words/opinions to our friends like that."</p>
Teacher Interview	<p>T: "Yes, about the jigsaw, I like it because it has a small focus ... their attention is focused ... and they try to ask for the missing information"</p> <p>T: "...the decision making, it is good because they are given the opportunity to have their own opinion, share their opinion and even in defending their opinion, and that's interesting."</p>

Task shortcomings: The students reported a problem in the decision making tasks and the teacher saw a different problem in the jigsaw tasks. Whereas they could have tried to express themselves more spontaneously, the students reported that they used more L1 in the decision making tasks when debating than in the jigsaw tasks due to lack of proficiency. The teacher, on the other hand, thought that the problem with the jigsaw tasks lay in the way the students shared the information they had in their different notes: they simply read the notes provided. Four students and the teacher expressed these different problems in task completion, as illustrated in Table 86 below.

Table 86 *Task shortcomings: simply reading, more use of L1*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F2: "In the last dialogue (decision making), Indonesian was used more when debating."

Teacher Interview	<p>T: “Yes, yes, the only thing I was thinking about is sometimes while they are filling in ... the missing information [in the jigsaw tasks], they just read. And I would like to suggest that for instance they use the method ... they can read, read and ... have eye contact as well.”</p> <p>T confirmed another disadvantage of Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) was that a few students looked at the other’s note when they didn’t get what was said.</p>
-------------------	---

Task benefit: As the participants talked about the levels of difficulty in both task types, they seemed to agree that the jigsaw tasks were easier than the decision making tasks, and so might benefit the less proficient students more than they might the more proficient ones. On the other hand, the decision making tasks might benefit the more proficient students more than they might the less proficient ones. Two students (F4 classified as the weaker student and M5 as the stronger student) and the teacher expressed this point as illustrated in Table 87 below.

Table 87 *Benefit for less vs. more proficient students*

Data Source	Participants’ Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F4: “I think, the previous one (jigsaw), we could talk easier. Because the questions were just around the notes, and we would just read them.”</p> <p>F4: “Right. That’s due to the language. I actually wanted to talk more [in Communicative Task 2 (decision making)], but most of the time we just mentioned the name of the medicine, oh the medicine is this one like that. But to argue for it, considering its complications this and this, that’s the difficulty.”</p> <p>M5 suggests other activities to elicit the same kind of interaction as in Communicative Task 2 (decision making), but their implementation should consider the less active students.</p>
Teacher Interview	<p>T: “I think both [types] are useful, thus it depends on the level I think. For the jigsaw I think we start, we start with that because it’s only sharing information, we got the information; some students miss the information so we share. So, it’s easier. But the second task, they have to keep their own opinion and they have to defend it ...”</p>

*Perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks*

The debriefing and interview data revealed the students' and teacher's perceptions that different aspects of language learning were emphasized in the two task types. In general, their perceptions regarding this matter can be divided into three aspects of language learning:

- the kind of language practice each task type emphasized (practice in listening vs. speaking),
- the kinds of words each type provided (more new words vs. more familiar words),
- the amount of repetition each type triggered (more vs. fewer repetitions).

Kind of language practice: The students believed that in general they got to practice their listening more in the jigsaw tasks as they listened to and wrote down the information from the others, and to practice their speaking more in the decision making tasks as they expressed their opinions and responded to the others'. Seven students expressed this point as illustrated in Table 88 below.

Table 88 *Practice in listening vs. speaking*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M3: "To practice our listening skills [in Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw)], for writing, so it'd be much easier."
Student Debriefing 2	F1 thinks both tasks are beneficial, Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) is more to practice listening to the others and Communicative Task 2 (decision making) is more to practice speaking to give opinions.  M5 thinks that Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) is better for listening and writing, to listen and write down the others' information, and Communicative Task 2 (decision making) is for them to think and express opinions; however, both helped increase his vocabulary.

However, there were times when the students could not optimize their speaking practice in the decision making tasks due to their limited ability, as expressed by F4: "Yes, usually when someone mentioned one medicine, but it wasn't appropriate or the others didn't agree with it, they usually just said, 'How about this medicine?' So, we just looked at the information on the medicine and read it ourselves."

Kinds of words generated: Although only one student addressed this issue specifically, others implied that the jigsaw tasks provided them with more new words than the decision making tasks, and the decision making tasks provided them with more practice of familiar words. In the teacher's view, the jigsaw tasks helped the students to enrich their vocabulary. This point is captured in Table 89 below.

Table 89 *More new words vs. more familiar words*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	F1 thinks Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) has more new vocabulary to learn, but Communicative Task 2 (decision making) has more understandable words as she said, "This one (decision making) is only about medicines".
Teacher Interview	T: "... Now, to enrich the vocabulary, I think jigsaw."

Repetition generated: Only one student addressed this issue specifically, but his view was confirmed in the data analysis of the small group discussions regarding repetitions in both task types. The jigsaw tasks triggered more repetitions than the decision making tasks did because in the jigsaw tasks the students needed to make sure that their utterances were comprehensible and that they understood what the others were saying while sharing information in order to write it down. So, the students used

repetitions mainly for correction, confirmation, and agreement. This point is captured in Table 90 below.

Table 90 *More vs. fewer repetitions*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M3 confirmed that the main reason for repetition in Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) was to write the information down in order to complete the table. He also reported that it was used for correction, confirmation, and agreement, but thinks it has no benefit for him, only to help the others.
Student Debriefing 2	M3 reported that in Communicative Task 2 (decision making) he never repeated what the others were saying when he didn't understand because it's a matter of opinion.

*Attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of students*

The debriefing data revealed the students' attitudes and perceptions regarding their own roles in completing both task types. Four issues related to this matter were extracted from their commentary:

- role as a group leader
- role as a speaker/listener
- importance of gestures and facial expressions
- willingness to use L2

While the first two issues were about the roles attributed to the students as they worked on the tasks, the last two issues were about the reactions that they had from each other that influenced task completion.

Students' role as group leader: The group leader had the responsibility of managing the flow of the discussion among the group members. S/he tended to initiate the topic and control the turn taking system. The students were allowed to appoint the

leaders of their groups. However, when there was no leader appointed at the beginning of the discussion, as in Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw), the flow of discussion was lame since “Everybody refused to start asking,” as expressed by M3. The leader also set group rules, for instance regarding the use of L1, and could provide a language model for the other members, for instance in correcting pronunciation. In other words, the leader seemed to enact the role of the teacher and was necessary for the group to work well together. Four students commented on this issue as captured in Table 91 below.

Table 91 *Role as a group leader*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M3 reported that his group didn't take turns (because there was no leader appointed), “and so we didn't know who should go next.”  M5: “Yes, there was time, at that time because I was the leader of the group I often corrected the wrong pronunciation of the others. This is the correct one.”
Student Debriefing 2	F2: “Right. Like the other one before, there was no leader, so when one talks, the others also talk, when no one talks, everybody keeps silent.”  F6: “So far I followed, you know I was always with M5 in the groups, he didn't allow us to talk in Indonesian. So, when the task was finished then we all asked each other and then we could use Indonesian, except when we spontaneously responded in Indonesian but just a little.”

Students' role as speaker or listener: This role seemed to depend very much on how task types influenced students' active involvement in task completion. While the jigsaw tasks forced each student to talk to share information, the decision making task encouraged them to talk to express their opinions. It was compulsory for each student to speak in the jigsaw tasks, but it was optional in the decision making tasks. Consequently, apart from the leaders, who tended to talk more than the other group members, students

had a balanced role as both speaker and listener in the jigsaw tasks, but not in the decision making task, where the more active students tended to have more of a speaking role while the less active students had more of a listening role. Four students commented on this issue as illustrated in Table 92 below.

Table 92 *Role as a speaker/listener*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M1 confirmed that he just talked when he needed to answer, when he had the information, "like when they asked how old, then I would answer."
Student Debriefing 2	F6: "M8 was talking and M5 asked us to write the conclusion ...they both seemed to be very involved with the discussion, were so involved that F5 and I only joined once in a while, just when they asked whether we agreed or not, and when they asked that, we often didn't answer in English but just nodded."  F6 also confirmed that in Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) it is a must to talk in order to share the information, but in Communicative Task 2 (decision making) it is ok not to give opinion.

Students' communication through gestures and facial expressions: Non verbal reactions while working on the tasks were seen as affecting the flow of communication in a good way. They seemed to help students in their understanding of difficult words or situations. When it was difficult for the students to understand what one was saying, gestures and facial expressions were often used to indicate or solve the problem. Two students particularly expressed this point as captured in Table 93 below.

Table 93 *Gestures and facial expressions*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F6 reported that when M5 mispronounced the word 'headache', she got to understand it after M5 pointed his head: "He said headache (pointing to the head)."

	<p>M5: "I knew it just from their facial expressions."</p> <p>M5: "Here, I know the word, I know the meaning. I noticed the others, F6 and the rest, seemed puzzled by the word ... so I said the meaning ..."</p>
--	--

Students' willingness to use the L2: The students indicated their willingness to use the L2 and to do their best, though it seemed difficult to solely use the L2 all the time. Motivated by the tasks, they had the urge to use the L2 in their small group discussions and this positive attitude influenced the group dynamics in terms of L1 and L2 use. As observed, most students seemed to try hard to use the L2 in their discussions and always returned to the L2 after the L1 was inevitably used. Seven students expressed this willingness to use the L2 as illustrated in Table 94 below.

Table 94 *Willingness to use L2*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	<p>F2: "For me, when it's like in a classroom, or when the course is English, I'll have to try my best to speak English."</p> <p>M2 thinks that L1 is not necessary in this activity and it's much better to use "English, so people are more forced to increase their language skills."</p> <p>M5: "Ideally, Indonesian shouldn't be used. Just use one language, English should only be used."</p>
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F4: "Yes. And another one, for instance when we are talking in English and then we don't know what to say, perhaps it's ok to use English a little bit than just to use Indonesian all the time."</p> <p>M3 thinks that the task motivated him to use L2 more in discussion.</p>

*Attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of teacher*

The teacher questionnaire and interview data particularly revealed the teacher's attitudes and perceptions regarding her own roles in implementing both task types. There were three issues related to this matter extracted from her commentary:

- role as a facilitator,
- role as a monitor, and
- preparation and class management.

While the first two issues were about how she perceived her roles in implementing the tasks, the last one was about her perception and attitude regarding the preparation for and class management in the implementation of communicative tasks.

Teacher's role as facilitator: As she indicated in the teacher questionnaire when asked about her role in the classroom, the teacher perceived herself "as a facilitator". This role was confirmed through observations. She facilitated the students' ability to carry out the communicative tasks, from her explanations and illustrations of task procedures through the content of each task. She made sure that the students understood what to do, and participated as they completed the tasks. She also mediated among the students as they expressed their opinions regarding task content or when they disagreed. As a facilitator, she seemed to perceive herself as having the obligation to help the students whenever needed. The teacher expressed this point as captured in Table 95 below.

Table 95 *Role as a facilitator*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Teacher Interview	<p>T: "... and as a teacher, after looking back I thought actually I should try to fill in the gap and then make them communicate again ..."</p> <p>T: "... for instance I was the teacher, I should have more returned and then helped them with the difficulties, to overcome their difficulties."</p> <p>T: "Actually I again as the teacher should have reminded them, if you didn't get the question you should ask 'could you say that again?' So, that's also one way of practicing your English and then probably they would understand."</p>

Teacher's role as monitor: This role seemed to be particularly important during the student discussions in their small groups to complete the tasks, and seemed to complement her role as a facilitator. The teacher sometimes went around while the groups were working, monitoring their activities to make sure that they were on task, and then helped them as needed. As for the small group size doing communicative tasks, she believed that it helped the teacher to monitor better. She also thought that as the teacher she should go around more often in order to help the students and to monitor them and discourage their L1 use. The teacher expressed this point as captured in Table 96 below.

Table 96 *Role as a monitor*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Teacher Interview	<p>T: "... in these small groups I think teachers, the teacher can also monitor better, monitor better ..."</p> <p>T: "When they got stuck I think ... I as the teacher should have warned them about if they kept using the Indonesian language."</p> <p>T: "Thus I keep ... going around, then for instance they get stuck then it's time for me to be there actually and then try to help them."</p>

Teacher's preparation for task and class management: When asked in the teacher questionnaire about problems in preparing and teaching her speaking classes, the teacher indicated five problems: “technical terms, appropriate usage, subtle meanings, class management, and the size of class.” However, as she was oriented by the researcher before each task implementation, she seemed to be confident and to have no problem in preparation and class management. She also realized that she needed to prepare the tasks beforehand if she would modify or adapt her teaching materials to be task-based. The teacher expressed this point as captured in Table 97 below.

Table 97      *Preparation and class management*

Data Source	Participants' Commentary
Teacher Interview	<p>T thinks that she had no problem in preparation and class management: “No, I think this is more effective.”</p> <p>T is also willing to adapt or modify future teaching materials to be task-based and understands the consequence of having to prepare them before hand.</p>

### *Summary of Findings on Research Question Three*

Explorations on the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method were based on a variety of data sources. The primary data were from students' debriefings on Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) and Communicative Task 2 (decision making), and a teacher interview. The supplementary data were from students' and teacher's reflective written comments after each task implementation, questionnaires, and classroom observations.

Seven themes emerged from the data analysis on the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding communicative tasks versus teacher-fronted tasks that basically revealed positive outcomes for communicative tasks. Table 98 below summarizes the themes with their points.

Table 98 *Summary of findings on students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding communicative tasks versus teacher-fronted tasks*

#### Communicative Tasks compared to Teacher-Fronted Tasks:

1. Attitudes toward communicative tasks compared to teacher-fronted tasks
  - Engagement/motivation
    - Students were more active and talked more in communicative tasks.
    - Students became motivated and enjoyed doing communicative tasks.
    - Students were not shy or afraid of making mistakes while doing communicative tasks with their classmates.
  - Causes of interest/liking
    - Students liked communicative tasks due to their benefits.
    - Students liked communicative tasks due to their different activities from teacher-fronted tasks
    - Students liked communicative tasks due to topics related to students' field.
  - Preferences for communicative tasks in L2 instruction
2. Perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in communicative tasks
  - Multi-model processing: vocabulary, speaking, listening, and writing
  - Written support from the text

3. Attitudes and perceptions on peer interaction in communicative tasks
  - Benefits of practicing with peers
    - Students' confidence building was increased.
    - An unthreatening atmosphere was created.
    - Indirect learning occurred.
  - Kinds of influence from group members
    - Influence from the more or less active peers
    - Influence from peers in L1/L2 use
    - Greater ease with "new" vs. "old" peers
  - Group size
4. Reasons for L1 use in task completion
  - Limited L2 proficiency
  - Habit/spontaneity/L1 environment
  - To move along
  - Unintelligible pronunciation/lack of comprehension
  - L1 use after task completion
5. Perceptions regarding other task-related issues
  - Attention focused on the product
  - Sense of time pressure
  - Unfamiliarity with the task
  - Need for teacher support
6. Perceptions of the relevance of communicative tasks to medical studies
  - Relevance of content
  - Language use in professional situation
7. Change of perceptions/attitudes over time
  - Change in students' perceptions/attitudes: from negative to positive
  - No change in students' perceptions/attitudes: positive from the beginning
  - Change in teacher's way of teaching

Five themes emerged from the data analysis on the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding jigsaw tasks versus decision making tasks that basically revealed positive outcomes for both task types. However, the students in particular tended to be more positive toward the decision making tasks than the jigsaw tasks. Table 99 below summarizes the themes with their points.

Table 99 *Summary of findings on students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes regarding jigsaw tasks versus decision making tasks*

Jigsaw Tasks compared to Decision Making Tasks

1. Attitudes toward jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks
  - Engagement/motivation
    - Less vs. more interesting discussion
    - One-way vs. two-way interaction in terms of responding
  - Feeling of interest/liking
    - Less vs. more preferred task type by students
    - Neutral in preference for the teacher
2. Perceptions of jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks
  - The nature: sharing information vs. expressing own ideas
  - Shortcoming: simply reading vs. more use of L1
  - Relative benefit: for lower proficient students vs. higher proficient students
3. Perceptions of the different aspects of language learning in jigsaw tasks compared to decision making tasks
  - Practice on listening vs. on speaking
  - More new words vs. more familiar words
  - More vs. fewer repetitions
4. Attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of students
  - Role as a leader
  - Role as a speaker/listener
  - Importance of gestures and facial expressions
  - Willingness to use L2
5. Attitudes and perceptions regarding the roles of teacher
  - Role as a facilitator
  - Role as a monitor
  - Preparation and class management

#### *Research Question Four*

*Is there any evidence that communicative tasks may facilitate lexical development?*

This study was primarily concerned with the nature of oral language generated through communicative tasks. But as the communicative tasks aimed at promoting both the amount and the quality of oral language use and interaction opportunities for students, it was assumed that they should therefore promote language development, particularly lexical development. Specifically, it was expected that some word learning would take place through attention and practice to particular words while students were involved in completing the tasks. It is, however, extremely difficult to demonstrate learning gains from such brief, unpredictable interventions since lexical development is incremental and learning a new word requires multiple exposures. Therefore, no specific measure was used to track students' lexical development. Rather, student self-report of lexical learning was undertaken to explore lexical learning, supplemented with transcript data. Obviously, this method of tracking word learning through students' retrospective recall of specific words they had learned would provide a very reduced estimate of their actual learning. This evidence is nonetheless interesting for its insights into the process and the types of words they were aware of learning. Here, word learning is defined specifically as students' self-declared recognition/remembering of form, pronunciation, or meaning of words, formerly unfamiliar to them, that students have been made aware of or learned.

This section reports evidence that these communicative tasks may have indeed facilitated lexical development. The data sources were student debriefings, students' written comments in post tasks, and transcripts of small group and class discussions during task implementation. This section is divided into three subsections. The first part

presents specific words students reported having learned as new vocabulary and how these differed between jigsaw tasks and decision making tasks. The second part looks at word learning as evidenced through transcripts of small group and whole class discussions. It considers three aspects of word knowledge, i.e., spelling, pronunciation, and meaning, and how such knowledge was differently emphasized in jigsaw tasks and decision making tasks. The third part explores various ways of facilitating word learning through communicative tasks as reported by the students.

#### *Words Reported Being Learned as New Vocabulary*

The findings on words being learned as new vocabulary were based primarily on self-reported evidence taken from the students' written comments on post tasks and debriefing data. The new vocabulary of interest was those words first encountered in the tasks - some of which they got to understand and some they did not. In general, the types of words reported being learned by the students were primarily nouns, plus some adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. Function words such as articles and prepositions were not reported. Most students were specific at indicating new vocabulary they remembered learning from the tasks. Nouns were reported most in both task types, although more in the jigsaw tasks (13 words) than in the decision making tasks (7 words). As for the other three types, five adjectives, four verbs, and one adverb were reported having been learned in the jigsaw tasks, but only two adjectives in the decision making tasks. The total number of words reported was 23 in the jigsaw tasks and 9 in the decision making tasks. These were almost certainly dramatic underestimate. As can be seen in Table 100 below, which was elicited from the post tasks and debriefings, the students reported learning

more new vocabulary for every word class from the jigsaw tasks than from the decision making tasks. (The number in the brackets after each word indicates the number of students who reported the word as being learned as new vocabulary.)

Table 100 *Words reported being learned in jigsaw and decision making tasks (n=8)*

Type of words	Jigsaw	Decision Making
Noun	hay fever (3) back trouble (1) pulled muscle (1) monospot (2) Raynaud (1) cholelithiasis (1) Henoch-Schonlein Syndrome (1) jaundice (1) upstairs (2) downstairs (2) bandage (2) bundles (1) buttocks (3)	whooping cough (6) pregnancy (1) disfiguring acne (1) impairment (1) scarlet fever (2) slums (1) bout (2)
Adjective	stuffed-up (3) sore (1) painful (1) retired (1) palpable (1)	renowned (1) deteriorating (4)
Verb	swallow (2) bend over (3) itch (1) wear (1)	
Adverb	barely (4)	
Total number of words	23 words	9 words

In addition, when cross examining all these words with the transcripts of small group and whole class discussions to see whether and how the students dealt with new words in the discussions, it was found that eight words in the jigsaw tasks and four words in the decision making tasks were actually dealt with by the students who reported them as new. Example 34 shows how the terminology ‘Henoch-Schonlein Syndrome’

reported by M3 as being new was dealt with in Communicative Task 3 (jigsaw). In this example, M3, who was reading his group's answer in a whole class discussion setting got to know how to pronounce 'Schonlein' and 'syndrome' from the teacher since the teacher corrected his pronunciation. (See transcription conventions in Table 4, page 66).

