Testing Interactional English Conversation Skills in a University Speaking Exam

William Collins
Nagasaki University

In this study I looked at ways to help learners develop conversation skills such as turn-taking, backchanneling, using clarifying cues to repair communication breakdown, and making comments. The study was conducted over 2 semesters and concerned the ability of students to use the skills in audio recordings under varying degrees of preplanning limitation. Students in both semesters took a speaking exam, then transcribed the recordings and self-evaluated their use of the different skills. The students in the second semester periodically did 2 reflective-listening exercises. The results suggest that the exercises had some positive impact on improving the students' use of the conversation skills.

本論は、順番交替, 相槌、発言や理解に関わる問題の修復等の会話技能を学生に身に着けさせる方法に関する研究を報告する。1年間、2つのクラスの学生が会話を定期的に録音し、会話形式の期末試験では、ペアで4つの会話を録音した。それぞれの会話がだんだん、事前練習が制限されることで、本当の会話状況でどれだけその技能を使えたかを研究した。2学期目の学生グループが学期中反省的なリスニング学習をし、それが学生の試験結果にどのような影響を与えたかという点も本研究で報告する。

O NE OF the most difficult challenges faced by EFL students is learning how to manage conversational interaction (Kramsch, 1986; Young, 2008). Pragmatic skills such as getting, holding, and keeping a turn, backchanneling, using clarifying cues to repair comprehension breakdown (Barraja-Rohan, 2011), and giving feedback comments (Mori, 2002) are difficult for students because they must use them under the time pressure of a conversation. Learners have a strong desire to improve their conversation skills in their L2. Given that the language classroom is the default setting in which EFL students will do this, teachers must find ways to ensure that the learning activities approximate as closely as possible the conditions of actual conversation if students are to become accustomed to real-time conversation.

This paper reports the results of a 1-year study concerning testing improvements in conversational interaction skills, conducted in a 1st-year university English communication class. The key components of the study were (a) a set of active-listening comment and clarifying strategies for increasing the participation of the listener in the conversation; (b) regular pair-recording and, in the second semester, a set of post-recording reflective-listening activities for raising students' awareness of the strategies; and (c) a speaking exam in which pair-recording was done under varying degrees of preplanning limitation including controlling whether

students had previously recorded on the given speaking topic or listened to their partner's story. The study was conducted in Nagasaki University's English Communication courses for 1st-year non-English majors. Prior to the introduction of pair-recording, exams were written that focused on vocabulary and written cloze exercises based on conversation dialogues. In student surveys I conducted, students expressed a desire for more in-class speaking practice and also said they did not know how to tell if their speaking skills were improving. Against this background, I sought a way students could increase in-class speaking time and a tool for measuring improvements in conversations.

Literature Review

Cook (1989) stressed the continuum in spoken discourse between more "one-way" speech, and discourse which has a high degree of *reciprocity*, which he defined as discourse in which "the receiver can influence the development of what is being said." (p. 60). Cook argued that the distinction between written and spoken discourse is a matter of degree and can be placed on a cline defined by several criteria: planned—unplanned, socially structured—less socially structured, aided by writing—unaided by writing, and less reciprocal (one-way)—more reciprocal (two-way). Cook argued further that one of the hardest aspects of teaching conversation is the gaining, holding, and yielding of turns.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) first proposed the Birmingham Model for analyzing classroom interaction. In this framework, classroom discourse was divided into five ranks: lesson, transaction, exchange, move, and act. The three types of exchanges were eliciting, informing, and directing and there were three parts or moves to an exchange: initiation (opening move), response (answering move) and follow-up (acknowledging move). Finally, moves were further subdivided into acts, the smallest unit of spoken discourse. In the following exchange from Brazil (1995) each teacher and student turn is called a *move*,

the units marked within slash marks are called *acts*, each three-turn unit (question / answer / follow-up) is called an *exchange* and the continuation of this sequence about pharaohs and pyramids until the teacher moves on to another segment of the lesson is called a *transaction*.

