

# Modified Interaction and Pedagogical Aspects of English Language Teacher Talk

Toshiaki Ishiguro

## INTRODUCTION

In the literature of simplified registers, initial works on the descriptive register studies focused on syntax, phonology, morphology, and vocabulary (Ferguson 1971, 1975, 1977; Henzl 1973, 1979; Ishiguro 1985, 1987, 1988), but later on, in addition to this aspect, conversational or pedagogical functions (e.g., clarification, repetition, etc.) were also studied (Gaies 1977; Freed 1980, 1981). Furthermore, there seems to be an effort to dichotomize the study of modified language by the native speaker into "input" and "interaction" (Long 1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1983c; Chaudron 1988) or into "input" and "negotiation" (Scarcella and Higa 1982). According to Long (1983b: 138-9), "modifications in the interactional structure of conversation are greater, more consistently found, and probably more important." Therefore, the writer in this research intends to compare 1) English language teachers' probable different interaction adjustments in teachers' speech, according to the levels of the students' oral language proficiency (high, middle and low groups, hereafter H, M, and L), and 2) interaction adjustment phenomena between native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English (Japanese teachers).

## RESEARCH DESIGN

**Setting:** The subjects of this research are nine native speakers of English and nine non-native speakers of English (Japanese teachers) who are professional foreign language teachers teaching at a college in

Japan. (The non-native speaker-teachers' communicative competence is sufficient to carry on meetings with native speakers in the target language.) The students are second-year students, majoring in the English language. The students' common background of learning English as a foreign language consists of six years in junior and senior high school and one year in college.

Based on the scores of the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL) (for a detailed explanation of the BINL, see the next section on measurement), the students were grouped into three groups, according to oral language proficiency: high, intermediate, and low. Each proficiency level was subdivided into six sections of oral conversation class, making a total number of eighteen sections. This grouping resulted in five or six students per group.

Eighteen professional foreign language teachers taught each section once a week, and each section of students rotated from teacher to teacher each week. Since the students who participated in this conversation majored in the English language, they had other English-related academic subjects such as phonetics, grammar, and composition. However, these conversation classes were selected for this research because, unlike the other classes, the means of instruction was the target language, regardless of whether the foreign language teacher was a native or a non-native speaker.

**Measurement of Oral Language Proficiency:** The Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL) is a criterion-referenced system designed to assess oral language proficiency of bilingual children. The task involved in this testing requires the students to select a picture and tell a story about it. The tester records whatever the students say, and later transcribes the first ten sentences (complete or incomplete).

The analysis of the transcribed utterances demands that the tester have a basic linguistic knowledge of syntax and morphology of the tested language, since the tester's task involves counting the number of words, modifiers, phrases, and clauses. The above grammatical

elements were scored in the manner as suggested by Herbert (1977 : 15-6).

The series of scores tabulated with the BINL provides the tester with language profiles of the students. The first score, called "fluency," is defined as the total number of words (TNOW) expressed in the sample of the natural language. The second score represents the "average sentence length" (ASL) as it is defined to be the total number of words divided by the number of partial or complete utterances. The third score indicates the "average level of complexity" (ALOC) of the utterance calculated by the division of the total points by the total number of partial or complete utterances.

The BINL was used for determining the oral language proficiency levels of the Japanese college students, even though it was originally designed for assessing language proficiency of bilingual children. The primary reason for such a decision was that this test was also considered most appropriate for eliciting spontaneous oral language samples from Japanese adults. This was confirmed by comparisons of sample utterances from three different proficiency levels.

In the present study three language proficiency levels (high, middle, and low) are defined as follows: Those who scored more than fifty-one on their "average level of complexity" are defined as the high level. The scores between forty-one to fifty and the scores below forty are classified as the middle and low levels respectively.

**Data Collection Method:** First, the BINL described in the previous section was administered to all sophomores in order to obtain data on the students' level of oral language proficiency. The test was given in the language laboratory where all of the students' speech was recorded for transcription and the classification of the students' oral language proficiency.

The baseline speech ("out-of class" speech) information on the foreign language teachers' talk was obtained by recording informal evaluation meetings. In attempting to secure comparable utterance

samples for each teacher, the researcher divided eighteen teachers into three groups, each of which included both native and non-native speakers. In this way, it was hoped that the baseline sample for each teacher would be adequate and comparable to the "in-class" sample utterances in terms of the sample size. These three meetings were recorded and transcribed for the analysis of the baseline teacher talk.