Example 34 *Reported new word as dealt with in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw)*

M3: **Diagnosis, the patient must have Henoch-/schonleen/**  
T: Schonlien  
M3: **/saindrom/**  
T: syndrome. **The patient must have Henoch-Schonlein syndrome. Do you agree?**  
Ss: Yes.

Example 35 shows how the word 'deteriorating' reported by F6 as being new was dealt with in Communicative Task 4 (decision making). In this example, F6 got to know the meaning of the new word from M5 who first explained it in the L2 but then had to translate it into the L1 for her to understand.

Example 35 *Reported new word as dealt with in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

F6: What's the meaning deteriorating?  
M5: worsening, worsening, become worse  
F6: Can you talk in Indonesian?  
M5: become worse, *semakin buruk (become worse)*.

From these two examples we can see how new vocabulary was treated when the students were completing the tasks; in this case, it was in terms of provision of correct pronunciation and meaning of the new words. Another way students worked with new words was by spelling them. The following subsection looks at these aspects of word learning as they were evidenced in the transcripts of small group and whole class discussions.

### *Aspects of Word Learning as Evidenced in the Discussions*

When students reported on the new vocabulary they learned from the tasks, they might imply that they gained either one, or two, or all of the three aspects of word learning: form (spelling), pronunciation, and meaning. The previous subsection presents new words being learned based on self-reported evidence, this subsection looks further at how students treated new words in small group and whole class discussions while completing the tasks in ways that might increase their lexical knowledge. As seen previously, some but not all words reported being learned as new vocabulary were dealt with in the discussions. In contrast, other words that were dealt with in the discussions in terms of form, pronunciation, and meaning were not necessarily reported as being new. However, this kind of treatment, i.e., asking for and/or provision of the words' form, pronunciation, and meaning that occurred in both task types in one way or another, would reasonably be expected to help students' lexical development.

First, in terms of the word forms, spelling out new words was common in the jigsaw tasks. Students either asked for the spelling of new words or provided it. In this way, lexical learning might be taking place as students paid attention to the spelled words. While students were forced to pay attention to the letters being spelled out in order to get the form of the new words and to write them down, thus they were also practicing the words. Example 36 below shows how the word 'barely' was dealt with in Communicative Task 1 (jigsaw) and finally spelled out by M5 who had access to it from his note, so that F5 and F6 could also focus on the word.

Example 36 *Spelling as an aspect of word learning in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)*

**M5: Sometimes he can barely see. Barely, barely see.**

**F6: He can?**

M5: **He can**  
F5: Sometimes?  
M5: **Sometimes he can**  
F6: He can?  
M5: **Barely see. Barely. Barely**  
F5: Barely, barely.  
M5: **Barely. B-a-r-e-l-y.** Ok and back to the diagnosis.

In the decision making tasks, however, spelling out new words was never done since the words were provided in the text and available for all students. In this case, some word learning in terms of recognizing its form would likely take place though it seemed to be taken for granted. As the students were advantaged with the available form, they might pay attention more to the other aspects of word learning, like how the word should be pronounced and/or what it meant.

Second, pronunciation of new words occurred in both task types. Provision of correct pronunciation by peers and the teacher was common in both task types with the difference that it was done more frequently in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. Though sometimes it was immediately and correctly repeated by the listeners and other times was not, it may be expected that pronunciation learning took place during the implementation of both task types. Students who provided the pronunciation of the new words practiced them, while their listeners who paid attention to the pronunciation of the new words would also gain some practice and might go further and practice pronouncing them correctly. The following examples show how pronunciation as an aspect of word learning in the jigsaw tasks and decision making tasks was facilitated by the teacher and peers. Example 37 below illustrates how the word 'ingestion' was mistakenly pronounced by F2, corrected by the teacher, and correctly repeated by F2 during a jigsaw task.

Example 37 *Pronunciation as an aspect of learning in Communicative Task 3 (Jigsaw)*

F2: **the history show no injection, no /inyestion/**

F4: no

F2: **/inyestion/, /inyestion/, /inyestion/**

F4: /inyestion/

T: ingestion, ingestion

F2: **ingestion of drugs. Bone marrow is normal. Bone marrow is normal.**

As mentioned previously, pronunciation as an aspect of word learning was also facilitated by peers. Example 38 below illustrates how the word ‘deteriorating’ was mistakenly pronounced by F1, corrected by M2, and correctly repeated by F1 during a decision making task.

Example 38 *Pronunciation as an aspect of learning in Communicative Task 4 (Decision Making)*

F1: **been /konfin/ to bed for the past five /ye/ months, /deterioting/**

M2: dete-, deteriorating

F1: deteriorating

Third, emphasis on the meaning of the new words also occurred in both task types. Provision of the meaning of the new words by peers and the teacher was common in both, although it was done less often in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. Not all the meanings of new words requested by students were provided, however, and when they were, it was usually in the L1. As the students got the meaning of a new word, they might pay attention to and understand it. Hence, it might be inferred that some learning in terms of the meaning of the new words took place during the implementation of both task types. The following examples show how word meaning as an aspect of word learning in the jigsaw tasks and decision making tasks was facilitated by peers and the teacher. Example 39 below illustrates how the meaning of the word ‘retired’ was

provided by M5 in the L1, as he thought it necessary for the others to understand during a jigsaw task.

Example 39 *Meaning as an aspect of word learning in Communicative Task 1 (Jigsaw)*

F6: What is the patient occupation?

M5: **He is a retired policeman.**

F5: He is?

M5: **retired**, *pensiunan (retired)*

As mentioned previously, word meaning as an aspect of word learning was also facilitated by the teacher. Example 40 below illustrates how the meaning of the terminology ‘whooping cough’ was provided by the teacher in the L1 during a decision making task.

Example 40 *Meaning as an aspect of word learning in Communicative Task 2 (Decision Making)*

T: What is whooping cough? Are you familiar with whooping cough? In Indonesian, the Indonesian equivalent *batuk (cough)* what? *Betuk rejang, batuk rejang (whooping cough, whooping cough)*, /kingfus/ ya? Ha ah. Does it take a long time for *batuk rejang (whooping cough)*

S: *Rejang (whooping)?*

T: *Rejang (whooping). Batuk rejang, batuk rejang (whooping cough, whooping cough)*, /kingfus/, right? Ok. So, you know what it is. Yes? I think you’ve done it very well, both tasks, um I think all of you will become good doctors, ya.

These three aspects of word learning were frequently evidenced in the small group and whole class discussions during communicative tasks, indicating the likelihood that lexical development in terms of form, and/or pronunciation, and/or meaning occurred. The next subsection looks at how these aspects of word learning were facilitated during the implementation of both task types as described by the students in the debriefings.

### *Ways of Facilitating Word Learning*

The debriefing data revealed the ways of facilitating word learning as reported by the students. There were six specific ways identified from their commentary as the students reported how they learned new vocabulary during the implementation of both task types: from self, peers, teacher, text, context, and the dictionary. Among these ways, word learning from peers was indicated by all eight students, followed by the text (six students), the context (five students), the dictionary (four students), self (two students), and the teacher (one student). Examples of these six ways of facilitating word learning are presented below in detail, particularly as they linked to the aspects of word learning.

The first way of facilitating word learning was from peers. As students worked together in small groups, they could learn new vocabulary from each other by asking their peers about the form, pronunciation, and meaning of the new words. It seemed that working with peers in a group was one of the best ways of facilitating word learning because usually someone knew the word and students tended to pay attention to and remember information given by their peers. As M2 asserted, “I can certainly remember it. Because it was the word that we didn’t know, so I would remember it more easily because my friend told me the meaning, and we were in an active discussion at that time. But if for instance we don’t know a word and the teacher is the one who gives the meaning, sometimes we forget it.” Here we can see that working together with peers has a positive impact on students’ word learning.

All eight students indicated that they learned new vocabulary from their peers by asking them about either the form or meaning of the new words. Though not all questions regarding the meaning were answered positively, all students reported that they

asked their peers for information in order to learn about the new vocabulary. This point is illustrated in Table 101 below.

Table 101 *Asking peers as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F1: "I asked, what does it mean?" F2: "Yes. I asked my friends, what's this, what's that?" M3: "I asked for the letters, asked them to spell one by one."
Student Debriefing 2	F6: "[I asked] mostly to my friends." M1: "If I didn't understand, I asked the others or did something else."

In addition, four students asserted that they learned the new vocabulary by listening to their peers as they spelled out, pronounced, and gave the meaning of the new word in the discussions. This point is illustrated in Table 102 below.

Table 102 *Listening to peers as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F4 reported that she got to know how to pronounce the word 'barely' from her friend.
Student Debriefing 2	F6 reported that by listening to the others while they were discussing, it helped improve her English.

The second way of facilitating word learning was from the written notes or text. Students indicated that exposure to the form of the new vocabulary in the text helped them understand it better. This is unique to task-based learning, particularly as task design employs written texts. Since the students were exposed to the form of the new

vocabulary, they would not get mixed up, even though it was incorrectly pronounced.

Six students commented on the text as a way of facilitating word learning. This point is illustrated in Table 103 below.

Table 103 *Exposure to the text as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	F6: "I did ask, but because it was difficult for her/him to spell, I didn't really get it, and so s/he showed me the note ..."
Student Debriefing 2	F1: "... But in this one it is written so it's more understandable, written." M1: "Yes. So, we won't get mixed up. Sometimes we say it incorrectly, mispronounce it." M2: "But in here, when someone said this [when it was incorrect], we could know, we could see it here in the text what s/he was saying."

The third way of facilitating word learning was from the context. As students completed the tasks by working with a text and together with peers, they could guess from and connect to the verbal and non-verbal contexts of the new vocabulary in order to understand it. Five students indicated that the context facilitated their word learning in one way or another. In terms of the verbal context, three students acknowledged that they learned the meaning of new vocabulary by guessing and connecting it to the sentence in which it occurred. Table 104 below illustrates this point.

Table 104 *Guessing from the verbal context as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	M2: "When we were talking, I understood it from the sentence." M5: "I put them in context, from the context of the sentence; I looked at the sentence or the words before and after the unknown words. I connected, guessed, and it was right."

Student Debriefing 2	M3 reported that he got to understand the meaning of a new word from the context: "I guessed the meaning, like this most probably meant that."
----------------------	--

In terms of the non-verbal context, which included facial expressions, gestures, and intonation, two students recognized how intonation and gestures helped them understand the mispronounced words, and one student was able to help his peers understand the new vocabulary after looking at their facial expressions. Table 105 below illustrates this point.

Table 105 *Guessing from the non-verbal context as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	<p><i>Intonation</i> F4 reported that she used rising intonation to understand which word her peer was saying: "That's because walking and working sound similar, walking working, so I wanted to make sure whether it was walking or working."</p> <p><i>Gestures</i> F6 reported that she understood what her peer was saying after he used some gestures: "He said headache (pointing to the head)."</p> <p><i>Facial expressions</i> M5 reported that he helped provide the new vocabulary after looking at his peers' facial expressions: "I knew it just from their facial expressions ... I mean maybe it was a new word for them or they didn't know it. It seemed like they didn't know how to write it ... so I spelled it."</p>

The fourth way of facilitating word learning was from the dictionary. When students could not get the meaning of the new vocabulary after asking their peers or guessing from the context, they looked it up in the dictionary. Four students reported that they looked up new words in the dictionary in order to find out their meanings, and then informed the others, which is unique to task-based learning since tasks encourage

cooperative learning. Table 106 below illustrates this point. The students also had access to the word form and pronunciation of the new words through the dictionary.

Table 106 *Looking up in the dictionary as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Example of Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 2	<p>F1: "Find out, look up in a dictionary."</p> <p>F4: "I usually borrowed an electronic dictionary from another group ... I usually informed [the others after]."</p> <p>F6: "If the others didn't know, then I borrowed a dictionary from those who brought it."</p>

The fifth way of facilitating word learning was through self-practicing. Self-practicing was particularly identified as facilitating word learning in terms of the form and pronunciation of the new vocabulary. Two students indicated that they learned new vocabulary by practicing the pronunciation of the word, in this case by guessing and self-correcting. One of them also indicated that he learned new vocabulary by spelling it out himself. Table 107 below shows the students' commentary regarding this point.

Table 107 *Self-practicing as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant's Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	<p>F4 reported that she lowered her voice because she didn't know how to pronounce the word 'suffered', but finally she could pronounce it after guessing.</p> <p>M5: "It (swallow) was actually a new word, I didn't know how to pronounce it, I just ... Just tried it out. Since the other said this, well maybe it was this. So, I just tried to find it out."</p> <p>M5: "Yes, I myself like to spell so I can learn."</p>

The sixth way of facilitating word learning was information from the teacher. Unlike the word learning facilitated by peers, which all eight students acknowledged, only one student particularly recognized word learning facilitated by the teacher in terms of the meaning. As F6 listened to the teacher’s explanation of the new word, she got to understand it then, but unfortunately forgot it later. Table 108 below illustrates this point.

Table 108 *Listening to the teacher as a way of facilitating word learning*

Data Source	Participant’s Commentary
Student Debriefing 1	<p>F6: “Yes, at that time it was the teacher who explained.”</p> <p>F6: “We got to know the meaning from the teacher”</p>

Though only one student reported this kind of facilitation, it would be likely that the others also gained new vocabulary knowledge as they listened to the teacher’s explanations. In addition, as evidenced in the transcripts of small group and whole class discussions, and as pointed out in the previous subsection, not only did the teacher provide the students with the meaning of new words, she also provided them with the form and pronunciation of the new vocabulary as she deemed necessary. This might facilitate students’ lexical development in one way or another without them recognizing it.

Overall, the students reported these six ways in which their word learning was facilitated, emphasizing a different aspect of word learning. Furthermore, since the data on word learning mainly involved self-reports, the findings were claims made by the participants and further inferred by the researcher. The analysis was not intended to demonstrate learning gains, but to capture some insights into the learning process.

#### *Summary of Findings on Research Question Four*

Exploration of the evidence that communicative tasks may facilitate lexical development was based on students' self reported learning and their involvement in small group and class discussions during task implementation. The data sources were student debriefings, students' written comments in post tasks, and transcripts of small group and class discussions during task implementation. This investigation focused on three points: the words reported being learned as new vocabulary, the aspects of word learning as evidenced in small group and whole class discussions, and the ways of facilitating word learning as reported by the students.

First, analysis of the words reported being learned as new vocabulary shows that nouns were the type of words reported most often as being new vocabulary in both task types, followed by adjectives; whereas verbs and adverbs were only reported in the jigsaw tasks. The students reported that they encountered more new vocabulary from the jigsaw tasks than from the decision making tasks, perhaps because there was more reading in jigsaw, and this was true in every type of words. As observed in the transcripts, the students also dealt with several of these words in the small group or whole class discussions.

Second, analysis of different aspects of word learning reveals that the students dealt with new words in small group and whole class discussions by asking for and/or providing the others with the words' form, pronunciation, and/or meaning, which might increase their lexical development. Attention and practice on the part of the students were ensured as they dealt with these three aspects of word learning in the discussions; thus some word learning may be inferred to have taken place. In terms of the form,

spelling out new words was common in the jigsaw tasks, but not in the decision making tasks since they were available for the students in the shared text. In terms of pronunciation, correction was provided in both task types although somewhat more in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. Word meanings were also provided in both task types but somewhat less in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks.

Third, analysis of facilitation of word learning reported by the students reveals six reported ways of facilitating word learning, each with an emphasis on a different aspect of word learning. First was from peers, the most frequent way identified, in which they could learn the form, pronunciation, and meaning of the new vocabulary as they asked and listened to their peers. Second was from the text, in which they could learn the form as it was exposed to them in the text. Third was from the context, verbal and non-verbal, in which they could learn the meaning, form, and pronunciation of the new vocabulary. Fourth was from the dictionary in which they could learn the meaning of the new vocabulary as reported, and also the pronunciation as might be assumed. Fifth was self-practicing in which students reported that they could learn the form and pronunciation of the new vocabulary as they practiced it. Sixth was from the teacher, the least frequent way identified but that would seem likely to have the same advantage as from peers, in which they reported that they could learn the meaning of the new vocabulary.

*Episode 5 in search of knowledge and understanding*

What I see

I see you in me  
I see us in me  
I see her in me  
I see him in me  
I see them in me  
Don't you?

I see me in you  
I see me in us  
I see me in her  
I see me in him  
I see me in them  
Don't you?

So ...

I see other in me  
I see me in other  
I see me in me  
I see other in other  
Don't I?

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

In this chapter I will summarize the key findings and discuss them in terms of the main purpose of the study, namely to describe the outcomes of communicative tasks in generating meaning-oriented interactive discourse in an EFL classroom, and to explore links between such tasks and participants' language use, perceptions and attitudes, and insofar as possible, their oral language development.

#### *Summary of the Main Findings*

This study was designed to address four research questions, so the main findings of this study are presented in terms of each of them in turn, namely:

- to describe the nature of EFL university students' oral discourse generated through the use of selected communicative tasks (jigsaw and decision making) in small groups in terms of its interactive features;
- to analyze the main features of the oral discourse used by the NNS teacher and the roles of her discourse;
- to investigate the students' and the teacher's perceptions and attitudes with respect to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method;
- to explore any evidence that communicative tasks may facilitate lexical development.

To summarize the findings for Research Question 1, EFL university students generated a considerable amount of interactive discourse as they completed both types of

communicative tasks. In the jigsaw tasks there seemed to be a balance between students' use of spontaneous language and reading aloud, while in the decision making tasks the students mostly used spontaneous language instead of reading aloud. In addition, the students sometimes used their L1 in both task types. In terms of the overall interactive features of the students' oral discourse, the jigsaw tasks generated more discourse moves (notably in comprehension facilitation, correction, and uptake), repetition, and negotiation cycles than the decision making tasks did. However, in both task types the overall turns among the members of the groups (except for the leaders who usually had more turns) tended to be relatively well distributed, indicating a high level of participation by most members.

The findings for Research Questions 2 revealed five main features of the teacher's discourse and two prominent roles of her discourse in task implementation, most of which related to task-based instruction. While her discourse was interactive, collaborative, supportive, indirect, and spontaneous in nature, its roles were to initiate the interaction and guide the students in task management, and to support the students in their interaction and encourage their involvement in task content. However, there are differences in the way she used the language for the two task types: her spontaneity was more obvious in the decision making tasks than in the jigsaw task, and her discourse role of encouraging students to collaborate was solely played out in the decision making tasks.

To summarize the findings for Research Question 3, the EFL students and the teacher generally had positive perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method. They believed that the tasks encouraged students to become more active and motivated because of the relevance of

the tasks to students' field of study. They also perceived various aspects of language learning that occurred and the benefits of peer interaction while doing the tasks. However, they still saw the inevitable use of L1. As for the task types, basically the students and teacher had positive perceptions and attitudes toward both jigsaw and decision making tasks because each task employed different aspects of language learning. However, the students in particular tended to be more positive toward the decision making tasks (although for a few these were more difficult) than the jigsaw tasks due to the nature of the task that required students to express their opinions, which led to more interesting discussion. Furthermore, the students and teacher seemed to play different, more active roles in task completion.

The findings for Research Question 4 suggested that several aspects of word learning might occur as students dealt with new words in small group and whole class discussions by asking for and/or providing the others with the words' form, pronunciation, and/or meaning. In terms of the form, spelling out new words was common in the jigsaw tasks, but not in the decision making tasks. In terms of pronunciation, correction was provided in both task types although somewhat more in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. Word meanings were also provided in both task types but somewhat less in the jigsaw tasks than in the decision making tasks. In addition, students reported six ways that their word learning was facilitated: from peers, text, context, the dictionary, self-practicing, and the teacher.