T: They were pharaohs. / Erm do you know anything about them? / They were great for building something you make in math. /

S: Pyramids

T: Pyramids yes. / Why did they call them pyramids? / Paul. / (Brazil, 1995, p. 17)

Francis and Hunston (1992) modified this framework so that it was "flexible and adaptable enough to cope with a wide variety of discourse situations [including] casual conversations between friends." (p. 123). The ranks in Francis and Hunston's framework were: interaction, transaction, exchange, move, and act. This framework was applied in the current study to student interactions in the form of recorded conversations in which one student told a story about a personal experience and the other listened and responded using backchanneling, rejoinder, and comment acts. Collectively, these three types of listener-response acts will be termed active-listening strategies in the study (see Figure 1).

Rost (2002) argued that "collaborative listening, in which learners interact with each other, is established as a vital means of language development" (p. 143). Rost identified comment strategies including (a) responding—providing a personal, relevant response to information or ideas presented, and (b) inferencing—drawing inferences based on incomplete information.

Barraja-Rohan (2011) stressed the importance for ESL students of learning interactional skills such as the turn-taking system,

self-repair, and displaying common understandings. She argued that explicit instruction and practice of conversation analysis techniques and having students analyze transcriptions of their own talk can aid them in becoming more aware of such interactional skills. Displaying common understandings was also stressed in Mori (2002), who discussed the adjacency-pair highly typical of talk-in-interaction in which the listener acknowledges the comment or answer the speaker has given by repeating all or part of the speaker's words or by producing explicit assessments such as "That's amazing." In Mori, students did not produce assessments as much as they could have but rather fell into a question-answer-question interview pattern. Hyvärinen (2008) stressed the particular relevance of evaluation feedback by the listener in narratives such as the storytelling conversations in the current study. The importance of repair in maintaining sequential development of talk-in-interaction in the face of comprehension breakdown was emphasized by Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) who found examples of both self-initiated repair and other-initiated repair in their data.

Collins and Ruhl (2008) explored the impact of pair-recording and active-listening on students' enjoyment of and confidence in their English conversations. Students in the study reported that pair-recording and active-listening helped them enjoy English more and improved their conversations. Washburn and Christianson (1996) argued that pair-taping helped students achieve higher fluency and listening comprehension.

Research Questions

1. Given regular practice using active-listening comment and clarifying strategies in rehearsed conversations throughout the semester, how well would students be able to use them in an unrehearsed conversation?
2. How would reducing the degree of planning allowed for the storytelling conversations affect the turn-taking dynam-

ics between speaker and listener, particularly the speaker's ability to recognize and respond to listener clarifying cues, such as word and sentence repetition, and the listener's ability to get a turn?
3. What impact would reflective listening activities, such as writing comments while listening back to recorded conversations and editing and redoing conversations, have on students' subsequent ability to use the strategies?

Method
Participants
The study was conducted at Nagasaki University in Japan with 70 medical students over 1 year in a 1st-year English Communication class. Thirty students participated in the first-semester group and 35 in the second. The students' proficiency levels ranged from high intermediate to advanced, based on the results of a university-administered G-TELP (General Test of English Proficiency), an English proficiency test similar to the TOEIC that tests reading and listening skills. The first-semester group had a mean score of 227.6, equivalent to 525 TOEIC, while the second-semester group had a mean score of 233.4, equivalent to 539 TOEIC (Ogasawara, in press). The two student populations were of comparable age, ethnic, and linguistic background.

Methodology
The study employed the Francis and Hunston (1992) adaptation of the Birmingham Model of spoken discourse analysis to measure degree of listener-participation and speaker-response in recorded storytelling conversations. In both semesters of the study, students regularly recorded their conversations. In the second semester of the study, two reflective listening activities

were introduced to assess their impact on improving students' awareness of and ability to use the active-listening and clarifying strategies. This was evaluated by comparing the student exam results of the class in the first semester that did not do the reflective listening activities (the control group) with the second-semester group that did (the study group).