As for the "in-class" teacher talk, eighteen conversation sections, each of which consisted of five or six students at the same level of oral language proficiency, were tape-recorded for three weeks. Each tape was transcribed, including both the teacher's and the students' utterances.

## RESULTS

**Types of Utterances:** Teachers' utterances in two-way exchanges were divided into three types: statements, questions, and imperatives. The number of each type used by native speakers with the three language proficiency levels is shown in Table 1. An analysis of variance was used in order to test whether or not there is a significant difference among the means of teachers' use of utterance type. The results indicate a significant difference among the means in each group (H:  $F=24.69$ ,  $d.f.=2, 24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ; M:  $F=18.60$ ,  $d.f.=2, 24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ; L:  $F=18.01$ ,  $d.f.=2, 24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Table 1 suggests that the native speakers tended to use more statements and more questions, but fewer imperatives in the lower level proficiency groups. Furthermore, the native speakers' preference for statements over questions was also observed.

**Table 1 Native Speakers' Types of Utterances**

Levels	Statements		Questions		Imperatives		F	P
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
High	109.33	41.41	81.89	28.83	12.22	13.95	24.69	**
Middle	124.00	54.92	93.00	42.71	11.11	9.84	18.60	**
Low	114.00	47.20	93.44	49.01	8.67	6.67	18.01	**

(\*\* $p<0.01$ )

In non-native teachers' classes, the means of teachers' use of utterance type differed significantly, as shown in Table 2 (H:  $F=15.13$ ,  $d.f.=2, 24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ; M:  $F=26.77$ ,  $d.f.=2, 24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ; L:  $F=13.93$ ,  $d.f.=2, 24$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Furthermore, non-native speakers also preferred statements to questions in all of the proficiency groups. As far as the frequency of imperatives is concerned, non-native speakers used more imperatives in lower groups, in contrast to native speakers' fewer imperatives.

**Table 2 Non-Native Speakers' Types of Utterances**

Levels	Statements		Questions		Imperatives		F	P
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
High	95.78	48.73	71.44	39.81	4.67	3.28	15.13	**
Middle	101.89	47.73	64.22	11.04	4.89	3.41	26.77	**
Low	112.33	65.37	82.56	39.51	5.89	3.52	13.93	**

(\*\* $p<0.01$ )

Out of the three types of utterances, questions were further analyzed. The first question concerns the difference between the means of native speakers' use of question type (wh-or yes/no questions). It was found that there was no significant difference between the means of native speakers' use of the question type, as shown in Table 3. Yet, Table 4 shows that in the non-native teachers' classes there was a significant difference between the means in the M group ( $t=4.18$ ,  $d.f.=16$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), i.e., the non-native speakers preferred yes/no questions to wh-questions in the M group.

**Table 3 Native Speakers' Types of Questions**

Levels	Wh Question		Yes/No Question		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
High	33.11	15.57	47.22	18.69	1.74	n.s.
Middle	37.11	21.57	52.67	21.40	1.535	n.s.
Low	37.56	19.65	52.67	28.12	1.321	n.s.

(n.s. non-significant)

**Table 4 Non-Native Speakers' Types of Questions**

Levels	Wh Question		Yes/No Question		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
High	28.56	16.40	42.11	26.53	1.303	n.s.
Middle	23.00	9.89	40.89	8.18	4.182	*
Low	29.89	16.21	52.00	27.30	2.089	n.s.

(\*  $p < 0.05$  n.s. non-significant)

The second question concerns the type of yes/no questions. Tables 5 and 6 indicate the means of inverted, uninverted questions, and prosiopesis in the three levels of classes. According to Table 5, a significant difference among the means of native speakers' use of the question type (inverted, uninverted or prosiopesis) was found in all of the classes (H:  $F=5.12$ , d.f.=2, 24,  $p < 0.05$ ; M:  $F=7.33$ , d.f.=2, 24,  $p < 0.01$ ; L:  $F=8.20$ , d.f.=2, 24,  $p < 0.01$ ). However, Table 6 shows that there was a significant difference between the means of non-native speakers' use of the question type in the M and L groups (M:  $F=13.69$ , d.f.=2, 24,  $p < 0.01$ ; L:  $F=6.66$ , d.f.=2, 24,  $p < 0.01$ ). One observation of native teacher talk is that the means of their use of uninverted questions in H and M groups exceeds their use in L groups. In contrast, non-native speakers did not differ on the basis of the means of uninverted questions. Non-native speakers, however, used prosiopesis most in L groups.