### *Discussion of the Findings*

Overall, the findings of the study show that jigsaw and decision-making tasks worked well in an EFL classroom in the hands of an experienced non-native teacher who was fluent in English. Both task types generated a considerable amount of interactive language as students interacted and cooperated during task implementation, and the two task types complemented each other in terms of the various aspects of language learning they promoted (e.g., more listening in jigsaw and more speaking in decision making), their relative difficulty, and the level of students' language proficiency required. Task design involved both reading written texts, which provide more complex language, and speaking in small groups to give the opportunity to communicate and interact, a necessary condition in EFL settings where language input and opportunity for production are very limited. Students played important, active roles during the small group discussions to complete the tasks, and the teacher played an important, active role before and after the discussion phase to provide models and instructions and to encourage active involvement and collaboration among the students. In addition, the students and the teacher had positive perceptions and attitudes regarding the use of communicative tasks in their classroom. The findings of the study affirm the pedagogical value of communicative tasks and indicate the feasibility of their use in EFL settings.

The discussion of these findings is divided into five parts. The first part deals with the learning context within which the study took place. The second part concerns task design and implementation. The third and fourth parts deal with task outcomes, namely interactive language use and enhanced student involvement, respectively. The fifth part concerns language learning outcomes.

### *Learning Context*

Since the study was conducted in an EFL classroom, the context exhibited the main characteristics of EFL settings: exposure to and use of the L2 were limited to the classroom environment, and students shared the same L1 amongst themselves and with the teacher. However, the context was specific to an EFL classroom where the teacher, the students, and the course each embedded specific characteristics that were conducive for language learning using communicative tasks. The teacher was an experienced, very skilled NNS teacher, and also very proficient in English, and had lived in an English language environment. Analysis of her discourse shows its unique features (mentioned above), that taken together made the tasks work well for oral language use. Although in communicative tasks it is the tasks themselves that should promote learning, the teacher has an important role as s/he supports and guides students in order for them to carry out the tasks successfully (Samuda, 2001; McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007). An important effect of her discourse in task management and content was to encourage students to participate actively in completing the tasks. She was also very motivated to implement this teaching innovation and cooperative toward the researcher during the study. As task orientation was provided before each implementation, she gained confidence and showed enthusiasm, appreciation, and willingness to cooperate and implement the tasks in her classroom. She also expressed the intention to adapt teaching materials to be task-based in her future lessons. In contrast to other studies in EFL settings (e.g., Burnaby & Sun, 1989; Chick, 1996; Li, 1998, Valdes & Jhones, 1991) where the teachers were limited in their English proficiency and sociolinguistic competence and therefore reluctant to adopt a communicative approach to teaching, the

teacher in this study was highly proficient in both, which contributed substantially to her successful implementation of communicative tasks. In EFL settings one does not always have such a teacher.

The students also contributed to the success of task implementation in this setting. They were undergraduate medical students who had some motivation to learn English because they would eventually need it as professionals in their future careers. This advantageous element of the context, having somewhat motivated students, also related to the nature of the course (in Communication Skills) and its non-credit, extra-curricular but nonetheless required status. Students needed to pass the course as per the requirement of the faculty, which to some extent enhanced their motivation to learn the language. In addition, the syllabus of the course was organized according to different language functions with topics particularly tied to English for medical purposes, which by itself promoted students' motivation for learning. As McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) point out, "EFL learners in academic contexts, particularly university-level learners, have immediate academic needs, and ... have real world interests that can be targeted in task-based courses as a way to sustain their engagement in the language learning process" (p.123-124). Due to perceived task benefits and topic relevancy to their studies, the students showed great involvement and enthusiasm during task implementation and revealed positive attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of communicative tasks in their classroom.

The communicative tasks incorporated in the course were designed in such a way as to increase student motivation and engagement when they saw relevance in language learning for their field of study. Topics and activities were very much related to their

field of study and to what they would have to do in the future, supporting Long's (2000) emphasis on learners' real world needs in task-based teaching. In addition, the tasks were designed to provide students with language exposure and opportunities for interaction, two important elements for language learning which tend to be lacking in EFL settings. Particularly for language exposure, the tasks employed written materials with more varied, less frequent, and technical vocabulary for students to base their interactions on. Two types of communicative tasks used, jigsaw and decision making, had been chosen due to their different characteristics and capacity to elicit negotiation of meaning (see Ellis, 2000; Pica, Kanagy, Falodun, 1993; Pica, 2005) and because they had worked in other situations (e.g., Bitchener, 2004 and Newton, 1995). In jigsaw tasks, each participant has information to share in order to complete the task, so the interactant relationship is two-way, and interaction is required to reach a convergent goal with a single outcome. In decision making tasks, the participants' interaction is optional although they all have shared access to the information needed to complete the tasks. The goal orientation is convergent and the outcome option is open.

A learning context such as this, with a skilled teacher, good students, and a relevant required course offered great potential for language learning. Intervention at the micro level of this context with tailored communicative tasks was purposeful and seemed to be facilitative for students' oral language development. As students perceived the relevancy of the tasks to their field of study and the support of written materials for their language production, they became motivated to participate and engage in meaningful interaction using the target language to complete the tasks. Analysis of the nature of the oral language generated by students during the communicative tasks showed considerable

interactive language use, while exploration of their lexical development through task use found widely shared student claims of vocabulary learning. Analysis of participants' perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of communicative tasks revealed positive outcomes that could further increase learners' motivation and create more opportunities for learning.

Still, all the advantages embedded in the learning context did not nullify the challenges of implementing the tasks and conducting the study. As it was situated in a larger context, the study was affected by institutional and cultural factors of the specific EFL setting. For example, the scheduling of the course that included several religious holidays and was in the prayer time of the Muslim students, delayed a couple of task implementations and eliminated several students as possible participants. Class attendance also affected task implementation and debriefing scheduling. For these reasons, the study could not be conducted exactly as planned; rather, changes were made during the semester and their consequences for the research were handled as appropriately as possible. This was facilitated due to the status of the researcher (myself) as an insider and the cooperation of the EFL teacher. As a member (on leave) of the teaching staff in the Center where the research site was situated, I had a good relationship with the administrator who provided me with helpful support and facilities. I also had a good relationship with the teacher and the student participants, who were willing to participate and cooperate throughout the study. Therefore, I was able to communicate and solve problems with them, maneuvering through difficult situations.

### *Reading-Based Communicative Tasks*

Task-based learning is based on the assumption that by transacting tasks, engaging in meaningful activities, and focusing on meaning and comprehensibility of the language, learners' interlanguage is stretched and developed (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Prabhu, 1987; Samuda & Madden, 1985). As pointed out previously, the communicative tasks employed in the study were designed specifically to provide L2 exposure through written language and opportunities for interactive oral production, two factors often lacking in EFL settings. Furthermore, the tasks were closely related to the students' field of study, suggesting meeting learners' real world needs; a feature unique to task-based learning (Long, 2000; Skehan, 1998). With relevant reading materials tailored into the tasks, students could base their language production on the texts as they engaged in meaningful interaction. In addition, exposure to text could be another way of facilitating word learning, as reported by the students. This design proved to promote oral language use and created an environment that provided motivation for student involvement. It allowed students to 'outperform their competence' by using reading materials with varied, relatively infrequent, and technical vocabulary on which to base their L2 production. The students and teacher perceived this as useful since the students needed this support for their L2 language production.

Both the jigsaw and decision making tasks used in the study promoted language exposure, opportunities for production, and student involvement in a meaningful way. During task implementation, students actively participated, interacting and cooperating with one another. They were also very much engaged in the tasks. According to Foster (1999), "giving learners tasks to transact, rather than items to learn provides an

environment which best promotes language learning process” (p. 69). By working on the reading-based communicative tasks, students were engaging in activities that focused on meaning and comprehensibility of the language; this stretched students’ oral production and language development provided that attention occurred during this process.

However, a pitfall of these reading-based communicative tasks was that students might depend on the text too much. As was discovered, students often tended to simply read from their notes when they shared the information they had in the jigsaw tasks. This, fortunately, was an implementation issue, which was mitigated by what the teacher encouraged as a ‘read and tell’ technique (a technique that required the students to read their notes first and then tell the information to the others without looking at the notes).

Another issue of task design related to its implementation was the use of small groups. Although Prabhu (1987) argued against the use of group work due to a risk of fossilization, small group work was considered necessary in this study, particularly because it provided students with the L2 practice they needed. Small group or pair work is fundamental to task-based learning since students need to interact in the target language to complete the tasks (Nunan, 1989). This small group interaction can increase students’ opportunities for oral language use (see Wesche, 1994), and participation in small or pair group interaction has been shown to promote second language learning (e.g., Adams, 2007; Mackey, 1999). Small groups of four students with mixed proficiency levels and genders were used in the study to optimize interaction among the students. With this group size, each student could participate more actively (except for two students in the decision making tasks) and the teacher could also monitor better than with larger groups. In other words, teacher and students’ active roles in both task types

were elevated. With mixed proficiency levels, students could learn together as they helped each other, reflecting a cooperative learning through task-based learning. In addition, as Kasanga (1996) found, “mixed-ability dyads tend to induce more interaction” (p. 628). Though there was a tendency for the more proficient students to think that they did not learn much, the findings indicate that they in fact did (similar to McDonough’s (2004) findings). By enacting the role of the teacher or the expert, they were practicing the language. With more practice, students might gain more fluency in the L2 (see Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005; Trofimovich & Gatbonton, 2006), and more participation might lead to improved production (McDonough, 2004). However, the students seemed to overlook this benefit or take it for granted. As for the less active students, they could learn from others’ participation (Breen, 2001), and they did, as was reported.

In terms of group dynamics, since they were varied across groups as students influenced one another differently, many patterns of interaction could be observed during task completion, including collaborative, dominant/dominant, dominant/passive, and expert/novice patterns (Storch, 2002a, 2002b). This led to the issue of leadership. As the students were allowed to choose the leaders of their groups, they tended to choose the same person, usually a more proficient student. Since the leaders were generally more proficient students, the findings in a way supported Kasanga’s (1996) study that “the level of proficiency had a significant effect on the amount of interaction achieved by the students” (p. 623). The leaders were in some ways more advantaged than the other members of the groups. They had more opportunities for practice and in turn for learning during task implementation. As they led their groups in discussion, they played a major role throughout the interaction, initiating and responding, and used more varied

interactive language features. The role as a leader also seemed to increase their motivation and opportunity for learning. The findings imply students to all have opportunities for leadership assignment.

Having two types of tasks to work with seemed to appeal to students differently. Though the topics of both task types were very much related to the students' field of study, the activities were different. Crookes & Gass (1993a) point out that different tasks affect the kind of language which students produce. While in the jigsaw tasks the students basically exchanged patients' information to fill in a form, in the decision making tasks they expressed their opinions to each other in order to reach a group decision regarding patients' treatments. While in jigsaw tasks the primary student modalities were listening and writing, as they tried to understand what the others were saying and write it down, in decision making speaking was emphasized, as they tried to express their thoughts spontaneously. Most students and the teacher felt that the jigsaw tasks were easier than the decision making tasks. While both types were reported as beneficial by most students, depending on their proficiency levels, most students seemed to prefer the decision making tasks. However, they also indicated that they wanted both types in their future courses. As for the teacher, she viewed both types as having different benefits for student learning. The variety itself was beneficial since each type complemented the other. The jigsaw tasks seemed to elicit more interactive language features as the students negotiated meaning during the interaction. The decision making tasks seemed to enhance student involvement as they were more engaged in the interaction, speaking more spontaneously. Further discussion on task outcomes is found in the next two sections.

### *Interactive Language Use*

Both jigsaw and decision making tasks generated a considerable amount of oral language use in this EFL classroom. Due to the task design that employed reading materials for oral production, the outcomes of student language production in both task types had the element of reading, which was used interactively, in addition to spontaneous language use. In jigsaw there seemed to be a balance between students' use of spontaneous language and reading, while in decision making the students mostly talked spontaneously compared to their oral production when reading. This means that although both task types provided them with opportunities for interaction and learning which the students made use of, the decision making tasks provided them with more opportunities for spontaneous language use. In other words, the findings revealed how task type influences the kind of language students produced (Crookes & Gass, 1993a) including the amount and type of interactional features (Kasanga, 1996). But it was also discovered that individual differences affected the turn taking system, particularly in the decision making tasks.

Interactive language use during task implementation was in part influenced by L1 use, one of the familiar issues that arises during small or pair group work (Carless, 2004; Carless & Gordon, 1997). Due to the EFL learning context where the students shared the same L1 among themselves, use of the L1 seemed to be inevitable in their production during task completion. In both task types the L1 was sometimes used to simply translate or express ideas dealing with task management and task content, reported reasons being students' limited L2 proficiency; habit and spontaneity; an L1 environment; the need to move along; and unintelligible pronunciation or lack of

comprehension. Several of these reasons were also reported in Carless' (2004) study. When students used the L1 extensively, it was usually to make a decision regarding a topic. In other words, they were negotiating the content. Hence, reasoning, agreeing, and disagreeing occurred. After they solved the problem, they got back to using the L2 and usually continued with the topic without translating back into the L2 what they had said in the L1. The use of communicative tasks in this specific EFL context appeared to provide students with opportunities for L2 production and to diminish L1 use in class but not to completely eliminate it. In other words, L1 use was largely determined by the EFL context.

In terms of interactive features such as discourse moves and repetitions that serve as input and practice, it was found that the jigsaw tasks generated more discourse moves overall (particularly comprehension facilitation, correction, and uptake) and far more repetition (of self and other) than the decision making tasks. In addition, in terms of turns and negotiation cycles, the jigsaw tasks elicited more turns and negotiation cycle turns than did the decision making tasks, which confirms past research (see Pica, 1994 for an overview). In line with SLA theory, as Mackey (2007) points out, these components of interactional feedback (i.e., clarification requests, comprehension checks, recasts in the form of peer correction, and repetition) "may lead to L2 development through helping to make problematic aspects of learners' interlanguage salient and giving them additional opportunities to focus on their production or comprehension" (p. 15). During this process of negotiation, the students can and do notice the gap in their utterances as they receive feedback from their peers. As was found, negotiation of meaning occurred while students were dealing with task content, using these components of feedback, in which

some lexical items were negotiated although not grammatical items (cf. Bitchener, 2004). Like earlier studies (e.g., Garcia-Mayo & Pica, 2000), the students in this study tended to keep their discussions going although they made frequent grammatical mistakes; no misunderstanding seemed to interrupt them.

Furthermore, among the interactive features used by the students were self correction and uptake, two components of modified output. Modified output has been seen as beneficial to L2 learning within the SLA theory (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996; Shehadeh, 1999, 2001; Swain, 1995, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1995). As Mackey (2007) states, “*producing ‘modified output’ is believed to benefit L2 development through its role in stretching learner’s linguistic abilities, testing hypothesis, and automatizing production*” (p. 20, italic as in the original). While the students in this study modified their output, either because they might have noticed their own errors or because of recasts, their interlanguage might be stretched; because this process promoted fluency and automaticity, provided opportunity for hypothesis testing, and drew students’ attention to their linguistic problems (Swain, 1995, 2005). It was found, as in interactional feedback, that jigsaw tasks generated more self correction in total and far more uptake in total than the decision making tasks. This suggests that the jigsaw tasks provided learners with more opportunities for interactional feedback and modified output than the decision making tasks did. The reason may be because of the task demand of *giving/getting the correct information to/from their interlocutors in the jigsaw tasks*, whereas in the decision making tasks, learners appeared to be more interested in exchanging opinions or ideas than trying to correct linguistic mistakes (similar to Lee’s (2002) findings). In addition, the task demand of expressing

opinions in the decision making tasks may also be the reason why among the discourse moves used, direct answers, extended answers, and extended wh-questions occurred far more frequently in this task type. This may suggest that the decision making tasks provided learners with more opportunities for spontaneous language use than the jigsaw tasks did.

Overall, both types provided students with learning opportunities as they practiced the language and got input from others, but different language aspects were favored. The jigsaw tasks provided them with more opportunities for discourse practice; i.e., how to carry out different interactive discourse moves. Since they elicited more negotiated interaction in the forms of interactional feedback and modified output, these tasks were potentially facilitative (Long, 1996), particularly for learning the linguistic elements of discourse. Looking more broadly at the wide range of opportunities students encountered, the decision making tasks provided them with more spontaneous negotiations of content during interaction. Spontaneous content negotiations, which were not analyzed in this study, were frequently observed, and have been argued to also facilitate language learning (Foster & Ohta, 2005; Nakahama, Tyler, van Lier, 2001; Poupore, 2005). In other words, the decision making tasks appeared to provide students with more opportunities for fluency development.

#### *Enhanced Involvement*

Positive perceptions and attitudes of the participants regarding the use of both task types arose mainly from their appealing nature in engaging students' interaction, since they related to students' real world needs (Long, 2000), which was different from

teacher-fronted tasks. While working on jigsaw and decision making tasks, students were more active and talked more than while working on teacher-fronted tasks; they reported becoming more motivated and enjoying doing the tasks, and that they were not shy or afraid of making mistakes. Moreover, as they worked with peers in small groups, practice took place “between equals in a supportive atmosphere, [in which] the resulting discourse can be better tailored to individual needs and interests than the whole-group activities” (Wesche, 1994, p. 236). As observed and reported by the students and the teacher, during peer interaction an unthreatening atmosphere was created and students’ confidence was increased. As well, indirect learning might occur. One of the students observed that she learned from others while listening to their discussion. Furthermore, students saw the need for the language, not only for task completion in both types, but also for their future careers, which might also have increased their motivation for learning and practice, and in turn their L2 achievement (see Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001).

However, the degree of involvement in the interaction was different from one task type to the other. Due to the nature of each task, in which jigsaw was for sharing information and decision making was for expressing ones’ own ideas, the students tended to be more engaged in the decision making tasks. The decision making tasks seemed to create more interesting discussion and two-way interaction in terms of responding, and were preferred by all students. It was exciting for the students to make decisions on patients’ treatments, just like what they imagined they would have to do in their future career, that is, to agree and disagree, and to reason with and challenge each other in order to make these decisions. The teacher also tended to be more engaged in the decision

making tasks than in the jigsaw tasks, particularly as she led and interacted with the students in the whole class discussion to reach some possible consensus.

Although the decision making tasks created a higher degree of involvement, it does not mean that the jigsaw tasks were less beneficial in terms of student involvement. Students were also involved in the interaction while doing the jigsaw tasks with a different kind of attention. While in decision making students' attention was focused on how to express their own opinions spontaneously, which obviously was much more exciting for the students, in jigsaw their attention was more focused on their message comprehensibility as they shared and listened to the information to write it down. In other words, while in the decision making tasks the students were more involved in speaking modality, in the jigsaw tasks they were more involved in listening modality. Both modalities may seem to be complementary for students' oral language development.

#### *Language Learning Outcomes*

While completing the tasks and getting involved in the interaction, attention, practice, and need for the language occurred, all elements considered necessary for language learning (Gass, 2002, Hulstijn, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001). Analysis of the oral language generated by students as they spoke and read during communicative tasks indicates that it was interactive. The analysis revealed more practice of interactive features in jigsaw and more practice of spontaneous language in decision making. As the students completed the tasks, practicing the language, they experienced the need for the language in the interaction, and so learning motivation was enhanced. As they interacted,

trying to convey their meaning, a misunderstanding sometimes occurred that might lead to negotiation of meaning.

When the students negotiated meaning in both task types to obtain mutual comprehension, they used a variety of strategies or interactional feedback such as comprehension questions, confirmation checks, clarification checks, and recasts, and they also modified their output. In this way, “language learning is assisted through the social interaction of learners and their interlocutors, particularly when they negotiate meaning toward mutual comprehension of each other’s message meaning” (Pica, Kanagy & Falodun 1993, p. 11). In addition, during this process, attention as a key mechanism in cognitive processing that mediates input and L2 development through interaction (e.g., Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long 1996; Gass, 1997, 2002, 2003; Robinson, 2003; Schmidt, 2001) seemed to be operationalized, resulting in the interactional feedback and modified output. Since the jigsaw and decision making tasks seemed to generate the elements generally considered to be necessary for language development, namely attention, practice, and need for the language (Gass, 2002, Hulstijn, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), the findings affirm that both task types create L2 interactions among learners that may promote learning.