Speaking Exam Format and Evaluation Criteria

For the speaking exam students recorded eight conversations, four as speaker and four as active-listener. In each conversation one student told a story about a personal experience while the partner listened and responded with active listening. For the first recording as speaker, the students were permitted to choose a partner they had already recorded with and retold the same story. For the other three recordings as speaker, I assigned a new topic and a partner with whom the speaker had not previously recorded. Students were not permitted to use any notes during recording. A sample of the story topics is shown in Appendix A. Grading was according to the following criteria:

As speaker (storyteller)

1. Was the student able to tell her story smoothly without too many pauses?
2. Was the content of the story enough (i.e., did it include information like when and where the story took place and who was in the story, as well as an evaluation, such as whether it was a good or bad experience, what the student learned from it or how it changed or affected the student)? Was it long enough (at least 2 minutes)?
3. Did the speaker notice when her partner signaled she didn't understand? Was she able to make her partner understand?
4. When her partner made a comment or asked a question, did the speaker pause to acknowledge it before continuing with her story?

As listener (active-listener)

Was the listener able to

1. use not just the backchanneling strategies, but also the comment strategies (see active-listening strategies below);
2. use the advanced active-listening strategies; and
3. signal when she didn't understand her partner and get clarification?

The focus of the current study was on the exam results concerning listener evaluation criteria and speaker evaluation criteria (3) and (4). Since the objective was to examine whether the students could use the strategies in unrehearsed conversations as well as in rehearsed conversations only the raw data reported in Table 1 will be discussed.

Active-Listening Strategies: Exam's Focus on Storyteller-Listener Interaction

The speaking exam in the study aimed to measure improvements in students' ability to use the active-listening strategies in recorded conversations over the course of the semester. In this section the target listening strategies, that were the focus of the exam, and the two reflective-listening activities used with the study's second-semester group are introduced.

Active-Listening Strategies

The strategies were taught and practiced in class and consisted of "basic" and "advanced" strategies (Collins and Ruhl, 2008). The basic strategies included *backchanneling* ("Oh yeah?" / "Oh really?" / "Uh-huh"), *comments or rejoinders* ("That's + adjec-

tive" / "Wow!" / "No Way!" / "Oh no!"), and *clarifying cues* (repeating an unfamiliar word or phrase). The advanced strategies consisted of personalizing, speculating, and generalizing, examples of which are shown in Figure 1.

Interlocutor's Comment: **I recently went camping with some friends.**
Personalizing
[Oh, I ---- too.]
Oh, I enjoy camping too. / Oh, I recently went camping too
[Oh, I ---- but ----]
Oh, I like camping, but I haven't gone recently
[Oh really? (In my case) ----]
Oh really? I have never been camping. / I want to go camping!
Generalizing
[(doing----)] is (adjective), isn't it?
Going camping is fun, isn't it?
[(Noun)] is (adjective), isn't it?
Camping is fun, isn't it?
It's (adjective) [(to do---- / doing----)] isn't it?
It's nice to go camping, isn't it?
[I think a lot of people ----]
I think a lot of people go camping in spring.
[I've heard that ----]
I've heard that camping is very nice this time of year.

Speculating
[I guess ----]
I guess that was (a lot of) fun. / I guess you had a good time.
[I bet ----]
I bet that was (a lot of) fun. / I bet you enjoyed that.
[---- must have been ---- / ([done]----)]
That must have been fun. / You must have had a good time.
Question
How ----
How is it going? / So how do you like it? / How was it?
What ----
What was that like? / What happened next?
Repeat sentence (to show surprise, strong feeling).
Only one person came? / You forgot your wallet?

Figure 1. Advanced Active-Listening Strategies

Regular Story-Conversation Pair-Recording

In addition to the recordings made for the speaking exam, a portion of each regular class throughout the semester was set aside for pair-recording of story-conversations. In the second semester of the study, students periodically transcribed these; after each transcription, they used the transcripts as the basis for two reflective-listening exercises.

Reflective Listening Exercise 1: Student Comment Protocols

In the first exercise, while listening back to their recorded conversations and reading their transcriptions, the listeners identified points in the conversation where they had wanted to get a turn but had been unable to and wrote comments in their

L1 as to the reason why. Appendix B shows one student's comment protocol.

Reflective Listening Exercise 2: Editing and Redoing Conversations

This activity was conducted in two stages. First, after the listener had finished the comment protocol, she wrote down ideas for comments she planned to make in the second recording. Then the students recorded the conversation again. The listener was not permitted to refer to notes during the recording. The transcript for this student's second recording is shown in Appendix C.