The use of wh-questions without wh-word fronting, was limited (see Tables 7 and 8). Yet, the highest frequency of no wh-fronting in L groups was shared by both native and non-native speakers. This implies

**Table 5 Native Speakers' Types of Yes/No Questions**

Levels	Inverted		Uninverted		Prosiopesis		F	P
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
High	22.00	8.00	7.78	10.84	17.44	9.84	5.12	*
Middle	27.44	10.19	8.78	7.05	16.44	13.07	7.33	**
Low	29.89	15.12	5.56	3.71	17.22	15.67	8.20	**

(\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$ )

**Table 6 Non-Native Speakers' Types of Yes/No Questions**

Levels	Inverted		Uninverted		Prosiopesis		F	P
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
High	17.00	10.24	6.78	5.04	18.33	14.41	3.19	n.s.
Middle	17.56	6.71	5.67	3.12	17.67	6.25	13.69	**
Low	22.56	13.07	6.22	4.47	23.22	13.61	6.66	**

(\*\* p&lt;0.01 n.s. non-significant)

**Table 7 Native Speakers' Types of Wh-Questions**

Levels	Wh-fronting		Without wh-fronting	
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
High	32.78	15.51	0.33	0.71
Middle	37.00	21.55	0.11	0.33
Low	36.78	19.49	0.78	1.09

**Table 8 Non-Native Speakers' Types of Wh-Questions**

Levels	Wh-fronting		Without wh-fronting	
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
High	27.56	15.71	1.00	1.12
Middle	21.11	9.58	1.89	2.42
Low	27.89	14.51	2.00	2.00

that teachers needed to clarify without wh-word fronting what students in L groups meant to say more than in other groups.

**Re-Statement of Teacher's Own Utterances:** The first type of teacher reaction to his/her own utterances is to repeat them exactly with or without a pause in the middle. The following example includes a pause indicated by a slash (/) and was given slowly and clearly.

- (1) Teacher: Are there many people who eat at SANKORUBO  
(the name of a restaurant near the college)  
all the time, like other students?  
So do you make a little group?

Student: Yes, so. Miss I. and so DARE (who?) K.A. and N.S.

T: Are you all from YAMAGATA?

*Are you all/ from YAMAGATA?* (slowly and clearly)

S: No.

The means of the frequency of "own repetitions" by both native and non-native speakers in three language proficiency groups are shown in Table 9 (in baseline talk, as expected, no one used this strategy). T-tests show that there was not a significant difference between the means regarding "own repetitions" employed by native and non-native teachers in each group.

The second type of "teachers' own repetition" involves word-substitution (typically one-word substitution), presuming that the second word supplied would be easier than the first one for the student. In the following example the contracted "t" was substituted by "not."

(2) T: Do you know what chemicals are?

S: No.

T: Can you explain it to her, Miss S.?

S: NTO (well), TATOEBBA (for instance), NANTO IUNO  
(What do you call it?)

KAGAKUTEKI NA MONO DAKARA (something  
chemical, so -)

T: So KAGAKUTEKI NA MONO (It's something chemical.)  
so that it *won't*, it *will not* be bad, so.....

The results for word-substitutions are displayed in Table 9 (again, in baseline speech this strategy was not found). The t-tests show that there was a significant difference between native and non-native teachers' use of word-substitution in only H groups ( $t=2.138$ , d.f. = 16,  $p<0.05$ ), i.e., native speakers used it more.

The third type of "repetition" is to repeat the same or similar idea in a different phrase, which can be called rephrasing, as in the example below.

(3) T: Every night and you have dinner ready for her?

S: Yes.



- T: Is supper ready for her?  
 S: But, but on Friday I, I come home late, so only Friday my mother cook.  
 T: I see. So, OK.  
*When your mother comes home, what is she most happy to see you cook?*  
*What does your mother like best?*  
*Nothing in particular?*  
 S: Um.

The initial question was a wh-question with a subordinate clause which includes the embedded sentence "you cook." Then it was rephrased without subordination. Furthermore, the wh-question was replaced by a yes/no question whose initial part was deleted. One can observe that each rephrased utterance is less complicated than the previous one in terms of subordination and deletion.

Table 9 presents the results of rephrasing one's own utterances.