Furthermore, based on students’ report and teacher’s observation, the use of communicative tasks in this EFL classroom was found to have an impact in students’ oral language development. Students claimed that their confidence was increased and their fluency in speaking was developed, particularly in the decision making tasks since they were more engaged spontaneously, which was also perceived by the teacher. This may suggest that as the decision making tasks provide students with more practice of what

they already know, the tasks may lead more to fluency or to more access to automaticity (Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005). The exploration of lexical development also indicates students' reported vocabulary learning. Although this was mainly based on self reports, which necessitated inference on the part of the researcher (Mackey, 2006b), any evidence that might be tied to language learning was worth mentioning. As the students dealt with different aspects of word learning, namely spelling, pronunciation, and meaning, implying their need for this information to use the language for the task at hand, their attention and practice were reinforced. These three aspects of word learning were frequently evidenced in the small group and whole class discussions during communicative tasks, indicating the strong likelihood that lexical development in terms of form, and/or pronunciation, and/or meaning was occurring. Students also reported that they learned new vocabulary from both task types, but recalled more words from the jigsaw tasks than from the decision making tasks, a difference also perceived by the teacher. This may suggest that one task makes more words salient than does the other task. In this case, the jigsaw tasks seemed to make certain words more salient to students than the decision making tasks did since students had to read or listen to the words several times during the jigsaw tasks, and so had more encounters with them.

In summary, the use of relevant reading materials in communicative tasks promoted language exposure, opportunities for production, and student involvement in an EFL classroom. Both task types provided students with learning opportunities as they practiced the language and got input from others. The study gives evidence of attention, practice, and need for the language during task completion; shows an impact on students' oral language development; and indicates students' reported vocabulary learning.

*Episode 6    looking back and ahead, looking inside and outside*

Time to ponder:

No one can be 'there' without others' support and cooperation.

No one can be 'there' without perseverance and self-determination.

Time to wonder:

I am finally 'there' because of Divine intervention.

Time to look yonder:

Yet, another 'there' is waiting for further exploration.

*Reflection on the writing process,  
April 11, 2008*

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION

This research reported on the use of communicative tasks in an EFL classroom. It described the nature of EFL university students' oral discourse generated through the use of selected communicative tasks (jigsaw and decision making) in small groups in terms of its interactive features; analyzed the main features used by the NNS teacher and the roles of her discourse; investigated the students' and teacher's perceptions and attitudes with respect to the use of communicative tasks vis-à-vis the existing oral method; and explored the evidence that communicative tasks might facilitate lexical development. The research was framed within cognitive orientation in SLA theory in order to examine how peer interactions in the L2 could be promoted by using communicative tasks and how this might contribute to students' language learning. An interaction approach was employed to characterize the linguistic and discourse processes and their outcomes. Thus, interactional features were identified and related processes and outcomes were described. In addition, participants' related perceptions and attitudes and their reported evidence of vocabulary learning were described as well.

This research followed principles of the case study methodology to identify contributions it can make to our understanding of language learning through interaction among students in a specific foreign language context. Data were taken from many different sources. The primary data were transcripts of four audio-taped classroom communicative task sessions, including student and teacher discourse in small group and whole group

contexts. Other data included student pre- and post-questionnaires and a teacher questionnaire; periodic classroom observations recorded through observation protocols and field notes; students' and the teacher's written reflective comments after each task implementation; transcripts of introspective debriefing sessions with the eight student participants (elicited after the first and second tasks, representing one example each of a jigsaw and decision making task); and a teacher interview at the end of the course. The analysis was descriptive, examining overall and context-specific patterns of participants' interactions, perceptions, and attitudes as they evolved over time. The findings suggest that both jigsaw and decision making tasks worked well in the hands of an experienced NNS teacher. Both task types generated a considerable amount of oral language as students interacted, negotiated, and cooperated during task implementation. In addition, the teacher and students reported similar, positive perceptions and attitudes with regard to the use of communicative tasks, and there was anecdotal and observed evidence that the communicative tasks might facilitate lexical learning in this setting.

#### *Limitations of the Study*

This study was based on the experiences of an EFL teacher and eight of her students enrolled in the Communication Skills course in a university in Indonesia. The findings described here represent the experiences of these participants during implementation of two types of communicative tasks over a semester. The research context was characterized by several unique features that were specific to the participants, the learning context, and the researcher as an insider. Both the teacher and student participants shared the same L1 with each other and with the researcher, and all

were of Indonesian nationality. Given this specific context of the study, which is with accordance to the case study methodology, the results of the study cannot be generalized to other L2 teaching and learning contexts. Clearly, to some extent the study is relevant to the EFL context and communicative context in general, but findings are specific to a given classroom context. Readers are directed to a detailed description of the context and the methodology of the study to decide the relevance of the study to their own contexts and situations.

Another limitation of the study is related to the research procedures. Since the study was classroom-based, using modest, affordable audio recordings, not all the utterances were clearly recorded. In addition, since the students recorded their own group discussions, they occasionally turned off the tapes during task completion, in which the exact amount of time that each group turned off their tape could not be exactly determined. Consequently, the data on students' language production used in the study is not exhaustive, although the intelligibly recorded utterances that were analyzed represented most of the language use by the participants. Furthermore, due to the small number of participants, statistical verification of task type outcomes in terms of the interactive features generated could not be done.

#### *Contributions of the Study*

Despite its limitations, the study has shown a successful implementation of communicative tasks in an EFL classroom. The research contributes to our understanding of language teaching and learning, particularly in foreign language instructional contexts, in which research on communicative tasks has rarely been

conducted in working classroom settings. More specifically, it provides insight into how communicative tasks can work successfully in an EFL classroom as part of an existing, regular course, and what kind of oral discourse and interaction they generate. The results explore the usefulness of such tasks for generating students' interactive oral discourse, and the role of such tasks in learning in an EFL setting, as confirmed by evidence of students' new vocabulary use and self-reported learning, and their self-reported attitudes toward communicative task use and its outcomes. They provide information for non-native EFL teachers on the pedagogic value of communicative tasks and how they may be effectively implemented to help students in promoting their oral language and lexical development.

The study itself, conducted in an Indonesian context at a specific time and having specific characteristics, is a real life case study with real people facing real issues. It contributes to our knowledge of EFL pedagogy and extends classroom-based research to EFL settings. Task design with reading texts - adapting the existing materials, and task implementation - conforming to the existing situation and conditions, as well as the positive task outcomes contribute to the feasibility of communicative task use in EFL settings. In addition, the taxonomy of discourse moves, including reading-based moves as a result of task design and implementation, contributes to SLA interaction research in general.

Overall, the study makes a valuable contribution to our understanding on classroom foreign language learning, particularly in its focus on the implementation of a communicative task-based methodology for promoting student interaction in an EFL setting.

### *Implications of the Study*

As pointed out previously, positive task outcomes and positive perceptions and attitudes of the participants regarding the use of both task types indicate their feasibility for use in EFL settings. However, there are several pedagogical implications resulting from the study. First, an experienced, skilled, and proficient teacher seems to be needed for the success of communicative task implementation. Relating to this is teacher training (e.g., McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007). The teacher should be made familiar with the task type and the specific content before implementing it in order to gain confidence. S/he is supposed to know what is expected from a teacher and from the students during the implementation. As the teacher of the study was very skilled and had near native-like proficiency of English, she was able to facilitate and monitor the students as they began and completed the tasks. Orientation to the tasks was also provided by the researcher so that she knew what was expected from her during task implementation.

Second, task variety and sequencing are important for students and for different purposes (see Nunan, 1989). On one hand, task variety can appeal to students' interests, and is probably necessary for promoting students' motivation. On the other hand, task sequencing can meet the needs for students' levels of difficulty. It is necessary for building up students' confidence and competence. The study employed two task types with different characteristics. While jigsaw was considered to be easier than decision making, the two task types appealed to students based on their respective levels of proficiency (and were implemented accordingly). While jigsaw was perceived as helping students practice their listening skills more and decision making their speaking skills, both types appealed differently according to students' interests in practicing the language.

Above all, as various tasks lead to various outcomes, it is necessary to have more than one type of task. As revealed from the analysis of participants' attitudes and perceptions, positive task outcomes based on the appropriate sequencing and variety indicate that both task types complemented each other in promoting students' language development.

Third, small group formation with students having mixed levels of proficiency seems to be conducive in promoting active interaction during task completion (e.g., Kasanga, 1996). Small group size created a relaxing atmosphere for students, triggered their willingness to participate, and built up their confidence. They helped each other as they interacted and cooperated. Although the stronger students tended to be more active and encouraging, and the weaker students tended to be less active and to listen rather than speak when possible, they were both advantaged in some way. The stronger students had more speaking practice and the weaker ones got listening input that they could use in their practice.

Fourth, students should all have opportunities for leadership assignment. The findings of the study show that the leaders of the group had more opportunities for practice as they led their groups in discussion. They initiated and responded more often than the other members and used more varied discourse moves and repetitions. As they enacted the role as a teacher, they practiced the language and provided input for the others. However, since the students were allowed to assign their own leaders, as in this study, they tended to point the same leader. Consequently, the other students never had a chance to be a leader, which in a way lessened their learning opportunity. This could be manipulated through turn taking in which the weaker students lead the easier tasks and

the stronger students the more difficult ones, or depending on students' leadership abilities since different leaders may not lead in the same way.

Fifth, since task design employed reading materials, its implementation particularly in the jigsaw tasks should promote a 'read and tell' technique to avoid students' tendency of simply reading when sharing the information they had. This implication specifically emerged from the interview data as the teacher suggested it as a solution for improvement of task implementation.

In addition to these pedagogical implications, there are four other research implications resulting from the study. The first one concerns research equipment. It was found that advanced technology was not always helpful. The pilot study using voice activated digital recordings proved to be inappropriate since they picked up background noises too strongly. In this case, manual audio recordings worked better to record peer interaction in small group discussion. As for the other equipment, the use of video recordings as suggested from the pilot study, capturing the whole class, was deemed important for fully understanding and transcribing classroom language use.

The second research implication deals with sensitivity to cultural issues. Research done has to comply with the cultural and institutional factors operative in their specific given context. As the study classroom was itself situated in a larger context, it was affected by the cultures of the society. In this case, the study was conducted in Indonesia where several different religions are officially practiced, so that different religious holidays are observed nation-wide. As a consequence, there were three holidays during the semester that resulted in extra intervals between course sessions. In addition, as the course was on Fridays, the Muslims' praying time, several Muslim students had to

leave to go to the mosque for prayers in the middle of each class session. This is entitled to them by the institution, and again administered nation-wide. Consequently, they could not be chosen for research participants.

The third research implication, related to cultural sensitivity, concerns the researcher as an insider. It seems to be necessary for a study conducted in a specific context to have a researcher who can have full access to the participants through their cultural, language, and institutional factors. As an insider, I was able to conduct the study because I had the ability to understand the participants' language. We shared the same L1, and were from the same country and institution, and so I could comprehend most of the subtleties, secrecy, and body language as they participated in the study. I had good relations with the administrator, teacher, and students, and so was able to verify my views with the participants and to do a member check. This advantageous condition may only be possible for an insider researcher. However, I was also aware that my position as the researcher could be seen as an outsider by the participants. As well, having left Indonesia for some time, I could relate to the notion of the researcher as an outsider.

The fourth research implication deals with vocabulary acquisition study techniques. The study of lexical development was beyond the scope of this research, but of interest for its insights into links between communicative tasks and vocabulary learning. Therefore, only retrospective recall was used. Building on this study, further research may be directed at students' vocabulary acquisition with more comprehensive techniques for a better understanding of word learning outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, R. (2007). Do second language learners benefit from interacting with each other? In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 29-51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beebe, L.M. (1985). Input: Choosing the right stuff. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 404-414). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, Inc.
- Belz, J.A. (2003). Identity, deficiency, and first language use in foreign language. In: The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native, and the non-native speaker. Issues in Language Program Direction, A Series of Annual Volumes. Report: ED481795. 42pp.
- Bitchener, J. (2004). The relationship between the negotiation of meaning and language learning: A longitudinal study. *Language Awareness, 13*(2), 81-95.
- Braidi, S. (2002). Reexamining the roles of recasts in native-speaker/non-native speaker interactions. *Language Learning, 52*(1), 1-42.
- Breen, M.P. (1984). Process syllabuses for the language classroom. In C.J. Brumfit (Ed.), *General English syllabus design. ELT Documents, 118*, 47-60.
- Breen, M.P. (2001). Overt participation and covert acquisition in the language classroom. In M.P. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 112-140). London: Longman.
- Brown, R. (1991). Group work, task difference, and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 12*(1), 1-12.
- Burnaby, B., & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of Western language teaching: Context informs paradigm. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 219-238.
- Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' reinterpretation of a task-based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 639-662.
- Carless, D., & Gordon, A. (1997). Hong Kong primary teachers' perceptions of the difficulties in implementing task-based language teaching. *Journal of Basic Education, 7*, 139-159.

- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms, research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chick, J.K. (1996). Safe-talk: Collusion in apartheid education. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 21-39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crookes, G., & Gass, S. (Eds.). (1993a). *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crookes, G., & Gass, S. (Eds.). (1993b). *Tasks and language learning*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal*, 52, 179-187.
- De Bot, K. (2001). Interaction in the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 602-603.
- Doughty, C.J., & Long, M.H. (Eds.). (2003). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (1994). Input and interaction and second language acquisition. In R. Ellis, *The study of second language acquisition* (pp. 243-291). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1999). Making the classroom acquisition rich. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a second language through interaction* (pp. 211-229). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 193-220.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., & He, X. (1999). The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meaning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(2), 285-301.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1971). Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity: a study of normal speech, baby talk, foreigner talk, and pidgins. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (pp. 141-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Foster, P. (1999). Task-based learning and pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 53(1), 69-70.
- Foster, P., & Ohta, A.M. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3), 402-430.
- Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning on performance in task-based learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(3), 299-324.
- Garcia Mayo, M.P., & Pica, T. (2000). L2 learner interaction in a foreign language setting: Are learning needs addressed? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 38(1), 35-59.
- Gass, S.M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S.M. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or, why apples are not orange and don't need to be. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 83-90.
- Gass, S.M. (2002). An interactionist perspective on second language acquisition. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 170-181). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S.M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty & M.H. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gass, S.M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 175-199). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. M., & Madden, C. G. (Eds.). (1985). *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Gass, S.M., & Varonis, E. (1985). Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S.M. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Gass, S.M., & Varonis, E. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Gass, S.M., & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- Gatbonton, E., & Gu, G. (1994). Preparing and implementing a task-based ESL curriculum in an EFL setting: Implications for theory and practice. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(2), 9-20.

- Gatbonton, E., & Selagowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on access to fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(3), 325-353.
- Gregg, K.R. (2003). SLA theory: Construction and assessment. In C.J. Doughty & M.H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 831-865). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hall, J.K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 186-203.
- Hasan, A. S. (2006). Analysing bilingual classroom discourse. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(1), 7-18.
- Hatch, E. (1983). Input/interaction and language development. In E. Hatch, *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective* (pp. 152-187). New York: Harper and Row Newbury House.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second-language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 256-284), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hulstijn, J.H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, 51(3), 539-558.
- Joe, A. (1995). Text-based tasks and incidental vocabulary learning. *Second Language Research*, 11(2), 149-158.
- Joe, A. (1998). What effects do text-based tasks promoting generation have on incidental vocabulary acquisition? *Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 357-377.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasanga, L.A. (1996). Peer interaction and L2 learning. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52(4), 611-639.
- Kasper, G. (1997). "A" stands for acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 307-312.
- Kennedy, J. (1996). Classroom explanatory discourse: A look at how teachers explain things to their students. *Language Awareness*, 5, 26-39.

- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1991). Language learning tasks: Teacher intention and learner interpretation. *ELT Journal*, 45, 98-107.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman.
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 1-26.
- Lee, L. (2002). Synchronous online exchanges: A study of modification devices on non-native discourse. *System*, 30, 275-288.
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 677-703.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (Rev. ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M.H. (1980). *Input, interaction, and second language acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Long, M.H. (1983a). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5(2), 177-193.
- Long, M.H. (1983b). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Long, M.H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Long, M.H. (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. In S. Anivan (Ed.), *Language teaching methodology for the nineties* (pp. 31-50). Singapore: Singapore University Press for SEAMO Regional Language Center.
- Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M.H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 179-192). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Long, M.H. (2007). Recasts: The story so far. In M.H. Long (Ed.), *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Long, M.H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1), 677-703.
- Long, M.H., & Crookes, G. (1993). Units of analysis in syllabus design: The case for task. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9-54). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Long, M.H., & Doughty, C.J. (2003). SLA and cognitive science. In C.J. Doughty & M.H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 866-870). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Long, M.H., & Porter, P.A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
- Luk, J. C.M., & Lin, A.M.Y. (2006). *Classroom interactions as cross-cultural encounters: Native speakers in EFL lessons*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Mackey, A. (1995). *Stepping up the pace: Input, interaction and interlanguage development. An empirical study of questions in ESL*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(4), 557-587.
- Mackey, A. (2006a). Epilogue: From introspections, brain scans, and memory tests to the role of social context: Advancing research on interaction and research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 369-379.
- Mackey, A. (2006b). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 405-430.

- Mackey, A. (2007). Introduction: The role of conversational interaction in second language acquisition. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S.M. (2006). Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 169-178.
- Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System*, 30, 459-477.
- Mackey, A., & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338-356.
- McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System*, 32, 207-224.
- McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(1), 79-103.
- McDonough, K., & Chaikitmongkol, W. (2007). Teachers' and learners' reactions to a task-based EFL course in Thailand. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 107-132.
- McDonough, K., & Mackey, A. (2000). Communicative tasks, conversational interaction and linguistic form: An empirical study of Thai. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(1), 82-92.
- Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case study research in education*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Merriam, S.B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & Van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 377-405.
- Newton, J. (1995). Task-based interaction and incidental vocabulary learning: a case study. *Second Language Research*, 11(2), 159-177.
- Newton, J. (2001). Options for vocabulary learning through communication tasks. *ELT Journal*, 55(1), 30-37.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Orland-Barak, L., & Yinon, H. (2005). Different but similar: Student teachers' perspectives on the use of L1 in Arab and Jewish EFL classroom settings. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 18*(1), 91-113.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*(3), 493-527.
- Pica, T. (2005). Classroom learning, teaching, and research: A task-based perspective. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(3), 339-352.
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: a comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, Inc.
- Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berducci, D., & Newman, J. (1991). Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 343-376.
- Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9-34). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 59-84.
- Pinter, A. (2007). Some benefits of peer-peer interaction: 10-year-old children practicing with a communication task. *Language Teaching Research, 11*(2), 189-207.
- Poupore, G. (2005). Quality interaction and types of negotiation in problem-solving and jigsaw tasks. In C. Edwards & J. Willis (Eds.), *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching* (pp. 242-255). NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J.C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (2003). Attention and memory during SLA. In C. Doughty and M.H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 631-678). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, and M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and testing* (pp.119-140). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shehadeh, A. (1999). Non-native speakers' production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning. *Language learning*, 49, 627-675.
- Shehadeh, A. (2001). Self- and other-initiated modified output during task-based interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 433-457.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38-62.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spada, N. & Frohlich, M. (1995). *COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) Observation Scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Stake, R.E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Storch, N. (2002a). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52, 119-158.
- Storch, N. (2002b). Relationship formed in dyadic interaction and opportunity for learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3-4), 305-322.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.); *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58, 44-63.

- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step toward second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 371-391.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320-337.
- Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 166-178.
- Towell, R., & Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to second language acquisition*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Trofimovich, P., Ammar, A., & Gatbonton, E. (2007). How effective are recasts? The role of attention, memory, and analytical ability. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 171-195). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trofimovich, P., & Gatbonton, E. (2006). Repetition and focus on form in processing L2 Spanish words: Implications for pronunciation instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 519-535.
- Tulung, G.J. (2001). *Teacher talk in task-based instruction in an EFL setting: A case study*. Unpublished master's research essay, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Tulung, G.J. (2004). Teachers managing a task within task-based instruction: A case study in an EFL setting. In B.Y. Cahyono & U. Widiati (Eds.), *The tapestry of English language teaching and learning in Indonesia* (pp. 143-156). Malang, Indonesia: State University of Malang Press.
- Valdes, A.I., & Jhones, A.C. (1991). Introduction of communicative language teaching in tourism in Cuba. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8, 57-63.
- Vandale, C. (1997). *Foreign language teaching: Characteristics, conflict resolution and processes of change*. Unpublished master's research essay, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Varonis, E., & Gass, S.M. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 71-90.

- Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 225-246.
- Wesche, M.B. (1994). Input and interaction in second language acquisition. In C. Gallaway & B.J. Richards (Eds.), *Input and interaction in language acquisition* (pp. 219-249). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wesche, M.B., & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based and content-based language instruction. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 207-228). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Zuengler, J., & Miller, E.R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 35-58.

## Appendix A: Student Consent Form in Indonesian

### Surat Pernyataan Berpartisipasi dalam Penelitian (Mahasiswa)

**Judul penelitian:** Bahasa oral yang tercipta melalui penggunaan communicative task di lingkungan kelas EFL

**Peneliti:** Nama: Golda Tulung  
Fakultas/Universitas: Education/University of Ottawa  
Telephone:  
E-mail:

**Pembimbing :** Nama : Dr. Marjorie Wesche  
Fakultas/Universitas: Education/University of Ottawa  
Telephone: (613) 562-5800 Ext. 3467  
E-mail: [mwesche@uottawa.ca](mailto:mwesche@uottawa.ca)

**Undangan berpartisipasi :** Saya diundang untuk berpartisipasi dalam proyek penelitian di atas yang dilakukan oleh Ibu Golda Tulung. Penelitian ini mendapat Bantuan Dana Program Sandwich dari DIKTI (Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi) Indonesia.

**Tujuan penelitian:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat hakekat bahasa oral yang tercipta melalui penggunaan communicative task, dari pengajar dan dari interaksi pembelajar, karena hal ini bisa berhubungan dengan perkembangan bahasa, sikap dan persepsi pembelajar.

**Jenis partisipasi:** Pada hakekatnya partisipasi saya berhubungan dengan mata kuliah Communication Skills yang saya ambil dan berlangsung selama satu semester ini (Februari sampai Juni 2005). Pada permulaan mata kuliah, saya diminta untuk mengisi questionnaire tentang latar belakang pendidikan dan pengalaman belajar bahasa Inggris, dan hal ini akan memakan waktu selama sekitar 20 menit. Selama berjalannya mata kuliah, akan ada empat communicative task yang dilakukan di kelas sebagai bagian dari kegiatan kelas, dan setiap task akan membutuhkan waktu yang sama seperti pada kegiatan kelas lainnya. Dalam setiap task, saya akan bekerja dalam kelompok kecil, terdiri dari tiga atau empat orang, membantu peneliti untuk merekam diskusi kelompok saya, dan menulis komentar atau pendapat tentang beberapa pertanyaan yang diajukan pada akhir setiap pelaksanaan task. ***Di setiap pelaksanaan task, kegiatan kelas akan direkam dengan video.*** Mungkin juga saya akan diminta meluangkan waktu selama 20-30 menit di luar kelas, diatur sesuai dengan jadwal saya, untuk membicarakan pengalaman saya waktu communicative task berlangsung di kelas.

**Resiko:** Resiko penelitian ini sangat kecil sampai pada tidak ada sama sekali. Saya telah mendapat kepastian dari peneliti bahwa setiap aspek proyek yang bisa membuat saya merasa tidak enak akan diperkecil.

**Keuntungan:** Partisipasi saya dalam penelitian ini akan menciptakan lingkungan belajar yang bisa membantu perkembangan bahasa saya, di mana saya akan berinteraksi dengan pembelajar bahasa lainnya dan berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan yang menggunakan bahasa yang sedang dipelajari. Penelitian ini bisa juga memberikan wawasan dan pengetahuan tentang bagaimana communicative task bisa dijalankan di lingkungan kelas EFL dan jenis bahasa oral dan interaksi yang tercipta darinya. Hal ini akan memberi informasi kepada para pengajar EFL akan nilai

pengajaran communicative task dan bagaimana penerapannya secara efektif untuk membantu pembelajar dalam mengembangkan bahasa oral dan kosa kata mereka.

**Kerahasiaan:** Saya telah mendapat kepastian dari peneliti bahwa informasi yang akan saya berikan tetap bersifat rahasia. Saya tahu bahwa isinya akan digunakan hanya untuk disertasi Ph.D. dari peneliti dan presentasi/publikasi akademis selanjutnya, dan bahwa kerahasiaan ini akan dijaga peneliti dengan penggunaan nama palsu. *Rekaman video hanya akan digunakan untuk keakurasian data dan tidak akan diperlihatkan pada konferensi apapun.* Data yang dikumpul akan diberi kode dan disimpan dalam tempat yang aman, dan hanya peneliti dan pembimbingnya yang mempunyai akses terhadap data tersebut.

**Anonimitas:** Anonimitas akan dijaga dengan menggunakan nama palsu dalam penulisan hasil penelitian.

**Penyimpanan data:** Data yang dikumpul (dalam bentuk questionnaire, komentar/pendapat yang ditulis, *rekaman video terhadap kegiatan kelas* dan rekaman suara saya pada waktu keempat communicative task dijalankan dan waktu debriefing dengan beberapa peserta, beserta transkripnya di Compact Disk) akan disimpan dengan aman di rumah peneliti di Indonesia, dan kemudian di rumah peneliti di Kanada. Data akan disimpan selama 5 tahun.

**Kompensasi:** Tidak ada kompensasi dalam berpartisipasi pada penelitian ini.

**Partisipasi sukarela:** Partisipasi saya bersifat sukarela. Jika saya memilih untuk berpartisipasi, saya bisa menolak untuk menjawab pertanyaan, tanpa ada konsekuensi negatif.

**Pernyataan:** Saya, \_\_\_\_\_, setuju untuk berpartisipasi pada penelitian ini yang akan dilakukan oleh Ibu Golda Tulung, kandidat Ph.D. pada Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, dan atas bimbingan Dr. Marjorie Wesche. Saya mengerti bahwa dengan setuju untuk berpartisipasi tidak berarti bahwa saya tidak berhak untuk mengundurkan diri dari penelitian ini.

Jika saya mempunyai pertanyaan tentang penelitian ini, saya boleh menghubungi peneliti atau pembimbingnya lewat alamat yang tertera di atas.

Jika dalam partisipasi ini saya mempunyai masalah etika yang perlu dibicarakan, saya boleh menghubungi Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, (613) 562-5841 or [ethics@uottawa.ca](mailto:ethics@uottawa.ca).

Ada dua buah lembar surat pernyataan, salah satunya untuk saya simpan.

Tanda-tangan:

Tanggal:

Tanda-tangan peneliti :

Tanggal:

## Appendix B: Teacher Consent Form in Indonesian

### Surat Pernyataan Berpartisipasi dalam Penelitian (Dosen)

**Judul penelitian:** Bahasa oral yang tercipta melalui penggunaan communicative task di lingkungan kelas EFL

**Peneliti:** Nama: Golda Tulung  
Fakultas/Universitas: Education/University of Ottawa  
Telephone:  
E-mail: ,

**Pembimbing :** Nama : Dr. Marjorie Wesche  
Fakultas/Universitas: Education/University of Ottawa  
Telephone: (613) 562-5800 Ext. 3467  
E-mail: [mwesche@uottawa.ca](mailto:mwesche@uottawa.ca)

**Partisipasi sukarela :** Saya telah diundang dan setuju untuk berpartisipasi dalam proyek penelitian di atas yang dilakukan oleh Golda Tulung. Partisipasi saya bersifat sukarela. Penelitian ini mendapat Bantuan Dana Program Sandwich dari DIKTI (Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi) Indonesia.

**Tujuan penelitian:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat hakekat bahasa oral yang tercipta melalui penggunaan communicative task, dari pengajar dan dari interaksi pembelajar, karena hal ini bisa berhubungan dengan perkembangan bahasa, sikap dan persepsi pembelajar.

**Jenis partisipasi:** Pada hakekatnya partisipasi saya berhubungan dengan pengajaran mata kuliah Communication Skills selama satu semester (Februari sampai Juni 2005), di mana empat unit yang diadaptasi (yaitu dengan menggunakan communicative task) akan dimasukkan dalam kurikulum. Selain itu, akan diadakan juga satu kali percobaan kegiatan dan pengisian questionnaire oleh mahasiswa yang akan dilakukan sebagai bagian dari kegiatan kelas. Sebelum mata kuliah ini berjalan, saya akan diminta untuk mengisi questionnaire tentang latar belakang pendidikan dan pengalaman mengajar bahasa Inggris yang akan memakan waktu selama 20 menit, dan berdiskusi dengan peneliti tentang pelaksanaan proyek penelitian di mana saya akan mendapat training dari peneliti tentang keempat communicative task yang akan dilakukan. Peneliti bersedia untuk diskusi lebih lanjut selama pelaksanaan penelitian ini. Selama berjalannya mata kuliah, saya diminta untuk mengajar sebagaimana biasanya, mengikuti bahan ajaran yang disediakan oleh ELTC, kecuali pada waktu keempat task dilaksanakan. Setiap task akan membutuhkan waktu yang sama seperti pada kegiatan kelas lainnya (2 jam). ***Di setiap pelaksanaan task, kegiatan kelas akan direkam dengan video.*** Saya juga diminta untuk menulis komentar atau pendapat tentang apa yang terjadi pada setiap pelaksanaan task. Pada akhir mata kuliah, saya akan diwawancarai selama sekitar satu jam tentang penggunaan communicative task di kelas saya.

**Resiko:** Resiko penelitian ini sangat kecil sampai pada tidak ada sama sekali. Saya telah mendapat kepastian dari peneliti bahwa setiap aspek proyek yang bisa membuat saya merasa tidak enak akan diperkecil (misalnya, dengan memberi bantuannya).

**Keuntungan:** Partisipasi saya dalam penelitian ini memberi kesempatan bagi saya untuk menggunakan metode pengajaran bahasa yang lain dari apa yang ada di silabus, dan memperkaya metode pengajaran saya. Lebih luas lagi, penelitian ini akan memberikan wawasan dan pengetahuan tentang bagaimana communicative task bisa dijalankan di lingkungan kelas EFL dan jenis bahasa oral dan interaksi yang tercipta darinya. Hal ini akan memberi informasi kepada para pengajar EFL akan nilai pengajaran communicative task dan bagaimana penerapannya secara efektif untuk membantu pembelajar dalam perkembangan bahasa oral dan kosa kata mereka.

**Kerahasiaan:** Saya telah mendapat kepastian dari peneliti bahwa informasi yang akan saya berikan tetap bersifat rahasia. Saya tahu bahwa isinya akan digunakan hanya untuk disertasi Ph.D. dari peneliti dan presentasi/publikasi akademis selanjutnya, dan bahwa kerahasiaan ini akan dijaga peneliti dengan penggunaan nama palsu. ***Rekaman video hanya akan digunakan untuk keakurasian data dan tidak akan diperlihatkan pada konferensi apapun.*** Data yang dikumpul akan diberi kode dan disimpan dalam tempat yang terkunci, dan hanya peneliti dan pembimbingnya yang mempunyai akses terhadap data tersebut.

**Anonimitas:** Anonimitas akan dijaga dengan menggunakan nama palsu dalam penulisan hasil penelitian.

**Penyimpanan data:** Data yang dikumpul (dalam bentuk questionnaire dan observasi kelas, komentar/pendapat yang ditulis, ***rekaman video terhadap kegiatan kelas*** dan rekaman suara saya pada waktu keempat communicative task dijalankan dan waktu wawancara, beserta transcripturnya di Compact Disk) akan disimpan dengan aman di tempat yang terkunci di rumah peneliti di Indonesia, dan kemudian di rumah peneliti di Kanada. Data akan disimpan selama 5 tahun.

**Kompensasi:** Tidak ada kompensasi dalam berpartisipasi pada penelitian ini.

**Pernyataan:** Saya, \_\_\_\_\_, setuju untuk berpartisipasi pada penelitian ini yang akan dilakukan oleh Golda Tulung, kandidat Ph.D. pada Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, dan atas bimbingan Dr. Marjorie Wesche. Saya mengerti bahwa dengan setuju untuk berpartisipasi tidak berarti bahwa saya tidak berhak untuk mengundurkan diri dari penelitian ini.

Jika saya mempunyai pertanyaan tentang penelitian ini, saya boleh menghubungi peneliti atau pembimbingnya lewat alamat yang tertera di atas.

Jika dalam partisipasi ini saya mempunyai masalah etika yang perlu dibicarakan, saya boleh menghubungi Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, (613) 562-5841 or [ethics@uottawa.ca](mailto:ethics@uottawa.ca).

Ada dua buah lembar surat pernyataan, salah satunya untuk saya simpan.

Tanda-tangan peserta penelitian:

Tanggal:

Tanda-tangan peneliti :

Tanggal :

## Appendix C: Non-Modified Activities and Alternate Form as Jigsaw

### I. Non-Modified Activities

## Unit 3 Where does it hurt?

1. Read the dialogues below while you listen to the recording. Listen for the differences.

(D = doctor; P = patient)

**A**

D: Where does it hurt?

P: Just here, doctor

D: Mm. And is that all the time?

P: No. Only when I walk, or when I'm going downstairs. Sometimes when I carry things.

D: When you carry things. Big things?

P: Yes.

D: I see. Now I want you to stand up ...

**B**

D: How often do you get them?

P: Oh, three or four times a week.

D: I see. Are they very bad?

P: Oh, yes. They stop me driving. Sometimes I can hardly see, you know.

D: Yes. Do you often get colds?

**C**

P: It's a really bad cough. It's really bad.

D: Does it hurt when you talk?

P: If I take a lot, yes.

D: I see. We'll just have a look at your chest. Do you drink?

Now listen to these conversations and try to write down the words that go in the blanks.

**D**

P: It's a really bad pain, doctor. \_\_\_\_\_ here.

D: Which side?

P: \_\_\_\_\_ side.

D: How long has this been going on? When did it start?

P: \_\_\_\_\_ morning, doctor. I thought perhaps it was indigestion, but it's too \_\_\_\_\_ for that.

D: \_\_\_\_\_ Now just \_\_\_\_\_ down here. That's right. Now \_\_\_\_\_ exactly does it hurt? Is it here?

P: Ooh! Yes!

**E**

D: Good morning, \_\_\_\_\_ Palmer. What's the \_\_\_\_\_ ?

P: Well, I've got a \_\_\_\_\_ sore throat, \_\_\_\_\_.

D: \_\_\_\_\_. How long have you had it?

P: Oh, about \_\_\_\_\_. It's \_\_\_\_\_ very painful. It's difficult to \_\_\_\_\_

**F**

P: It's every \_\_\_\_\_ about the same time, doctor. Stuffed-up nose, my \_\_\_\_\_ itch, and I feel sort of \_\_\_\_\_ the whole time.

D: Is it \_\_\_\_\_ when you're inside or outside?

P: When I'm in the \_\_\_\_\_

**G:**

P: I get this \_\_\_\_\_ when I bend \_\_\_\_\_, doctor. Just here.

D: I see. Take your \_\_\_\_\_ off.

**2. Copy this list, and then close your book. Find out what each of the words or expressions means, by using a dictionary or asking you teacher. Then listen to the conversations again. Which patient has which problem?**

headaches      bronchitis      back trouble  
 appendicitis    a pulled muscle  
 hay fever      tonsillitis

**3. Here are some more things the doctor said.**

A: Don't carry heavy things for a while.

B: I think you should make an appointment at the Eye Hospital.

And here is what the patients told their families.

A: He told me not to carry heavy things.

B: He advised me to make an appointment at the Eye Hospital.

What do you think the doctor told the other patients? Work in groups to decide, and report to the class. You can use words from the box below, or ask your teacher for help. Begin your sentences like this:

*'We think the doctor told/advised patient C ....'*

to have:	an operation	some physiotherapy	
	some tests	a rest	an injection
to take:	some tablets	some medicine	
	some syrup	some vitamins	
to wear:	a bandage		
to do:	some exercises		

**4. Pronunciation. Say these sentences. Don't separate the words.**

Where does it hurt?

Only when I run.

I want you to stand up.

How often do you get them?

They stop me working.

Sometimes I can hardly see.

Do you ever get hay fever?

It's a really bad cough.

It's a really bad pain.

This side.

Just lie down here.

It's difficult to eat.

It's every year about the same time.

I get this pain.

## II. Alternate Form as Jigsaw

### Unit 3 Where does it hurt?

#### *Pre-task:*

What questions should you ask to get a patient's information below? Write your questions and compare them with a partner. Number 1 has been done for you.

1. Name  
*What's the patient's (his/her) name?*
2. Age
3. Marital status
4. Occupation
5. Complaints
6. Doctor's diagnosis
7. Doctor's advice

#### *Task:*

In this activity, you will share information with your peers in order to complete a form that lists the information of seven patients.

1. Divide the class into groups of 4 students.
2. Each student will get a note about different parts of the patients' information. Do **not** show your note to your group members.
3. Read your note.
4. Complete the form beginning from Patient 1.
5. Ask your group for the information you do not have.
6. Tell your group the information you have.
7. Listen and write the information to complete the form.
8. Be ready to present a patient when called on.

Patients' Information Form

Patient	Name	Age	Sex	Marital Status	Occupation	Complaints	Doctor's diagnosis	Doctor's Advice
1.					Mechanic			
2.	Kevin .....							
3.							bronchitis	
4.						a really bad pain on the stomach; .....		
5.		30						
6.								Have some .....
7.				Married				

### **Student A**

Patient 1: His name is David Brown. He is 44 years old.

Patient 2: He's suffered from headaches. The doctor told him to make an appointment at the Eye Hospital.

Patient 3: She's had a very bad cough and it causes pain when she talks a long time.

Patient 4: She is married. She works as a receptionist in a hotel.

Patient 5: His name is Robert James. He is 30 years old.

Patient 6: He's suffered from hay fever. The doctor advised him to have some medicine.

Patient 7: He gets the pain when he bends over and he has had it for 2 days.

### **Student B**

Patient 1: He is married. He is a mechanic.

Patient 2: His name is Kevin Hall. He is 32 years old.

Patient 3: She's suffered from bronchitis. The doctor advised her to have some tests.

Patient 4: She's had a really bad pain on the stomach and it has started since this morning.

Patient 5: He is single. He works in a big company as a computer programmer.

Patient 6: Her name is Mary Thompson. She is 21 years old.

Patient 7: He's suffered from back trouble. The doctor told him not to carry heavy things for a while.

### **Student C**

Patient 1: He feels painful when walking or going upstairs & downstairs; also painful when he carries bundles.

Patient 2: He is single. He is a truck driver.

Patient 3: Her name is Kathleen Lynn. She is 52 years old.

Patient 4: She's suffered from appendicitis. The doctor told her to have an operation.

Patient 5: He's had a bad sore throat. He's had it for about 3 days, and it's difficult for him to swallow.

Patient 6: She is single. She is a student.

Patient 7: His name is Jack Hudson. He is 66 years old.

### **Student D**

Patient 1: He's suffered from a pulled muscle. The doctor advised him to wear a bandage.

Patient 2: He gets the pain 3 or 4 times a week. The pain keeps him from driving and sometimes he can barely see.

Patient 3: She is a widow. She is a teacher.

Patient 4: Her name is Helen Jones. She is 37 years old.

Patient 5: He's suffered from tonsillitis. The doctor told him to have an injection.

Patient 6: She gets stuffed-up nose every year about the same time, and her eyes itch; worse when in the garden.

Patient 7: He is married. He is a retired policeman.

## Appendix D: Non-Modified Activities and Alternate Form as Decision Making

### I. Non-Modified Activities

#### Task 5

Using the prescribing information opposite, choose the most appropriate antibiotic for these patients.