After the second recording, the speaker who told the story listened back to the conversation, transcribed it, and noted spots in the conversation where she had failed to respond to listener conversational cues. The aim of this activity was to further improve the reciprocity of the interaction, so that not only did the listener respond to the speakers' talk, but the speaker also managed to pause in her storytelling to respond to the listener's comments. After completing this review, the students recorded the conversation for a third and final time. Appendix D shows the student-transcription of the final conversation.

Speaking Exam: Preplanning Limitations and Blend of Self- and Teacher-Evaluation

The evaluation for the speaking exam was done in two stages. First, the students transcribed their conversations and, using Francis and Hunston's (1992) rank-scale, identified types, number, and mean-length of listener acts (see Speaking Exam section below). Then I checked the data and assigned a number score of between 60 and 100 based on how well each student met the evaluation criteria enumerated above (see Speaking Exam Format and Evaluation Criteria). Students recorded eight

storytelling conversations in two 90-minute classes at the end of the semester for the speaking exam. For two of the recordings (one as speaker, one as listener) they were allowed to choose the topic and partner and practice the conversation before the exam, while the other three partners and topics were assigned by me at the start of the exam. The amount of planning and rehearsing that was permitted students before recording was incrementally reduced in the four conversation recordings. The topics and partners were chosen to ensure that they met the following conditions:

Recording 1: Speaker and listener had previously recorded together on same topic. (Retelling of same story with same partner.)

Recording 2: Both speaker and listener had recorded on the topic but with different partners.

Recording 3: The speaker had recorded with a different partner on that topic but the listener had not recorded on this topic before.

Recording 4: Students were assigned a partner with whom they had not recorded any conversations during the semester and given a random story topic.

Measuring Listener Participation: Student-Compiled Data

To measure improvements in listener participation and speaker response to listener cues, the students compiled data based on their conversation transcripts. I subsequently checked the data. (The results needed some adjustments in the data originally reported by the students and will be discussed later.) The data measuring listener participation included *ratio of listener back-channeling acts to comment acts*, *ratio of basic comment to advanced*

comment acts and *mean word-length of comment acts*. In addition, as a way to measure effectiveness of listeners' use of clarifying cues, students identified points in each conversation where they had not understood something their partner had said. This was then used to calculate the *ratio of the number of times students noted inability to understand the speaker to the number of successful clarifications*. Finally as a way to measure reciprocity, the *ratio of acknowledged to unacknowledged comment moves* was calculated.

Findings: Speaking Exam Results

The students transcribed only the four conversations they participated in as listener. The first three ratios were based on student counts of their moves, classification of them as back-channeling or comment, and advanced or basic comments. The listener also noted parts in each of the four conversations where they had not understood what their partner said to calculate comprehension breakdown to successful clarification ratio. Finally, the listener identified instances in each conversation of acknowledged and unacknowledged comment cues.

Teacher Verification and Adjustment of Student-Reported Data

The following error-distribution in counting and classify-ing acts were found. Thirty-two percent of students in the first semester and 27 percent in the second semester confused moves with acts, resulting in undercounts of the total number of listener-acts. Twelve percent of first-semester and 9 percent of second-semester students incorrectly classified comment acts as backchanneling, resulting in undercounts of comment acts in both semesters. Ten percent of first-semester and 8 percent of second-semester students incorrectly identified basic comment acts as advanced, resulting in over-counts of advanced acts in both semesters.

I collected the students' transcriptions and the results of each of the five measurements and determined the mean for each of the measurements. The results for the two semesters of the study are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

First-Semester Findings

The results for the first semester of the study showed sharply different levels of listener participation between the first recording and the remaining three. The first conversation was recorded with a high degree of planning; the two partners had already recorded on this same topic previously. Having already worked through negotiation of meaning and clarification in the initial recordings, the listeners reported no instances of commu-nication breakdown in their re-recording on the speaking exam. As the degree of preplanning was reduced in each successive recording, the mean number of listener acts (obtained by add-ing together the backchanneling and comment acts) decreased steadily from 27 to 22 to 18 to 15, and the listener used fewer comment and more backchanneling acts. The mean ratio of backchanneling to comment acts and of basic to advanced comment acts also shifted towards the less active end of the continuum. The mean word-length of listener comment acts also decreased (the latter uptick resulting from fewer comment moves). The incidence of listener comprehension-breakdown in the second through fourth recordings averaged between 3 and 4, and in each the listener was unable to use clarifying cues to negotiate meaning with the speaker. Finally, in the ratio of acknowledged to unacknowledged listener comment cues, the number of unacknowledged cues averaged between 3 and 4, while the number of acknowledged cues declined from 2 to between 1 and 0.