**Table 9 Native and Non-Native Speakers' Re-Statement of their own Utterance**

Types	NS		NNS		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
Own Repetition						
High	2.33	2.06	1.33	1.41	1.199	n.s.
Middle	2.11	1.69	1.44	2.60	0.644	n.s.
Low	2.78	2.49	1.67	1.12	1.221	n.s.
Substitution in Own Utterance						
High	1.44	0.88	0.56	0.88	2.138	*
Middle	1.44	1.42	1.89	2.20	-0.508	n.s.
Low	1.44	1.74	0.89	1.17	0.795	n.s.
Rephrasing Own Utterance						
High	6.56	3.84	2.89	3.89	2.012	n.s.
Middle	7.00	3.35	2.78	2.86	2.872	*
Low	9.67	6.14	5.11	5.16	1.703	n.s.

(\*  $p < 0.05$  n.s. non-significant)

Again there was a significant difference between native and non-native teachers' use of rephrasing in M groups ( $t=2.87$ ,  $d.f.=16$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), i.e., native speakers rephrased their utterances more. Yet, the results indicate that both native and non-native teachers rephrased most in L groups.

**Reaction to Students' Utterances:** The second category of communicational aspects concerns the teacher's reflection on students' utterances. The first type of teacher reaction to a student's utterance is to repeat what the student has said ("other-repetition") with either falling or rising intonation. The function of the falling intonation may be to confirm the student's utterance, while that of the rising intonation may be to ask clarification of what the student has said.

- (4) T: Is your house near the station?  
 S: No. Ah, center of city.  
 T: Ah, *center of city*.  
 .....  
 S: How many children do you want?  
 S: I want to have three children.  
 S: Boy or girl.  
 S: Both.  
 T: *Both?*  
 S: Two girls and one boy.

Regarding "other-repetitions," Table 10 shows an opposite tendency between the native and non-native teachers. The native speakers used this strategy most frequently with the M group, while the non-native speakers used it with both H and L groups. However, the results of t-tests revealed that there was not a significant difference between the means of native and non-native teachers' use of other-repetition in each group.

The second type of teacher reaction can be called "completion," or the "fill-in the blank technique." When a student hesitates or is thinking of a word or phrase, the teacher tends to break in to supply

the unfinished part of the student's utterance, either with a falling or rising intonation.

- (5) S: So maybe you want to marry a rich man.  
 S: Um, I don't mind whether he is rich or not.  
 We um—both of us—  
 T: *Work very hard.*  
 S: Work very hard and do our best for, for our purpose, perhaps, but....
- (6) T: .....  
 Very famous. He, father is very rich. He will give you—a lot of money.  
 S: Only summer.  
 T: Oh, summer.  
 S: Um. So busy. But winter is—  
 T: *Not so busy?* You said you went to Tokyo to help your father.

Table 10 shows the means of the frequency of the teacher's completing student's utterances. According to t-tests, there was a significant difference between the native and non-native teachers' use of "completion" only with the H group ( $t = -2.78$ ,  $d.f. = 16$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). In

**Table 10 Native and Non-Native Speakers' Reaction to Students' Utterance**

Types	NS		NNS		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
Other-Repetition						
High	10.78	6.24	14.56	9.55	-0.993	n.s.
Middle	15.89	13.76	10.78	6.10	1.018	n.s.
Low	9.44	5.08	15.22	9.80	-1.571	n.s.
Completion of Student's Utterance						
High	3.11	2.85	8.44	5.00	-2.779	*
Middle	4.33	3.00	6.89	4.20	-1.486	n.s.
Low	5.00	5.43	6.56	4.33	-0.671	n.s.

(\*  $p < 0.05$  n.s. non-significant)

this table, one can observe that non-native speakers completed students' utterances more often than native speakers did. As for the differences across three language proficiency levels, the native speakers' use of this "completion" strategy reflected the students' proficiency level. The native speakers employed it most in L group and least in H groups. This proportionally increased use of the completion strategy is identical to that of "rephrasing own utterances" as mentioned above. Non-native teachers, on the other hand, completed the students' utterances most in H groups, and least in L groups, which is the opposite of the results for native speakers.

### **Pedagogical Behavior**

The third category of communicational aspects of foreign language teacher talk is explicit teaching behavior. Such behavior includes corrections of students' errors in their speech. Teachers were active in correcting students' mistakes, using the repetition strategy.

(7) S: ..... I was very tired. So I, I, I want to bed so. I get up.

I—

T: *Got up.*

S: Got up eight thirty today.

T: Eight thirty, huh? Wow. So after class you're going to bed?

S: No.

T: No?

S: I'm very fine now.

T: Now you're fine. Oh, that's good. That's good.

S: What about you?

S: We know, ah, we know news or information on TV, and there are a lot of interesting programs. Good point on TV, from one point of view, the best program is baseball game.