1. A 4-year-old boy with meningitis due to pneumococcus. He is allergic to penicillin.
2. A 67-year-old man with a history of chronic bronchitis now suffering from pneumococcus. The causative organism is resistant to tetracycline.
3. A 27-year-old woman with urinary tract infection in early pregnancy. She complains of nausea.
4. A 4-year-old girl with septic arthritis due to haemophilus influenzae.
5. An 18-year-old man with left leg amputation above the knee following a road traffic accident.
6. A 50-year-old woman with endocarditis caused by strep. viridans.
7. A 13-year-old girl with disfiguring acne.
8. An 8-year-old boy with tonsillitis due to B-haemolytic streptococcus.
9. A 43-year-old dairyman with brucellosis.
10. A 4-year-old unimmunised sibling of a 2-year-old boy with whooping cough.

#### AMPICILLIN

**Indications:** urinary-tract infections, otitis media, chronic bronchitis, invasive salmonellosis, gonorrhoea

**Cautions; Contra-indications; side-effect:** see under benzylpenicillin (section 5.1.1.1); also erythematous rashes in glandular fever and chronic lymphatic leukaemia; reduce dose in renal impairment. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (section 7)

**Dose:** by mouth. 0.25-1 g every hours, at least 30 minutes before food  
gonorrhoea, 2 g as a single dose with pro-benedid 1 g; repeated for women Urinary-tract infections, 500 mg every 8 hours

**By intramuscular injection or intravenous injection or infusion,** 500 mg every 4-6 hours; higher doses in meningitis. CHILD, any route, ½ adult dose

#### BENZYL PENICILLIN

(Penicillin)

**Indications:** tonsillitis, otitis media, erysipelas, streptococcal endocarditis, meningococcal and pneumococcal meningitis, prophylaxis in limb amputation

**Cautions:** history of allergy ;renal impairment

**Contra indication:** penicillin hypersensitivity

**Side-effects:** sensitive reaction including urticaria, fever, joint pains; angioedema; anaphylactic shock in hypersensitive patients; diarrhea after administration by mouth

**Dose:** by intramuscular injection, 300-600mg 2-4 times daily; CHILD up to 12 years, 10-20 mg/kg daily; NEONATE, 30mg/kg daily

**By intravenous infusion,** up to 24 g daily

**By intravenous injection,** 6-12 mg daily

Prophylaxis in dental procedures and limb amputation, section 5.1, Table 2

#### CO-TRIMOXAZOLE

A mixture of sulphamethoxazole 5 parts, trimethoprim 1 part

**Indications:** invasive salmonellosis, typhoid fever, bone and joint infections due to *H. influenzae*, urinary-tract infections, sinusitis, exacerbations of chronic bronchitis, gonorrhoea in penicillin-allergic patients

**Cautions:** blood counts in prolonged treatment, maintain adequate fluid intake, renal impairment, breast-feeding; photosensitivity. Elderly patients (see notes above). Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (sections 2.8B, 4.8, 6.1, 8, 15)

**Contra-indication:** pregnancy, infants under 6 weeks, renal or hepatic failure, jaundice, blood disorders

**Side-effects:** nausea, vomiting, rashes, erythema multiforme, epidermal necrolysis, eosinophilia, agranulocytosis, granulocytopenia, purpura, leucopenia; megaloblastic anaemia due to trimethoprim

**Dose:** by mouth, 960mg every 12 hours increased to 1.44 g in severe infections; 480mg every 12 hours, 6 weeks to 5 months 120 mg; 6 months to 5 years, 240mg; 6-12 years, 480mg

Gonorrhoea, 1.92 g every 12 hours for 2 days, or 2.4g followed by a further dose of 2.4g after 8 hours

**By intramuscular injection or intravenous infusion,** 960 mg every 12 hours

**Note:** 480mg of co-trimoxazole consists of sulphamethoxazole 400mg and trimethoprim 80mg

### ERYTHOMYCIN

**Indications:** alternative to penicillin in hypersensitive patients; sinusitis, diphtheria and whooping cough prophylaxis; legionnaires' disease; chronic prostatitis

**Cautions:** hepatic impairment. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (sections 2.8B, 3, 4.7, 4.8)

**Contra-indications:** estolate contra-indicated in liver disease

**Side-effects:** nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea after large disease doses

**Dose:** by mouth, 250-500 mg every 6 hours; CHILD, 125-250 mg every 6 hours

Syphilis, 20 g in divided doses over 10 days

**By slow intravenous injection or infusion,** 2 g daily in divided doses, increased to 4 g in divided doses

### GENTAMICIN

**Indications:** Septicemia and neonatal sepsis; meningitis and other CNS infections; biliary tract infection, acute pyelonephritis or prostatitis, endocarditis caused by *strep. Viridans* or *faecalis* (with a penicillin)

**Cautions:** increase dose in renal impairment (see below). Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (sections 5.1, 5.1, 8, 15)

**Contra-indications:** pregnancy, myasthenia gravis

**Side-effects:** vestibular damage, reversible nephrotoxicity.

**Dose:** by intramuscular injection or slow intravenous injection or infusion, 2-3 mg/kg daily, in divided doses every 8 hours. In renal impairment the interval between successive doses should be increased to 12 hours when the creatinine clearance is 30-70 ml/minute, 24 hours for 10-30 ml/minute, 48 hours for 5-10 ml/minute, and 3-4 days after dialysis for less than 5 ml/minute

CHILD, up to 2 weeks, 3 mg/kg every 8 hours

**By intrathecal injection,** 1 mg daily, with 2-4mg/kg daily by intramuscular injection in divided doses every 8 hours

### PHENOXYMETHYLPENICILLIN

(Penicillin V)

**Indications:** tonsillitis, otitis media, erysipelas, rheumatic fever prophylaxis, endocarditis prophylaxis

**Cautions:** **Contra-indications;** **Side-effects:** see under Benzylpenicillin. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (section 5.1)

**Dose:** 250-500 mg every 6 hours, at least 30 minutes before food; 1-5 years 125 mg, 6-12 years 250 mg.

### TETRACYCLINE

**Indications:** exacerbations of chronic bronchitis; infections due to brucella, Chlamydia, mycoplasma, and rickettsia; severe acne vulgaris

**Cautions:** breast-feeding; rarely causes photosensitivity. Avoid intravenous administration in hepatic impairment. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (section 2.8C, 5.1, 7, 9)

**Contra-indications:** renal failure, pregnancy, children under 12 years of age

**Side-effects;** nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea; superinfection with resistant organisms; rarely allergic reactions

**Dose:** by mouth, 250-500 mg every 6 hours

**Acne see section 13.6**

Syphilis, 30-40g in divided doses over 10-15 day

Non-gonococcal urethritis, 500 mg 4 times daily for 10-21 days

**By intramuscular injection,** 100 mg every 8-12 hours, or every 4-6 hours in severe infections

**By intravenous infusion,** 500 mg every 12 hours; max. 2 g daily

## II. Alternate Form as Decision Making

**Pre Task:** Work with a partner and answer the questions below.

1. What is a pharmacology reference?
2. When does a doctor need it?
3. What should a doctor consider before prescribing a patient the most appropriate antibiotic?

**Task:** Work in a group of four and do the activity below.

Using the prescribing information opposite, choose the most appropriate antibiotic for these patients.

1. A 4-year-old boy with meningitis due to pneumococcus. He is allergic to penicillin.
2. A 67-year-old man with a history of chronic bronchitis now suffering from pneumococcus. The causative organism is resistant to tetracycline.
3. A 27-year-old woman with urinary tract infection in early pregnancy. She complains of nausea.
4. A 4-year-old girl with septic arthritis due to haemophilus influenzae.
5. An 18-year-old man with left leg amputation above the knee following a road traffic accident.
6. A 50-year-old woman with endocarditis caused by strep. viridans.
7. A 13-year-old girl with disfiguring acne.
8. An 8-year-old boy with tonsillitis due to B-haemolytic streptococcus.
9. A 43-year-old dairyman with brucellosis.
10. A 4-year-old unimmunised sibling of a 2-year-old boy with whooping cough.

### **AMPICILLIN**

**Indications:** urinary-tract infections, otitis media, chronic bronchitis, invasive salmonellosis, gonorrhoea

**Cautions; Contra-indications; side-effect:** see under benzylpenicillin (section 5.1.1.1); also erythematous rashes in glandular fever and chronic lymphatic leukaemia; reduce dose in renal impairment. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (section 7)

**Dose:** by mouth. 0.25-1 g every 4 hours, at least 30 minutes before food  
gonorrhoea, 2 g as a single dose with pro-benecid 1 g; repeated for women Urinary-tract infections, 500 mg every 8 hours

*By intramuscular injection or intravenous injection or infusion, 500 mg every 4-6 hours; higher doses in meningitis. CHILD, any route, ½ adult dose.*

### **BENZYLPENICILLIN**

(Penicillin)

**Indications:** tonsillitis, otitis media, erysipelas, streptococcal endocarditis, meningococcal and pneumococcal meningitis, prophylaxis in limb amputation

**Cautions:** history of allergy; renal impairment

**Contra indication:** penicillin hypersensitivity

**Side-effects:** sensitive reaction including urticaria, fever, joint pains; angioedema; anaphylactic shock in hypersensitive patients; diarrhoea after administration by mouth

**Dose:** by intramuscular injection, 300-600mg 2-4 times daily; CHILD up to 12 years, 10-20 mg/kg daily; NEONATE, 30mg/kg daily

*By intravenous infusion, up to 24 g daily*

*By intravenous injection, 6-12 mg daily*

Prophylaxis in dental procedures and limb amputation, section 5.1, Table 2

### **CO-TRIMOXAZOLE**

A mixture of sulphamethoxazole 5 parts, trimethoprim 1 part

**Indications:** invasive salmonellosis, typhoid fever, bone and joint infections due to *H. influenzae*, urinary-tract infections, sinusitis, exacerbations of chronic bronchitis, gonorrhoea in penicillin-allergic patients

**Cautions:** blood counts in prolonged treatment, maintain adequate fluid intake, renal impairment, breast-feeding; photosensitivity. Elderly patients (see notes above). Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (sections 2.8B, 4.8, 6.1, 8, 15)

**Contra-indication:** pregnancy, infants under 6 weeks, renal or hepatic failure, jaundice, blood disorders

**Side-effects:** nausea, vomiting, rashes, erythema multiforme, epidermal necrolysis, eosinophilia, agranulocytosis, granulocytopenia, purpura, leucopenia; megaloblastic anaemia due to trimethoprim

**Dose:** by mouth, 960mg every 12 hours increased to 1,44 g in severe infections; 480mg every 12 hours, 6 weeks to 5 months 120 mg; 6 months to 5 years, 240mg; 6-12 years, 480mg

Gonorrhoea, 1,92 g every 12 hours for 2 days, or 2,4g followed by a further dose of 2.4g after 8 hours

*By intramuscular injection or intravenous infusion, 960 mg every 12 hours*

**Note:** 480mg of co-trimoxazole consists of sulphamethoxazole 400mg and trimethoprim 80mg

## ERYTHOMYCIN

**Indications:** alternative to penicillin in hypersensitive patients; sinusitis, diphtheria and whooping cough prophylaxis; legionnaires' disease; chronic prostatitis

**Cautions:** hepatic impairment. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (sections 2.8B, 3, 4.7, 4.8)

**Contra-indications:** estolate contra-indicated in liver disease

**Side-effects:** nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea after large disease doses

**Dose:** by mouth, 250-500 mg every 6 hours; CHILD, 125-250 mg every 6 hours  
Syphilis, 20 g in divided doses over 10 days

**By slow intravenous injection or infusion,** 2 g daily in divided doses, increased to 4 g in divided doses

## GENTAMICIN

**Indications:** Septicemia and neonatal sepsis; meningitis and other CNS infections; biliary tract infection, acute pyelonephritis or prostatitis, endocarditis caused by *strep. Viridans* or *faecalis* (with a penicillin)

**Cautions:** increase dose in renal impairment (see below). Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (sections 5.1, 5.1, 8, 15)

**Contra-indications:** pregnancy, myasthenia gravis

**Side-effects:** vestibular damage, reversible nephrotoxicity.

**Dose:** by intramuscular injection or slow intravenous injection or infusion, 2-3 mg/kg daily, in divided doses every 8 hours. In renal impairment the interval between successive doses should be increased to 12 hours when the creatinine clearance is 30-70 ml/minute, 24 hours for 10-30 ml/minute, 48 hours for 5-10 ml/minute, and 3-4 days after dialysis for less than 5 ml/minute

CHILD, up to 2 weeks, 3 mg/kg every 8 hours

**By intrathecal injection,** 1 mg daily, with 2-4mg/kg daily by intramuscular injection in divided doses every 8 hours

## PHENOXYMETHYLPENICILLIN

(Penicillin V)

**Indications:** tonsillitis, otitis media, erysipelas, rheumatic fever prophylaxis, endocarditis prophylaxis

**Cautions:** **Contra-indications;** **Side-effects:** see under Benzylpenicillin. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (section 5.1)

**Dose:** 250-500 mg every 6 hours, at least 30 minutes before food; 1-5 years 125 mg, 6-12 years 250 mg.

## TETRACYCLINE

**Indications:** exacerbations of chronic bronchitis; infections due to brucella, Chlamydia, mycoplasma, and rickettsia; severe acne vulgaris

**Cautions:** breast-feeding; rarely causes photosensitivity. Avoid intravenous administration in hepatic impairment. Drug interactions: see Appendix 1 (section 2.8C, 5.1, 7, 9)

**Contra-indications:** renal failure, pregnancy, children under 12 years of age

**Side-effects;** nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea; superinfection with resistant organisms; rarely allergic reactions

**Dose:** by mouth, 250-500 mg every 6 hours

**Acne see section 13.6**

Syphilis, 30-40g in divided doses over 10-15 day

Non-gonococcal urethritis, 500 mg 4 times daily for 10-21 days

**By intramuscular injection,** 100 mg every 8-12 hours, or every 4-6 hours in severe infections

**By intravenous infusion,** 500 mg every 12 hours; max. 2 g daily

## **Appendix E: Teacher Questionnaire**

### **TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE**

Introduction: This questionnaire is to know your personal background and teaching experiences for the purpose of a research project. There are two parts in this questionnaire and there are no right or wrong answers. I am simply interested in your opinions. Please answer the questions frankly as your frankness is essential to the research. Your cooperation is very well appreciated.

#### **Part 1: Background**

1. Name:
  
2. Age:
  
3. Sex:
  
4. First language:
  
5. Highest educational degree obtained and year:
  
6. Number of years in English language teaching:
  
7. English language courses taught:
  
8. Please describe your experience in English speaking countries:

## **Part 2: Beliefs about Effective Oral Language Teaching and Learning**

1. In your opinion, what activities are useful for oral skill development?
2. What activities do you use in your speaking classes?
3. In your opinion, what are the advantages of communicative activities, like role-play, pair work, small group work, class discussion, games, etc., for the student and the teacher?
4. In your opinion, what are the disadvantages of communicative activities, like role-play, pair work, small group work, class discussion, games, etc., for the student and the teacher?
5. In your opinion, what is your role in the classroom?
6. What teaching methods have you used in your speaking classes?
7. What materials have you used in your speaking classes?



## Appendix F: Student Pre-Questionnaire

### STUDENT PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to know your personal background and English learning experiences for the purpose of a research project. There are two parts in this questionnaire and there are no right or wrong answers. I am simply interested in your opinions. Please answer the questions frankly as your frankness is essential to the research. Your cooperation is very well appreciated.

#### Part 1: Background

1. Name:
2. Age:
3. Sex:
4. Religion:
5. First language:
6. How long have you been learning English?
7. Have you ever learned English outside school (private courses)? If yes, for how long?
8. Do you have any experience in going, studying, or living abroad ? If yes, for how long?
9. Do you have any experience encountering speakers of English? If yes, for how often?
10. Do you have any experience of interaction with peers while learning English? If yes, in which courses?

#### Part 2: Effective English Learning

1. In my opinion, the classroom activities that are useful to improve my English speaking skills are:

2. Types of activities in English courses that I have experienced:
  
3. In my opinion, the advantages of communicative activities (such as role-play, pair work, small group work, class discussion, etc) in the classroom are:
  
4. In my opinion, the disadvantages of communicative activities (such as role-play, pair work, small group work, class discussion, etc) in the classroom are:
  
5. In my opinion, my role in the classroom is (things that I ought to do):
  
6. My reason for taking the Oral Communication course in English is:
  
7. My motivation for taking the Oral Communication course in English is:
  
8. Things I expect from the teacher:
  
9. Things I expect from the other students :
  
10. Problems I experience in improving my English speaking skills:

## Appendix G: Student Post-Questionnaire

### STUDENT POST-QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to know your opinions after experiencing the four communicative tasks, two jigsaw tasks (sharing information to complete a form) and two decision making tasks (expressing ideas in making decisions). Please answer the questions frankly as your frankness is essential to the research. Your cooperation is very well appreciated.

- 1) Answer with 'yes' or 'no': After doing the jigsaw tasks (sharing information to complete a form), do you think that:
  - a) your vocabulary increased?
  - b) your speaking ability increased?
  - c) you became more confident in speaking English ?
  - d) you learned from your friends ?
  
- 2) Circle the one(s) applicable to you: Is there any change in perceptions regarding the jigsaw tasks?
  - a) from *did not like it* to *liked it*
  - b) from *liked it* to *did not like it*
  - c) from *boring* to *interesting*
  - d) from *interesting* to *boring*
  - e) no change
  
- 3) Circle the one(s) applicable to you: The difficulties you experienced while doing the jigsaw tasks:

a) in listening:	a lot	a few	none
b) in writing:	a lot	a few	none
c) in speaking:	a lot	a few	none
d) in vocabulary:	a lot	a few	none
  
- 4) Answer with 'yes' or 'no': After doing the decision making tasks (expressing ideas in making decisions), do you think that:
  - a) your vocabulary increased?
  - b) your speaking ability increased?
  - c) you became more confident in speaking English ?
  - d) you learned from your friends ?
  
- 5) Circle the one(s) applicable to you: Is there any change in perceptions regarding the decision making tasks?
  - a) from *did not like it* to *liked it*
  - b) from *liked it* to *did not like it*
  - c) from *boring* to *interesting*
  - d) from *interesting* to *boring*
  - e) no change
  
- 6) Circle the one(s) applicable to you: The difficulties you experienced while doing the decision making tasks:

a) in listening:	a lot	a few	none
b) in writing:	a lot	a few	none
c) in speaking:	a lot	a few	none
d) in vocabulary:	a lot	a few	none
  
- 7) What was the major difference between these two types of tasks?
  
- 8) Which type do you prefer? Why?



## Appendix I: Students' Reflective Comments

**Name:**

### ***Post Task:***

Write your comments on the following issues by giving concrete or real examples (you can write in Bahasa Indonesia).

- Specific things I learned through doing the task today:  
(Hal khusus yang saya pelajari dalam melakukan *task* hari ini)

New vocabulary:

Others:

- Things that I learned from my peers:  
(Hal yang saya pelajari dari teman saya)
- I like the activities because:  
(Saya suka kegiatan tadi karena)
- I dislike the activities because:  
(Saya tidak suka kegiatan tadi karena)
- Problems I faced in completing the task:  
(Masalah yang saya alami dalam menyelesaikan *task*)
- The advantages of the task were:  
(Keuntungan/manfaat yang saya rasakan dari *task* tersebut adalah)
- The disadvantages of the task were:  
(Kerugian yang saya rasakan dari *task* tersebut adalah)



## Appendix K: Taxonomy of discourse moves with acronyms and descriptions

Discourse Move	Acronym <sup>1</sup>	Description
<i>1. Topic Initiation:</i>		
Topic Initiation Questions	TIQ	Topic initiation questions occur when a student asks a question about a new topic or a previous question to a new interlocutor.
Topic Initiation Statements	TIS	Topic initiation statements occur when a student initiates a topic by making a statement.
Topic Initiation Questions with Partial Reading	TIQ PR	Topic initiation questions with partial reading occur when a student asks a question about a new topic by partially reading from a text.
Topic Initiation Statements by Reading	TIS R	Topic initiation statements occur when a student initiates a topic by reading a statement from a written text.
<i>2. Responses:</i>		
Direct Answers	A	Direct answers occur when a student directly answers the question that was asked.
Extended Answers	ExtA	Extended answers occur when a student gives an answer/response though not being directly asked or continues completing/giving more information/explanation.
Comments	Com	Comments occur when a student gives a response related to the situation but not the content.
Answers by Reading	AR	Answers by reading occur when a student answers a question by reading from a text.
Extended Reading	ExtR	Extended reading occurs when a student continues completing an answer or giving more information/explanation by reading.
Answers with Partial Reading	A PR	Answers with partial reading occur when a student answers a question by partially reading from a text.
Extended Answers with Partial Reading	ExtA PR	Extended answers with partial reading occur when a student gives an answer/response though not being directly asked or continues completing /giving more information/explanation by partially reading from a text.
<i>3. Comprehension Facilitation</i>		
Clarification Requests	CRq	Clarification requests occur when one student asks the other to clarify a previous utterance.