Table 1. Mean Results for Five Measurements of Four Recordings (First-Semester Exam)

Type of measurement	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Listener backchanneling to comment acts ratio	15:12	12:10	12:6	10:5
Basic to advanced comment acts ratio	10:2	8:2	5:1	4:1
Comment act mean word-length	3.5	2.8	2.6	2.7
Comprehension breakdown to successful clarification ratio	0:0	3:0	3:0	4:0
Acknowledged to unacknowledged comment ratio	2:4	1:3	0:4	1:4

Second-Semester Findings

There was greater listener-participation across the five measurements in the second-semester group of students who had regularly done the two reflective-listening exercises. As the degree of preplanning was reduced in each successive recording, the number of listener acts decreased slightly from 35 to 31 to 29 to 28, a much smaller decrease than in the first-semester group. The decline in the mean number of comment acts, from 18 to 14, was smaller in the second-semester group than the first-semester group's 13 to 5. The mean number of advanced active-listening comments the listeners were able to use decreased over the four recordings, but the mean number of advanced comments was higher in each recording compared to the first-semester group. Even with no preplanning (fourth exam), students were still able to produce a mean of 3 advanced comments, compared to just one comment for the first-semester group. As with the first-semester group, there was a decline in the mean word-length of listener comment acts, but the mean for all four recordings was higher than in the first-semester group. The mean number of successful clarifications during instances of reported communication breakdown was also higher, averaging between 2 and 3 in the second group compared with 0 in the first. Finally, in the ratio of acknowledged to unacknowledged listener comment cues, the number of acknowledged cues averaged between 4 and 3 in the second-semester group compared with between 2 and 0 in the first-semester group.

Table 2. Mean Results for Five Measurements of Four Recordings (Second-Semester Exam)

Type of measurement	First	Second	Third	Fourth
Listener backchanneling to comment acts ratio	17:18	16:15	15:14	14:14
Basic to advanced comment acts ratio	12:6	10:5	10:4	11:3
Comment act mean word length	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.5
Comprehension breakdown to successful clarification ratio	0:0	3:2	3:2	3:3
Acknowledged to unacknowledged comment ratio	4:1	3:3	3:2	4:1

Discussion

The findings obtained in the study provided evidence to help answer each of three research questions raised at the outset of the paper. The first question concerned ability to use the comment and clarifying strategies in unrehearsed conversation. Comparison of the first-semester control groups' exam results for the first recording (rehearsed) with the other three recordings (unrehearsed) revealed a sharp decline in all of the measures of strategy use, suggesting that explicit instruction and regular recording alone were not sufficient to enable students to use the strategies in unrehearsed conversations. The second question dealt with the impact of reduced planning on the turn-taking dynamic. In the first-semester exams, the decline in both the absolute number of comments and the ratio of basic to advanced comments as well as the rise in both unsuccessful clarification cues and unacknowledged comment cues suggested that reduced planning sharply diminished the contribution of the listener to the conversation. The final research question looked at the impact of regular reflective listening activities on students' ability to use the strategies. The higher degree of listener participation across all four measurements in the second-semester students' recordings suggested that those students' regular performance of reflective-listening activities such as writing comments, editing conversations, and redoing conversations had a positive impact on students' ability to use the target strategies.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the current study. The decision to base the findings on student-compiled data raises questions concerning the reliability of the findings. While the different categories were carefully defined and repeatedly discussed and practiced with students, individual perceptions of what constituted a countable move, or which type of move it was, were subject to some degree of imprecision and error. While the author checked all of the students' data, there is a need to establish reliability estimates for the data obtained. The criteria for determining what was an unacknowledged cue was necessarily subjective as it was based on each individual listener's sense of which of their own cues called for some kind of acknowledgement from the speaker and which were more naturally passed over by the speaker without sacrificing the reciprocity that made for satisfying interaction. Finally, the relatively small student population and their high proficiency-level makes it difficult to infer a general efficacy of reflective-listening exercises in improving listener-participation.