T: Oh, *baseball games.*

In example 7 direct corrections can be found. When the student said, "I get up." The teacher immediately corrected it by saying, "Got up." The second correction was done when the student used a singular form of "baseball game," instead of "baseball games." These corrections regarding verb tense and number of nouns are considered "grammatical corrections."

Error corrections are not limited to grammaticality. The following corrections are classified as "lexical corrections" in which a more appropriate lexical item was provided by the teacher when an inappropriate one was used.

- (8) S: She NANTE, in the SHINHAMA park, he hand, he, he hand with her hand TE IUNOKANA? (I wonder if you say so.)  
 T: He *held hands with her*.  
 S: He held hands.  
 S: Oh, oh, really, oh, he, he—he don't, he don't do it me.  
 T: He doesn't hold mine.  
 S: He doesn't hold mine. (giggling)  
 S: (Giggling)  
 S: If, if I were you, I, I separate.  
 T: I would *leave* him.

In the domain of lexical corrections, the teacher supplied the words, "hold," and "leave" for the wrong choice of "hand," and "separate" made by the student.

"Pronunciation corrections" are a third type and are limited as shown in Table 11. The examples below show that pronunciation corrections were done with teachers' provision of the correct pronunciation. Example 9 also includes explicit teaching of a lexical item—"fawn."

- (9) T: ..... What's your next card look like?  
 Oh, those are pretty cards, three dimension.  
 Do you know three dimension?

- S: /d e r/ANO (WELL), /d e r/ ah, /d e r/.
- T: *No, deer* (/d i r/).
- S: (Laugh)
- T: Well, a fawn. We say a baby deer is a fawn.
- (10) S: No. When you come, come Japan, maybe you eat  
*runch, runch.*
- T: *Lunch!*

Table 11 shows the results for these three types of corrections. According to t-tests, there was a significant difference between native and non-native teachers' word-choice corrections with the H group ( $t=2.67$ , d.f. = 16,  $p<0.05$ ) and between their use of pronunciation corrections with the L group ( $t=2.14$ , d.f. = 16,  $p<0.05$ ). Furthermore, this table suggests that both native and non-native teachers corrected grammatical errors most and pronunciation errors least. Also, the

**Table 11 Native and Non-Native Speakers' Pedagogical Behavior**

Types	NS		NNS		t	p
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
[Grammar]						
High	3.67	1.87	2.22	1.79	1.674	n.s.
Middle	5.00	3.54	4.67	4.44	0.176	n.s.
Low	5.89	5.58	3.78	5.40	0.815	n.s.
[Word-Choice]						
High	2.67	1.73	1.00	0.71	2.672	*
Middle	2.67	2.29	1.78	1.56	0.961	n.s.
Low	3.44	3.54	2.33	1.87	0.832	n.s.
[Pro-nun-ciation]						
High	0.11	0.33	0.00	0.00	1.000	n.s.
Middle	0.44	0.73	0.33	0.71	0.328	n.s.
Low	0.56	0.53	0.11	0.33	2.138	*
[Provision of English Words]						
High	9.11	6.39	13.00	8.05	-1.135	n.s.
Middle	15.33	14.02	9.56	5.94	1.138	n.s.
Low	8.78	5.14	13.33	9.75	-1.240	n.s.

(\*  $p<0.05$  n.s. non-significant)

frequency of corrections made by the native teacher increased with the lower level groups: there were more corrections in L groups and fewer in H groups.

In addition to these corrections, the teacher's provision of an equivalent English term for a Japanese word used by a student can be considered an explicit pedagogical behavior. The means of this type in each language level are illustrated in Table 11 as well, and it is indicated that there was no significant difference in terms of speakers' provision of a Japanese word between native and non-native speakers. Yet, one can observe a tendency that the native speakers supplied the English equivalent words most in M groups and the non-native teachers provided them most in L and H groups.

## DISCUSSION

First, the types of utterances will be discussed. Native speakers established a significant difference between the means of teachers' use of utterance (statements, questions, or imperatives) in each proficiency level. These results mean that native speakers used statements most and imperatives least. This was parallel to the findings of Long (1983b). The native speakers' preference for statements over questions was observed in the present data as well. Further observation of the results suggests that native speakers tended to use more statements, more questions and fewer imperatives in the lower level proficiency classes. More frequent use of statements and questions in the lower level classes can be explained by the fact that teachers not only needed to say more in the form of statements to fill up possible silent periods, but also to interact more with the learners to figure out what the students meant.