<sup>1</sup>The shaded acronyms indicate that the moves were done spontaneously and the non-shaded acronyms indicate that the moves were reading-based.

Confirmations	Conf	Confirmation occurs when a student verbally shows that s/he has understood a previous utterance, usually by repeating it.
Confirmation Checks	ConfC	Confirmation checks occur when a student wants to make sure that what s/he has understood is what the other means.
Comprehension Assistance	Comp	Comprehension assistance occurs when a student verbally shows that s/he wants to make sure that the other has understood what s/he means.
Comprehension Checks	CompC	Comprehension checks occur when a student wants to make sure that the other has understood what s/he means.
Decomposition	Decom	Decomposition occurs when a student breaks down a long utterance into more manageable parts.
Left Dislocation	LDis	Left dislocation occurs when a student emphasizes the topic of an utterance by putting it first.
Confirmations by Reading	ConfR	Confirmation by reading occurs when a student reads from a text to show that s/he has understood it.
Comprehensions by Reading	CompR	Comprehension by reading occurs when a student verbally shows that s/he wants to make sure that the other has understood what s/he means, by rereading from a text.
<i>4. Corrections</i>		
Self Corrections	SCor	Self corrections occur when a student spontaneously corrects her/his own utterance.
Peer Corrections	PCor	Peer corrections occur when a student spontaneously corrects the other's utterance.
Self Corrections while Reading	SCorR	Self corrections occur when a student corrects her/his own utterance by reading from a text.
Peer Corrections while Reading	PCorR	Peer corrections occur when a student corrects the other's utterance by reading from a text.
<i>5. Completions</i>		
Peer Completions	Cmpl	Peer completions occur when a student spontaneously completes the other's utterance.
<i>6. Extended Questions</i>		
Extended Wh-Questions	ExtWhQ	Extended wh-questions occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of wh-questions.
Extended Yes/No Questions	ExtY/NQ	Extended yes/no questions occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of yes/no questions.

Extended Or-Questions	ExtOrQ	Extended or-questions occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of or-questions.
Extended Imperatives/Requests	ExtIm/Rq	Extended imperatives/requests occur when a student wants to ask for further information regarding a topic in the form of imperatives/requests.
<i>7. Uptake</i>		
Uptake from Peer	Uptake-P	Uptakes from peers occur when a student subsequently repeats her/his peer's utterance in order to correct her/his own.
Uptake from Teacher	Uptake-T	Uptakes from teacher occur when a student subsequently repeats the teacher's utterance in order to correct her/his own.

## Appendix L: An Example of Coded Transcript of Jigsaw Task

### Communicative Task 3 Group 2

M1: Leader, leader.

M3: Student A is

F2: Good morning, this is group two, my name is F2. This is Student A.

M3: Student B, M3.

M1: Student C, M1.

F4: Student D, F4.

(whispering-inaudible)

M3: Patient one.

Comment: TIS

F2: **The patient is twenty-six years old, twenty-six year old woman complaining of swelling of the ankle.**

Comment: AR, (SRep) CompR

(pause)

M3: Findings on examination.

Comment: TIS

F4: Pardon me.

Comment: CRq

F2: Finding

Comment: (ORep) Cmpl

M3: **Pregnancy test is negative.**

Comment: AR

F2: Ha?

Comment: CRq

M3: **Pregnancy test is negative.**

Comment: AR (SRep)

F2: Pregnancy? Finding on

Comment: CRq (ORep)

M3: **Pregnancy test is negative.**

Comment: AR (SRep)

F2: Pregnancy

Comment: (ORep)CRq

F4: Pregnancy test is negative.

Comment: (ORep) Cmpl

F2: negative

Comment: (ORep) Conf

F4: negative

Comment: (SRep) Conf

M3: **Chest x-ray is normal. (pause) The liver is not in, enlarged.**

Comment: ExtR

F4: What? The liver

Comment: CRq

M1: The liver is not enlarged

Comment: (ORep) Cmpl

F2: Is not enlarged

Comment: (ORep) Conf

M3: **The liver is not enlarged**

Comment: ConfR (SRep)

F2: The results of investigation

Comment: TIS

M1: **Five day fecal fat collection is fifteen millimol per liter.**

Comment: AR

F2: per liter

Comment: (ORep) Conf

(pause)

M1: **Jejunal biopsy is normal. (pause) Lab stick urinary protein test show protein plus plus.**

Comment: ExtR

F4: What?

Comment: CRq

M3: double plus

Comment: (ORep) Cmpl

(pause)

M1: **Serum total protein is forty gram per liter.**

Comment: ExtR

F2: The diagnose?

Comment: TIQ

F4: **The, the patient must have nephrotic syndrome.**

Comment: AR

F2: Nephrotic	Comment: CRq
F4: syndrome.	Comment: AR (SRep)
(pause)	
F2: Patient two.	Comment: TIS
(pause)	
F4: <b>The, the patient is five year, five, five year old girl with a pete, petechial rash, petechial rash</b>	Comment: AR, (SRep) CompR
M3: petechial rash. (pause) Findings on examination	Comment: (ORep) Conf, TIS
F2: Findings, findings on examination, <b>both ankles, the left elbow, both ankles, the left elbow, and the right, and the right wrist are</b>	Comment: (ORep) Conf, AR, (SRep) CompR
F4: and the right	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F2: <b>wrist are, wrist are swollen, and painful</b>	Comment: AR (SRep), ExtR
M1: are	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F2: <b>are swollen and painful. The history shows</b>	Comment: AR (SRep), ExtR
F4: painful?	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F2: <b>the history show no injection, no /inyestion/</b>	Comment: AR (SRep), ExtR, (SRep) CompR
F4: no	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F2: <b>/inyestion/, /inyestion/, /inyestion/</b>	Comment: AR, (SRep) CompR
F4: /inyestion/	Comment: (ORep) Conf
T: ingestion, ingestion	Comment: Uptake-T (Pro), ExtR, (SRep) CompR
F2: <b>ingestion of drugs. Bone marrow is normal. Bone marrow is normal.</b>	Comment: TIS, AR, (SRep) CompR
M3: Results of investigation, the rash, the rash is on the buttocks, buttocks, <b>b-u-t-t-o-c-</b>	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F4: -o-	Comment: AR
M3: <b>-k-s, -o-c-k-s-</b>	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F4: -o-c-	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F2: -o-c-k-s-	Comment: (ORep) Cmpl
M3: <b>and extensor</b>	Comment: ExtR
F2: and?	Comment: (ORep) CRq
M3: <b>extensor /surfais/ of the arms</b>	Comment: AR (SRep), ExtR
F2: of the?	Comment: (ORep) CRq
M3: <b>arms and legs.</b>	Comment: AR (SRep), ExtR
F4: and legs?	Comment: (ORep) ConfC
M3: <b>legs.</b>	Comment: (SRep) ConfR
F4: legs.	Comment: (ORep) Conf
M3: Diagnosis?	Comment: (ORep) Conf
M1: <b>The patient must have Henoch-Scholein syndrome.</b>	Comment: TIQ
F4: Henoch-Scholein?	Comment: AR
F2: Henoch	Comment: (ORep) CRq
F4: Henoch	Comment: (ORep) Conf
M1: <b>Henoch-Scholein syndrome.</b>	Comment: (ORep) Conf
M3: Patient three?	Comment: AR (SRep) ConfR
M1: Patient three. <b>Twenty-eight years old</b>	Comment: TIQ
F2: Thrity?	Comment: (ORep) Conf, AR
	Comment: ConfC

M1: **Twenty-eight**  
 F2: oh  
 F2: twenty-eight  
 F4: twenty-eight  
 M1: **man with headaches, sore throat**  
 F2: headaches  
 M1: **sore throat, and enlarged glands in the neck.**  
 F4: enlarged  
 M3: enlarged  
 M1: **glands in the neck.**  
 F4: glands in the neck.  
 M3: Findings on examination?  
 F4: Findings on examination, **the spleen is pal, palpable, palpable.**  
 M1: The /splen/ is palpable  
 M3: /splen/ is  
 F4: /splen/ is, /splen/ is palpable  
 M1: palpable  
 F4: **and there is a macropapular, macropapular rash**  
 M1: papular  
 F4: **papular, macropapular rash all over. r-a-s-h-**  
 M3: rash  
 F4: **rash all over**  
 M3: Result of the investigation?  
 F2: Result of the investigation, /wi/ **BC, WBC /sows/ lymphocytes positive, double positive.**  
 M1: *apa? (what?)*  
 F2: /wi/ **BC, W**  
 M1: slowly please  
 F2: **W, WBC /sows/ lymphocytes positive**  
 F4: show?  
 M1: shows  
 F2: /sows/, /sows/, **shows lymphocytes positive, monospot is positive.**  
 F4: mono  
 F2: **Monospot is positive.**  
 T: Monospot, that's right.  
 M3: The diagnosis, **the patient must have**  
 F2: what?  
 M3: **The patient**  
 T: Say again please, or pardon, don't say what? Ha ah.  
 M3: **The patient must have**  
 T: Hm hm?

- Comment:** ConfR (SRep)
- Comment:** Conf
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf
- Comment:** ExtR
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq
- Comment:** AR (SRep), ExtR
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq
- Comment:** AR (SRep)
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf
- Comment:** TIQ
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf, AR, (SRep) CompR
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq
- Comment:** AR (SRep), (SRep) CompR
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf
- Comment:** ExtR, (SRep) CompR
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq
- Comment:** AR (SRep), ExtR
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf
- Comment:** ConfR (SRep)
- Comment:** TIQ
- Comment:** (ORep) Conf, AR, SCorR
- Comment:** LI
- Comment:** AR (SRep), SCorR
- Comment:** ExtQ-Imp
- Comment:** AR (SRep)
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq, PCor (Pro)
- Comment:** (ORep), CRq, PCor (Gr)
- Comment:** AR (SRep), Uptake-P (Pro), ExtR
- Comment:** (ORep) CRq
- Comment:** AR (SRep)
- Comment:** TIS, AR
- Comment:** CRq
- Comment:** AR (SRep)
- Comment:** AR (SRep)

M3: <b>mononucleosis, glandular</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ExtR
F2: gland	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) CRq
M3: <b>glandular</b>	<b>Comment:</b> AR (SRep)
F2: glandular	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf
T: glandular	
M3: <b>glandular fever.</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ExtR
T: fever.	
(pause)	
F2: The patient four.	<b>Comment:</b> TIS
M3: Patient four. <b>He's a forty</b>	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf, AR
F2: forty	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf
F4: fourteen	<b>Comment:</b> PCor
F2: fourteen or forty?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtOrQ
M3: <b>forty</b>	<b>Comment:</b> AR (SRep)
F2: forty	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf
M3: <b>woman, complaining of /nausi/ and episodes</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ExtR
F2: and?	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) CRq
F4: epi	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Cmpl
M1: /episodes/	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Cmpl
M3: <b>/episodes/ e-p-i-s-o-d-e-s of pain</b>	<b>Comment:</b> AR (SRep), ExpR
F4: of?	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) CRq
F2: pain	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Cmpl
M1: pain	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf
M3: <b>pain in the right</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ConfR (SRep), ExtR
F4: in the? Pardon?	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) CRq
M3: <b>hypochondrium</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ExtR
F4: in the right?	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) CRq
M3: <b>in the right hypochondrium.</b>	<b>Comment:</b> AR (SRep)
M1: Findings on examination, <b>the pain is associate with</b>	<b>Comment:</b> TIS, AR
F2: Pardon?	<b>Comment:</b> CRq
M1: <b>The pain is associate with</b>	<b>Comment:</b> AR (SRep)
F4: with?	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) ConfC
M1: <b>with dietary indiscretion, indiscretion.</b>	<b>Comment:</b> (SRep) ConfR, ExtR, (SRep) CompR
F4: de-tary? e-?	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) CRq
(pause)	
F2: dietary	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Cmpl
M1: <b>indiscretion</b>	<b>Comment:</b> AR (SRep)
F2: indiscretion	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf
M1: <b>indiscretion</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ConfR (SRep)
F4: indiscretion	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf
M1: <b>Murphy's sign is positive. (pause) There is mild jaundice.</b>	<b>Comment:</b> ExtR
M3: Results of the investigation	<b>Comment:</b> TIS
F4: Results of the investigation, <b>lab tests show, lab tests show alkaline phosphatase</b>	<b>Comment:</b> (ORep) Conf, AR, (SRep), CompR
(pause) <b>one hundred and sixty units, one hundred and sixty units</b>	<b>Comment:</b> L1 (ConfC)
M1: <i>per liter ini? (is this per liter?)</i>	

F4: per liter. Cholestrol, choles, cholecystography shows a non-functioning gall bladder, gall bladder.  
M1: Choles apa? (what)?  
F4: Cholecystography shows a non-functioning, functioning gall bladder.  
M1: The diagnose  
F2: The diagnose, the patient must have choleli, cholelitiasis,  
F4: must have?  
F2: must have cholelithiasis. C-h-o-  
F4: -l-e-l-i-  
F2: apa so nintau (I don't know the rest).  
(pause)  
M3: Patient five?  
F2: The patient five, the patient five is a forty-nine year old  
F4: forty-nine  
F2: forty-nine year old man, the complain exhibiting Raynaud, exhibiting Raynaud phenomenon and with difficulty in swallowing.  
M1: Findings on examination  
M3: The patient /exhaibits/  
F2: yes?  
M3: /exhaibit/ cutaneous calcinosis and has difficulty in breathing.  
F4: difficult  
M1: difficulty  
M3: difficulty in breathing  
M1: in?  
M3: breathing  
F2: breathing?  
M3: Results of the investigation?  
M1: The patient's face is /pincet/  
F2: is? is? pin?  
M1: /pincet/  
F4: The diagnose  
M3: The diagnosis  
F4: The patient must have scleroderma.  
(pause)  
(whispering)  
M3: Patient three, result of the investigation, not monophosphate but monospot is positive  
F4: monospot?  
M3: monospot is positive  
F4: mono?  
F2: monospot  
M3: Monospot, m-o-n-o-s-p-o-t  
M1: yes.  
(pause)  
(tape turned off)  
(pause)

- Comment: ConfR(SRep), ExtR, CompR (SRep)
- Comment: LI
- Comment: AR (SRep)
- Comment: TIS
- Comment: (ORep) Conf, AR
- Comment: (ORep) CRq
- Comment: AR (SRep), ExtR (Sp)
- Comment: Cmpl (Sp)
- Comment: LI
- Comment: TIQ
- Comment: (ORep) Conf, AR
- Comment: (ORep) Conf
- Comment: ConfR (SRep), ExtR, (SRep) CompR
- Comment: TIS
- Comment: AR
- Comment: CRq
- Comment: AR
- Comment: (ORep) CRq
- Comment: PCor
- Comment: AR (SRep)
- Comment: (ORep) CRq
- Comment: AR (SRep)
- Comment: (ORep) ConfC
- Comment: TIQ
- Comment: AR
- Comment: (ORep) CRq
- Comment: AR (SRep)
- Comment: TIS
- Comment: PCor
- Comment: AR
- Comment: TIS, AR
- Comment: (ORep) CRq
- Comment: AR (SRep)
- Comment: (ORep) CRq
- Comment: (ORep) Cmpl
- Comment: ConfR (SRep), ExtR (Sp)
- Comment: Conf

F2: *Ini dang (How about this?)*

Comment: L1

M1: *Aduh so butul kwa ta da tulis (inaudible). Papular bukang popular (See, it was correct that I wrote. Papular not popular.)*

Comment: L1

F2: *Monospot ini apa depe arti (What's the meaning of monospot?)*

Comment: L1

M1: *papular ini bukang popular (it's papular not popular)*

Comment: L1

F2: What monospot, what's the meaning monospot?

Comment: TIQ, SCor (SRep)

M1: I don't know. Maybe ask doctor M7. Maybe.

Comment: A

F2: Doctor M7, what's the meaning monospot, monospot?

Comment: TIQ (SRep)

M1: *macropapular ini (inaudible) So bilang ini kwa nda percaya (it's macropapular. I told you but you don't believe me.)*

Comment: L1

(pause)

(whispering in L1 – inaudible)

M1: *Ini sapa punya ini? Ini sapa punya kote ini? (Whose is this? Whose is this one?)*

Comment: L1

(pause)

M1: (inaudible) *Ini lagi (This one again.)*

Comment: L1

(M1 and F2 whispering in L1 – inaudible)

M1: Finished.

T: Finished?

M1: Yes.

(pause)

(T checking answers with the whole class)

## Appendix M: An Example of Coded Transcript of Decision Making Task

### Communicative Task 4 Group 1

M5: Good morning, this is Group One. I'm just reading the text. Ok, my name's M5

F1: I am F1

M2: I'm M2

F6: I'm F6

M5: Ok, we are, belong to Group One and discuss about units, **unit nine "Who gets the heart?"**, the heart sorry. And tens minutes ago we asked to read about seven patients who give, who receive the heart, and now we'll, we'll discuss about who's patient, about the length of who's patient we just give the heart. And now, let's began discuss. What about the first class, the first rank? What about you?

F1: I think the first to get the heart is number two, number two, Sohan Kim, Sohan Kim, Soohan Kim

M5: Soohan Kim

F1: Soohan

M5: (coughing) What is your reason?

F1: Um in, in the history I think because he he

F6: he's younger

M5: Because he's younger?

F1: Hm and his his condition, his condition um, um

M5: *Cepat, cepat jo (Come on, hurry up).*

F6: His condition is very dramatically, so she very much need to give heart transplant.

M5: What about the doctor say that **wanted to wait until he has a /teen-eiger/ to replace his heart**, what about this? Doctor /advison/. **Doctors wanted to wait until he has a /teen-eiger/ to replace his heart.** What about this?

F1: Because, because, um but in, but the condition is so worse so he need, he need the heart soon, get soon. So, I think he must get the first.

M5: What about the patient six, Martha Rosales? We can give the heart the first with Martha Rosales. Because in the patient two Soohan Kim, ok, he's younger, but doctors advised he has to wait until he's a /teen-eiger/. My reason in Martha Rosales because **her problem originate from a bout she had with scarlet fever and she raised money for her operation**, she good woman, she's a good woman.

F1: I think, I think maybe, maybe, she can get the first, but maybe can the second, second chance.

M5: Who's the second?

F1: Martha Rosales.

M5: Are you agree?

F6: Yes, because she, she has family.

M5: Oh family

F6: No, I think

M5: If you read

F6: the second

M5: the Martha Rosales, she never married but she has four children

F1: Because he he work, he work in (inaudible)

**Comment:** TIS, TIQ (SRep, Comp)

**Comment:** A (SRep, Comp)

**Comment:** Conf (ORep)

**Comment:** Conf (SRep)

**Comment:** ExtWhQ

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** Cmpl

**Comment:** ConfC (ORep)

**Comment:** Conf, ExtA

**Comment:** L1

**Comment:** Cmpl

**Comment:** TIQ PR (SRep, Comp)

**Comment:** A (ORep), Comp (SRep)

**Comment:** TIQ, A, ExtA PR, SCor (SRep)

**Comment:** ExtA (SRep)

**Comment:** CRq

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** TIQ

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** Conf (ORep)

**Comment:** ExtA

**Comment:** ExtA

**Comment:** ExtA

**Comment:** ExtA

**Comment:** ExtA (SRep)

(laughing)

M5: I don't think so, ok, what about you?

Comment: ExtA, TIQ

M2: I don't agree because she's /unemploy/. How could he pay the, her heart, heart transplant operation?

Comment: A

M5: We are the doctors, we doctors maybe we can give her our money because we we are the doctors in Washington, university hospital in Washington D.C.

Comment: ExtA (SRep)

F6: I think Martha can get the first and Soohan Kim the second because Soohan Kim need the, um I mean she like doctor want until he has teenager. So, so between time maybe Martha first until that Soohan.

Comment: ExtA

M5: Ok. Are you /stu/ agree? The, she said Martha the first and

Comment: Conf (ORep), TIQ

F1: So, the first is Martha?

Comment: ConfC (ORep)

M5: Yes, the first is Martha and second is Soohan Kim. Because the doctor advise

Comment: Conf (ORep)

F1: I think, I think

Comment: A

M5: until he

Comment: ExtA

F1: because the condition is not good. He he must get the heart soon.

Comment: ExtA

M5: But if we, if we give the heart now in the twelve

Comment: ExtA

F1: he can die, he can die if we not give the heart as soon he can die, if he, if he

Comment: ExtA (SRep)

M5: Ok, if we give the first to Soohan Kim in the younger this maybe Soohan Kim bodies is not receive the heart because in the younger. What about if we wait until she maybe twenty years or twenty one?

Comment: ExtA

F1: Um look at this **but his con doctor want to wait until he has a teenager but his condition has /worse/ dramatically**

Comment: ExtAR

M5: Ok we can give medicine, medicine

Comment: ExtA

F1: I think not, medicine can, can't make the heart is function again.

Comment: ExtA

M5: Some in our pharmacology /amplikoseeda/ jantung (heart). Maybe, maybe can heart Soohan Kim or any any ideas, any ideas?

Comment: ExtA, LI, TIQ (SRep)

F6: Maybe, yes right Soohan first because Martha problem is just about money, but Soohan

Comment: A (ORep)

F1: No, (inaudible) is good

Comment: ExtA

F6: yeah

Comment: Conf

F1: Soohan Kim

Comment: Conf (SRep)

F6: but Soohan problem is more difficult, so Soohan first. Maybe.

Comment: ExtA

M5: What about you?

Comment: TIQ

(pause)

M5: Ok, if, if we give the first to Soohan Kim, and give and if the Soohan Kim bodies cannot receive in the young what (inaudible) we are doing

Comment: ExtA (SRep)

F1: Before we are doing the transplantation *kan (right)* we get, we get the examination, so we don't, we can know if he body cannot, not receive.

Comment: ExtA

M5: *Trus (But)* he's younger

Comment: ExtA

F1: Because he, he younger, his body is strong.

Comment: ExtA

M5: What about you?

Comment: TIQ

F6: Maybe can get another way, just not about his child but but maybe we another check up, the doctor can make way to give the heart transplant.

Comment: A

M5: (sighing) Ok, you?

Comment: TIQ

M2: I think Soohan Kim, too. Because his condition has /worse/. But in patient six, she, she can wait, because she's condition not worse. If, if we wait til Soohan Kim age sixty eh twenty-six or older, maybe she eh he or maybe die.

M5: What about the other, another patient? Peter Jacobsen.

F6: Peter Jacobsen?

(pause)

M2: He has already had one heart transplant

M5: Peter Jacobsen has been kept alive

F1: Yes, but he, he ever get heart transplant operation

M5: It's three weeks ago

F1: Yes, if, if we get the transplantation, maybe her, his body reject heart again.

T: So it will be in vain then, ya?

F1: Um um, ya.

T: so give the priority to somebody else?

F1: Um um.

M5: The other end you're ok that Peter Jacobsen got it?

F1: The first is Soohan Kim.

M5: and Peter?

F1: Peter?

M5: In this case

T: Put in number

M5: In this case the hot one or?

T: Just only one.

M5: Only one.

T: So you try to arrange

M2: just only one

F1: Number one is Soohan Kim. Number two?

M5: Peter Jacobsen is this, I think

(inaudible)

M2: Galia Feinstein.

F1: Galia Feinstein.

M5: Galia Feinstein?

F1: Yes. Galia Feinstein. Galia Feinstein.

M5: What's your reason? What's your reason to Galia Feinstein?

M2: Because she's have a good condition.

M5: What?

M2: Because she's have a good condition and the maybe the heart /transplosion/ going well.

(laughing)

(pause)

M5: Maybe Alicia Fagan, the second?

M2: Alicia Fagan? She's have failing kidney

F1: fail

M2: fail kidney

F1: her heart fail

M2: and kidney

Comment: A

Comment: TIQ

Comment: ConfC (ORep)

Comment: A

Comment: ExtA

Comment: ExtA

Comment: ExtA

Comment: ExtA, SCor

Comment: Conf

Comment: Conf

Comment: TIQ

Comment: A

Comment: TIQ

Comment: ConfC (ORep)

Comment: A

Comment: ExtQ Or

Comment: Conf (ORep)

Comment: Conf (SRep)

Comment: Conf (SRep), TIQ

Comment: A

Comment: A

Comment: A (ORep)

Comment: ConfC (ORep)

Comment: Conf (SRep)

Comment: ExtWhQ (SRep)

Comment: A

Comment: CRq

Comment: A (SRep)

Comment: TIQ

Comment: ConfC (ORep), A

Comment: Conf (ORep)

Comment: Conf (SRep)

Comment: ExtA

Comment: Cmpl (SRep)

F1: and kidney fail, so the, the chance to live is fifty-fifty. Maybe	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl (ORep), ExtA
M5: Maybe he's the first, she's the first	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl, SCor (SRep)
F1: We, we get the heart, so the, to make the patient is be life span is long, be long.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: What about in Soohan Kim? If we give heart, (inaudible) Soohan Kim life	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: Because he, the condition is, is worse, so we must give the, the heart to, to strength ch (whispering)	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M2: What's?	<b>Comment:</b> CRq
F1: to defense, to defense	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA (SRep, Comp)
M5: defense?	<b>Comment:</b> ConfC (ORep)
F1: to defense.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (SRep)
M5: Ok, now our group, group's is Soohan Kim first and then, yes? (pause) fifty (T talking to the whole class)	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep)
M5: Ok? Because Soohan Kim, the reason is?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtQ
F1: His condition	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: About his condition, ok? And the second is Alicia? Or Peter Jacobsen? Or Leonid Gromykovitch? What's your, possibly, Peter or Leonid? Maybe Alicia?	<b>Comment:</b> CompC (ORep), ConfC (ORep), ExtOrQ (SRep)
F1: Hm	<b>Comment:</b> Comment
M5: I think second is Leonid. Are you agree with me? The second?	<b>Comment:</b> A, TIQ (SRep)
F1: Yes, I think Leonid. Leonid Gromykovitch.	<b>Comment:</b> A (ORep)
M5: What about, what's your reason?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
F1: Um because um um he	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Ok, Leonid Gromykovitch	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (SRep)
F1: um he life with a heart and lung machine.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: What?	<b>Comment:</b> CR
F1: he live with a, with heart and lung machine	<b>Comment:</b> A (SRep), SCor
M5: Oh yes	<b>Comment:</b> Conf
F1: and he, he has three /child/ three children, no, no wife, no wife	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: If no wife	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: wife die, die. So he	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: (inaudible)	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: (inaudible) to, to, to draw her, his children	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: and you?	<b>Comment:</b> TIQ
F6: Yeah, like, like F1.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: How about Peter, not? Never married? How about Alicia? He's smart, he's smart, this is a promising Ph.D. What about Alicia the second? If we give the heart to Alicia Fagan, the Alicia Fagan will	<b>Comment:</b> TIQ, TIQ (SRep), ExtA
F1: It's, it's, it's fifty-fifty	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: What about fifty-fifty, the failing heart and kidney?	<b>Comment:</b> ConfC (ORep)
F1: It's <i>meragukan (doubtful)</i> , it's <i>meragukan (doubtful)</i> . <i>Mending kita memberikan, memberikan sesuatu, memberikan hati itu to untuk yang, yang ada kemungkinan untuk hidup dang (It's better if we give, give something, give the liver, right, to the one who has a chance to live, like that).</i>	<b>Comment:</b> L1
M5: to him maybe keep alive	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: He, he heart and kidney is fail, if we, if we, if we, if we give, give the heart, the, the kidney, we don't know.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA (SRep)
M5: What about his information a Ph.D.? Smart?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ

F1: Ph.D. to what, to the live? No.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: If we give to Leonid, she's only a US government, at Central Intelligence Agency.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F6: Maybe Alicia must, I think make um her condition is better about failing and kidney after that he can get a heart transplant	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: after	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep)
F6: but her failing kidney must be heart first after that transplant heart. Maybe she, she	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: Ok? Ok the second Leonid Gromykovitch. Are you agree?	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep), TIQ
M2: Yes.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Give reason.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtRqQ
M2: Yes, Leonid Gromykovitch. Because he, his wife already died and he has three children who's still younger.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep), A
M5: Yes, I agree. If another group ask to us, you can	<b>Comment:</b> A
F1: explain	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl
M5: explain why we	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep), ExpA
F1: why we give	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl
M5: choose, why we choose Leonid Gromykovitch the second, ok? And you the first, you the first to Soohan Kim, yes? Ok. And the third?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA, CompC, Comp (SRep), Conf, TIQ
F1: The third, M2, what do you think?	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep), TIQ
M5: Yes, what do you think?	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep)
M2: I think Galia Feinstein.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: The reason, please.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtRqQ
M2: Because his condition	<b>Comment:</b> A
(pause)	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl
F6: probably	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl (ORep)
F1: probably, probably	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA (SRep), SCor
M2: Because her condition probably for heart /transplesion/, /transplesion/	<b>Comment:</b> PCor
M5: transplantation	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA, SCor
M2: heart transplant um (laughing)	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: Come on (inaudible)	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M2: Um I think she has just to life longer.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf, TIQ
M5: Ok, what's you	<b>Comment:</b> A
F6: Hm I think the third Martha	<b>Comment:</b> ConfC (ORep)
M5: Martha?	<b>Comment:</b> Conf
F6: Yes.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep), ExtRqQ
M5: Oh Martha. The reason, please.	<b>Comment:</b> A
F6: Because um (pause) because he's have a many change to live to success the operation.	<b>Comment:</b> A PR, ExtA, TIQ
M5: I think the third is Galia Feinstein, because her failing kidney have not been affected and he's holds a Master's degree from Harvard is smart, smart and if we choose Martha Rosales I think is maybe because yes, let's Martha gone, never married and again she's a poor woman and what about, F1?	<b>Comment:</b> A
F1: Yes, I'm same with you, I'm agree.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
M5: what's your reason?	<b>Comment:</b> A (SRep)
F1: The, the reason like, like you, the same, same	<b>Comment:</b> ExtQ
M5: Can you talk about it?	<b>Comment:</b> A
F1: Why, why I must talk again, you talk the same, yes, just to	

M2: Waste the time, waste the time	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl (SRep)
F1: waste the time	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep)
M5: Ok. Are you agree the third patient is	<b>Comment:</b> Conf, TIQ
F6: yes	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Galia Feinstein? Ok. What the fourth? You (inaudible) the first.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf, TIQ
(pause)	
(whispering: <i>Ini sudah? (have we chose this?)</i> )	
M5: English, please.	<b>Comment:</b> Comment
(pause)	
(whispering in L1 – inaudible)	
M5: Are you fine? Are you sick?	<b>Comment:</b> TIQ
F1: No, I think Peter Jacobson, eh Jacobsen.	<b>Comment:</b> A, SCor
M5: Peter Jacobsen? Patient four? Your reason?	<b>Comment:</b> ConfC (ORep), ExtRqQ
F1: Because, oh sorry, sorry, sorry, wrong, wrong. I think Alicia Fagan.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Why?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
F1: Because um	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: You say Alicia Fagan is fifty-fifty to life.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: Yes, but	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: Some, Alicia Fagan reason I think is the same with Peter Jacobsen, because Peter Jacobsen condition is refuse the heart	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: So, Amegneza Eдорh, Eдорh.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: I think if we choose	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
F1: Martha	<b>Comment:</b> Cmpl
M5: Martha Rosales. Are you agree? Yes?	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep), TIQ (SRep)
F6: Yes.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Are you agree?	<b>Comment:</b> TIQ (SRep)
M2: Yes.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Not only yes, yes. What's your reason?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
F1: Yes, yes.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf
M5: What's your reason?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ (SRep)
F1: Yes, yes. Maybe if he, maybe, maybe	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: Maybe, maybe, ok.	<b>Comment:</b> Conf (ORep)
F1: I think fourth, fourth. His condition is good and he must got four children. So the, the refuse to the transplantation organ is maybe negative.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: What about in her status, he's a poor woman.	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
F1: Status is, status, status is not <i>mempengaruhi (influential)</i> .	<b>Comment:</b> A (SRep), L1
M5: How, how she can pay	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
F1: Ha?	<b>Comment:</b> CRq
M5: she can pay his, she's operation because she's a poor woman	<b>Comment:</b> ExtWhQ
F1: pay, government, government will, maybe will, can, can help to pay the operation.	<b>Comment:</b> A (SRep), SCor
M2: and medicine	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA
M5: If the patient, eh if the government agree. If the government not agree? Ok, and you? The reason same with F1?	<b>Comment:</b> ExtA, SCor, TIQ (SRep)
M2: Yes.	<b>Comment:</b> A
M5: And you?	<b>Comment:</b> TIQ

F6: Yes, but maybe if the government is not agree to give her helper about the money, maybe the doctor or, or the hospital can help Martha.

M5: Ok. You are the doctor in the hospital. Are you can give your money?

F1: If I have a lot, a lot of money, I'll, I'll, I help, I will help.

M5: But your condition now you are a doctor in the hospital. Are you will give your money?

F1: In my dream.

M5: In your dream (giggles)

F1: I think I'll, I'll, I'll be a doctor, I, I can, I will help.

M5: Yes, I choose Martha Rosales, ok. Not you, not you. Ok, the fifth? Amegneza Eдорh, ok? Amegneza, Amegneza Eдорh, ok? Are you agree? Sorry. Just to add

F6: What's the meaning deteriorating?

M5: worsening, worsening, become worse

F6: Can you talk in Indonesian?

M5: become worse, *semakin buruk (become worse)*.  
(pause)

M5: I think Amegneza Eдорh is the first better than Alicia or Peter. Alicia Fagan actually her is fifty-fifty, you said it.

F1: yes, but she's in the fifth ranking

M2: The fifth rank.

M5: How about Amegneza Eдорh, he's a female, he's marriage, he's um received Nobel

F1: Amegneza Eдорh, the *apa (what)*?

M2: **has been /konfin/ to bed**

F6: yeah

F1: **been /konfin/ to bed for the past five /ye/ months, /deterioting/**

M2: dete-, deteriorating

F1: deteriorating

M2: health

F1: health

M5: So?

F1: Condition is

M2: Maybe in

F1: If we, if we

M2: in heart transplantation, maybe she's could die

F1: in the table of operation

M5: Ok, I agree. But if our, other group ask to group one, you can try to explain, ok? why you choose Alicia Fagan.

F6: Why not?

M2: (inaudible) You  
(whispering - inaudible)

M5: And I am Martha Rosales. Amegneza Eдорh. Alicia Fagan number five, four, five, five.

M2: Six?

M5: Six?

(pause)

Comment: A

Comment: Conf (ORep), TIQ

Comment: A (SRep)

Comment: Comp (SRep), TIQ (SRep)

Comment: A

Comment: Conf (ORep)

Comment: ExtA (SRep)

Comment: Conf (ORep), TIQ, A (SRep, Comp), TIQ

Comment: CRq

Comment: A

Comment: ExtQ

Comment: A, LI

Comment: ExtA (ORep)

Comment: Conf

Comment: Conf (SRep)

Comment: TIQ

Comment: Conf (ORep), CRq LI

Comment: ExtAR

Comment: Conf

Comment: ExtAR (ORep)

Comment: PCor

Comment: Uptake

Comment: Cmpl

Comment: Conf (ORep)

Comment: ExtQ

Comment: A

Comment: A

Comment: ExtA

Comment: ExtA

Comment: Cmpl

Comment: Conf, TIS, CompC

Comment: A

Comment: Comp (SRep)

Comment: ExtA, Conf (ORep), SCor (SRep)

Comment: ConfC

Comment: ConfC (ORep)

M5: Only seven, only seven.	Comment: A
M2: <i>Aduh (Gosh)</i> . I'm sorry.	Comment: Comment, L1
F6: <i>Bukannya nomor dua Leonid? (Isn't Leonid number two?)</i>	Comment: L1
M2: <i>Io no. (Yes, right)</i> .	Comment: L1
F6: <i>Nomor tiga dang ini. (So, this is number three.)</i>	Comment: L1
M2: The first Soohan Kim.	Comment: ExtA
M5: Soohan Kim the first.	Comment: Conf (ORep)
M2: The second	Comment: TIS
M5: Leonid	Comment: A
M2: Gromykovith.	Comment: Cmpl
F6: <i>Kong (then)</i> third	Comment: TIS, L1
M5: The third	Comment: Conf (ORep)
M2: Galia Feinstein	Comment: A
M5: Ok.	Comment: Conf
M2: Fourth	Comment: TIS
M5: Martha. The fifth	Comment: A, TIS
M2: Fifth	Comment: Conf (ORep)
M5: Alicia Fagan	Comment: A
M2: Sixth	Comment: TIS
M5: Amegneza	Comment: A
F1: Amegneza	Comment: TIS
M5: Amegneza Eдорh. Seventh Jacob Piterson, ok? Are you agree?	Comment: A
F1/F6: Yes.	Comment: Conf (ORep)
M5: What about our reason if we choose Amegneza better than Peter	Comment: Conf (SRep), TIS, TIQ
F1: Peter	Comment: A
M5: better Peter, better than Peter	Comment: ExtWhQ
M2: because Peter Jacobsen <b>has a history of heart disease</b>	Comment: Conf (ORep)
M5: Mm	Comment: Conf (SRep)
M2: So, maybe	Comment: A PR
M5: And Amegneza Eдорh?	Comment: ExtA
F1: He has a history of heart disease	Comment: TIQ
M5: Ok, I think we have (inaudible)	Comment: A
F1: (inaudible) a little bit.	Comment: ExtA
M5: Maybe the sixth Amegneza Eдорh, Eдорh, Eдорh, Eдорh, Eдорh. Then Peter Jacobsen. Are you will try to give some reason again? Give some reason again?	Comment: ExtA
M2: No.	Comment: ExtA (SRep, Comp), ExtRqQ (SRep)
F6: No, no.	Comment: A
M5: Ok, this is, we are just (pause) um our discuss is end today. My name eh before it I will read what our rank, ok? This first is? The first?	Comment: A
F1: Soohan Kim	Comment: Comment, TIQ (SRep)
M5: Soohan Kim. Ok, the second?	Comment: A
	Comment: Conf (ORep), TIQ

M2: Leonid Gromykovith

M5: The third is Galia Feinstein. And the fifth?

F6: For Martha Rosales.

M5: Martha Rosales. The sixth is, remember the sixth Alicia Fagan, the seventh?

M2: Amegneza Edorh

M5: Ok, and the last?

M2: Peter

F6: Peter Jacobsen.

M5: Ok. My name's M5.

F1: F1

M2: M2

F6: F6

M5: We belong to group one and yes

F6: finish

M5: finish our discussion, thank you for your attention and see you tomorrow and see you

F6: next time

M5: next time. Bye, bye.

(giggles)

(T talking to the whole class: Are you ready? Are you ready? Are you?)

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** A, TIQ

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** Conf (ORep), A, TIQ

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** Conf, TIQ

**Comment:** A

**Comment:** Conf (ORep)