In non-native teachers' classes, the means of their use of utterance type differed significantly: non-native speakers also preferred statements to questions in all of the classes. However, as far as the frequency of imperatives is concerned, non-native speakers used more imperatives

in lower level groups, in contrast to native speakers' fewer imperatives. If the use of imperatives is related to the simplification of teacher talk, the non-native teachers' behavior meets the students' requirements for comprehensible input. Yet, there is the possibility that the teachers needed to give instructions or to encourage the "quiet" learners to say more because of a possible breakdown in their conversation.

The type of question used by the teachers was further analyzed. The first question concerns the difference between the use of wh-and yes/no questions. No significant difference was found between the means of native speakers' use of the question type, because of their large standard deviations (see Tables 3 and 4). However, there was a significant difference between the means in the M group by non-native speakers, i.e., non-native speakers preferred yes/no questions to wh-questions in the M group.

Regarding the type of yes/no questions, a significant difference among the means of native speakers' use of inverted, uninverted questions and prosiopesis was found in all of the classes. Non-native speakers, on the other hand, established a significant difference between the means of their use of the question type in the M and L groups. What these results indicate is that both native and non-native teachers used inverted yes/no questions more than uninverted ones, and also used prosiopesis more than uninverted questions. Furthermore, native speakers tended to use uninverted yes/no questions least in the L class. This tendency may have been dominant for the sake of students with the lower language proficiency. On the other hand, non-native speakers did not reveal the same tendency in the L group.

Regarding the three variables of "re-statement of own utterance (e.g., own repetitions, teachers' substitution in own utterance, and teachers' rephrasing own utterance), significant difference was found between native and non-native speakers' use of word-substitution in the H group and their use of rephrasing their own utterances in the M group. These statistics indicate that native speakers substituted



words in their own utterances more frequently in the H group and further rephrased their own utterances more frequently in the M group than did non-native speakers. Judging from these results, it can be inferred that native speakers use more demanding vocabulary in the H group than non-native speakers do, and furthermore native speakers may initially be less sensitive to the lower students' need for comprehensible input. This is evidenced by the fact that they provide input beyond students' comprehension, and thereby need to simplify their utterances more frequently than do non-native speakers.

Two variables related to "teachers' reaction to students' utterances," such as other-repetition and completion of students' utterances were compared between native and non-native teachers. A significant difference was found only with the variable of completing students' utterance in the H group, i.e., non-native speakers completed students' unfinished utterances more often than native speakers did in the H group. This finding may point out that non-native speakers tend to be less patient than native speakers in terms of "waiting" and therefore are motivated to complete students' unfinished utterances more frequently than do native speakers.

The difference between the variables relating to "reaction to students' utterances" and "re-statement of the teacher's own utterance" leads one to recognize the following two distinctive communication modes: the "internal mode" and the "external mode." The former refers to the mode in which teachers reflect on what they say and re-state their own utterances. The latter refers to the mode in which the source of communication lies in the external students' utterances, such as the variable category of "reaction to students' utterances."

In terms of active pedagogical behavior, such as the provision of English words in response to a Japanese word uttered by the student or corrections of students' errors in grammar, word-choice, or pronunciation, there was a significant difference between native and non-native teachers' word-choice corrections in the H group and

between their use of pronunciation corrections in the H group. These statistics imply that native speakers are less tolerant of students' errors in the choice of words and in their pronunciation than non-native speakers, probably because these errors would interfere with communication.

Although there was not a significant difference between native and non-native speakers' provision of English words, the data show that non-native speakers supplied English words most in L groups, likely because of the students' struggle to find the right word. Interestingly enough, non-native teachers provided English words in H groups as often as in L groups. This seemingly contradictory phenomenon implies that non-native speakers tended to participate more actively in discussion with H and L groups for different reasons. For H groups they become active in demanding more complex ideas which require sophisticated vocabulary. On the other hand, for L groups the teachers simply needed to supply basic words to keep the conversation going.

As for the type of teachers' corrections, both native and non-native speakers corrected pronunciation mistakes least and grammatical errors most. This tendency shows that the "error gravity" (Ensz:1982, Ludwig:1982, Delisle:1982) of pronunciation is less than that of grammar.

In relation to error corrections, there is yet another point to be discussed. There were some cases in which the native teachers imitated the students' errors, ranging from syntactic and lexical to phonological mistakes. Closer examination of error repetitions on the part of the native speakers shows that there are three types of teacher repetition of students' mistakes: 1) repeating an error with rising intonation (pedagogical), 2) simply "echoing" a student's mistake (non-pedagogical), and 3) repeating an error in the manner of joking (non-pedagogical). When these types of teacher repetition of students' mistakes and teacher corrections are considered together, it becomes clear that there are two modes operating in the minds of the teachers: pedagogical and non-

pedagogical (communicative) modes. The "echoing" type of repetition follows the non-pedagogical mode. In contrast, the correction of students' mistakes follows the teachers' pedagogical mode.

### CONCLUSIONS AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The trigger for the adjustment phenomena in foreign language teacher talk was hypothesized to be the level of the students' language proficiency. This idea was supported by the clear-cut modifications of baseline talk in the classroom situations. All the interaction variables were present in class, but the following variables were not observed in the baseline talk: wh-questions without wh-word fronting, own-repetition, substitution in own utterances, rephrasing own utterances, three types of corrections (grammar, word-choice, and pronunciation), and the provision of equivalent English words.

However, some of the variables were not simplified, depending on the students' language proficiency level. For example, teachers elaborated their own utterances with more use of clauses and more use of rephrasing their own utterances.

The identification of these adjusted and non-adjusted variables in teacher talk creates some problematic environments for the students to receive their "comprehensible input." First of all, English teachers rephrased their own utterances more in lower level groups. These phenomena led the researcher to interpret that teachers, especially, native speakers, may initially provide input beyond students' comprehension in lower level classes. Therefore they had to rephrase their own utterances more frequently than did non-native teachers. The use of more clauses in rephrased utterances (Ishiguro, 1987) can be interpreted as the manifestation of the teachers' intent to simplify their speech. However, paradoxically the great clausal complexity in a succession of rephrasing seemed to have caused more confusion on the part of the learners as was demonstrated by Chaudron (1982, 1983).

Second, non-native teachers were less patient about waiting for

students' responses. This was shown by their tendency to complete students' unfinished utterances and to provide equivalent English words when students used Japanese words. These types of interaction behavior can be considered as the teachers' cooperative participation in conversation. However, it is interpreted that students are taking advantage of non-native speakers' (Japanese teachers of English) competence in the Japanese language, i.e., students know that non-native speakers can understand Japanese and communication is achieved with the use of Japanese words.

From the viewpoint of negotiation of meanings, it would perhaps be more beneficial if non-native teachers encourage students to choose a similar word in meaning from their own vocabulary repertoire and try to express their intentions. This would be a sounder pedagogical move than to directly provide the vocabulary item that the student does not know, as there is still some question as to whether or not these instantly supplied or provided words are actually retained in the student's long term memory.

Third, the phenomenon of repeating students' errors has to be re-examined in two aspects: 1) whether or not corrections are necessary in conversation classes where the focus is on communication, and 2) whether or not repeating student's mistakes is a matter of joking. In the Canadian educational setting, Swain (1983) proposes "comprehensible output" and encourages the teacher to correct grammatical errors. However, in the context of Japanese education where the target language is rarely used as a means of instruction, it is questionable whether the students benefit from these corrections, especially in the conversation class, because the corrections themselves shift the focus from communication, the goal of the class, to forms.

Regarding the second aspect, if the learner recognizes the repetition as a joke, she/he may feel embarrassed over the mistake, thus creating a mental block toward both the teacher and language learning experience. Also, unless the learner is free from a psychologically

threatening atmosphere, he/she cannot be expected to acquire the language, as claimed by Krashen (1980, 1981, 1982). Furthermore, when teachers make overt corrections in a so-called conversation class, they seem to be unaware that they are engaging in such explicit pedagogical behavior.

Before concluding, there should be some mention regarding the generalizability of the findings in relation to the non-native speaker teachers, i.e., the Japanese teachers of English. The Japanese teachers in this research were those who were able to carry on meetings in English with native speakers—a level of oral proficiency much higher than that of most English teachers in Japan. Therefore, the findings' may not necessarily be applicable in general, to foreign language teachers in Japan. However, the findings with regard to native speakers are generalizable to any conversation classes conducted in the target language by native speakers in the Japanese educational setting.

To conclude, the present research has the following implications for the field of foreign language education.

1) Native speakers' rephrasing their own utterances with more clauses, especially in lower level classes, has to be re-evaluated as to whether or not the intent to simplify speech results in more confusion on the part of the learner. In order to lessen the burden of comprehending a series of rephrased utterances, teachers should give either longer pauses between utterances or provide a clear "signal" (e.g., Let me say that in another way.....) to indicate to the learners that what follows is a simplified utterance, not new information.

2) The common mother tongue between non-native teachers and students prevents both students and teachers from negotiating meanings in conversation, e.g., students depend on the use of Japanese terms when English words are not known to them. Also, non-native speaker teachers provide equivalent English words spontaneously more often than do native speakers. Therefore, it is more necessary for non-native teachers to make efforts to interact or negotiate meanings in the target

language, rather than to complete communication with the use of their mother tongue.

3) Both native and non-native teachers in the pedagogical mode cannot refrain from correcting students' errors in conversation class even if the focus in class is on communication, and not on the accuracy of students' grammar. Yet, it is necessary for foreign language teachers to reflect on whether or not their own corrections are effective in such a conversation class for students' acquisition. These implications outlined above will help foreign language teachers realize how they are actually talking in different levels of class and outside class. It is also hoped that this awareness will encourage language instructors to become more successful providers of comprehensible input for the sake of facilitating their students' language acquisition.

### Reference

- Chaudron, Craig. "Vocabulary Elaboration in Teachers' Speech to L2 Learners." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 4:170-180, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreigner Talk in the Classroom: An Aid to Learning." In *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. Edited by Herbert W. Weliger and Michael H. Long, pp.127-143. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Delisle, Helga H. "Native Speaker Judgment and the Evaluation of Errors in German." *Modern Language Journal* 66:39-48, 1982.
- Ensz, Kathleen Y. "French Attitudes toward Typical Speech Errors of American Speakers of French." *Modern Language Journal* 66:133-39, 1982.
- Ferguson, Charles A. "Absence of Copula and the Notion of Simplicity." In *Pidginization and Creolization of Language*. Edited by D. Hymes, pp. 141-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Towards a Characterization of English Foreigner Talk." *Anthropological Linguistics* 17:1-14, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Baby Talk as a Simplified Register." In *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition*. Edited by C.E. Snow and C.A. Ferguson, pp. 209-235. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Freed, Barbara F. "Talking to Foreigners Versus Talking to Children: Similarities and Differences." In *Issues in Second Language Research*.

- Edited by Robin C. Scarcella and Steven D. Krashen, pp. 19-27. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreigner Talk, Baby Talk, Native Talk." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28:19-39, 1981.
- Gaies, Stephen J. "The Nature of Linguistic Input in Formal Second Language Learning: Linguistic and Communicative Strategies in ESL Teachers' Classroom Language." In *On TESOL '77: Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice*. Edited by H. D. Brown, C.A. Yorio, and R.H. Crymes, pp. 204-212. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1977.
- Henzl, Vera M. "Linguistic Register of Foreign Language Instruction." *Language Learning*, 23:207-222, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreigner Talk in the Classroom." *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 17:159-167, 1979.
- Herbert, Charles H. *Basic Inventory of Natural Language: Instructions Manual*, San Bernardino: CHEC point Systems, 1977.
- Ishiguro, Toshiaki. "Foreign Language Teacher Talk as a Simplified Register." *Kanagawa University Language Research* 8:1-21, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Adjusted and Non-Adjusted Input in English Language Teacher Talk." *Kanagawa University Language Research* 10:137-166, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Aspects of Teacher Talk in the Classroom Setting." *ELEC BULLETIN* Fall:35-40, 1988.
- Krashen, Stephen D. "The Input Hypothesis." In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1980: Current Issues in Bilingual Education*. Edited by James E. Alatis, pp. 168-180. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theoretical and Practical Relevance of Simple Codes in Second Language Acquisition. In *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Edited by Stephen D. Krashen, pp. 119-137. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.
- Long, Michael H. "Input, Interaction, and Second-Language Acquisition." In *Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379, pp. 259-278. Edited by Harris Winitz. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Linguistic and Conversational Adjustments to Non-Native Speakers." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 5:177-193, 1983a.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation and the Negotiation of Comprehensible Input." *Applied Linguistics* 4:126-141, 1983b.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation in the Second Language Classroom." *On TESOL '82. Pacific Perspectives on Language Learning*. Edited by M. Clarke and J. Handscombe, pp. 207-225.

Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1983c.

Ludwig, Jeannette. "Native-Speaker Judgments of Second Language Learners' Efforts at Communication: A Review." *Modern Language Journal* 66: 274-83, 1982.

Scarcella, Robin C. and Corrine Higa. "Input and Age Differences in Second Language Acquisition." In *Child-Adult Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. pp.175-201. Edited by Stephen D. Krashen, Robin C. Scarcella, and Michael H. Long. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1982.

Swain, Merrill. "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development." In *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. pp.235-253. Edited by S. Gass and C. Madden. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1985.