Conclusion

The findings in the current study suggest that the study group's ability to use the active-listening strategies in unrehearsed conversations was improved by the reflective-listening activities and the student analysis of their own transcribed conversations using the rank scale of spoken discourse in the Francis and Hunston (1992) framework. The wide disparity between the first rehearsed recording and the other three unrehearsed ones in the control group's ability to use the various conversation skills was not seen in the study group's exam results. In the three recordings where the students had not recorded together, the frequency of listener response acts, ratio of comment to backchanneling acts, and ratio of advanced to basic comment acts was consistent with the first recording. Listeners also had a similar rate of success in using clarifying cues to repair comprehension breakdown and receiving speaker acknowledgement to their comment-cues.

Student feedback suggested that the reflective-listening exercises were helpful in raising the awareness of both speakers and listeners in ways to maintain speaker-listener reciprocity. Listen-

ers commented that transcribing, editing, and redoing their conversations helped them understand the advanced comment cues and how to use them and also helped them more assertively signal comprehension breakdown. The speakers similarly commented that the editing exercise helped them notice and respond to the signals better.

Future research should test the findings with a larger student group. Further, students' perceptions of how to distinguish between cues that need speaker acknowledgement and those that can be passed should be explored in greater detail. Finally, larger samples of transcribed student conversations might prove fruitful in developing a comprehensive corpus of EFL learner language so that patterns in speaker and listener interaction could be studied in greater depth.

References

Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research, 15*, 479-507.

Brazil, D. (1995). *Classroom and spoken discourse*. Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham Press.

Collins, W., & Ruhl, D. M. (2008). Speaking and listening skills through storytelling, talking journals, and active listening. In K. Bradford Watts, T. Muller, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT2007 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Francis, G., and Hunston, S. (1992) Analyzing everyday conversation. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Hyvärinen, M. (2008). Analyzing narratives and story-telling. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & Brannen, J. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social research methods*. London. Sage.

Hutchby, I., and Wooffitt, R. (1998). Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications. Oxford: Polity Press.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*, 366-72.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics 23*, 323-347.

Ogasawara, S. (in press). G-TELP Kokusai eiken ni yoru TOEIC sukoa no yosoku —G-TELP reberu 3 ni yoru yosokusiki no sakusei to kousatu [An inquiry into developing a formula for estimating TOEIC scores based on G-TELP scores]. In Yamasaki Tosihiko sensei go tainin kinen ronbun syu [A collection of articles commemorating the retirement of Professor Toshihiko Yamaoka]. Tokyo: Kairyudo.

Rost, M. (2002). Teaching and researching listening. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Washburn, N., & Christianson, K. (1996). Teaching conversation strategies through pair-taping. *Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Christianson-PairTaping.html

Young, R. F. (2008). *Language and interaction: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

Appendix A
Speaking Exam Story Topics Sampling

1. Tell me about a time you had a big change in your life,
2. A memory or experience that meant a lot to you
3. A scary experience you had
4. A time you pushed yourself to do something you didn't think you could do
5. A time you thought "I know I shouldn't do this but . . ."

Appendix B

Sample Student Comment Protocol

Note. The points where the listener didn't understand a word were left blank by the student. For convenience these parts are inserted into the listener's transcription based on the speaker's transcription. Comments made by the listener are shaded. They were originally in Japanese and have been translated.

A: I remember a great day I had

B: Uh-huh?

A: It's a precious memory for me.

B: Oh, that's good!

A: A few years ago I visited my grandfather with my family during summer vacation.

B: ----------------------[My partner seemed to be concentrating and I didn't want to disturb her so I hesitated.]

A: The day was special because it was his birthday.

B: Birthday? Ohh, that's nice.

A: So I thought I wanted to do something special for him.

B: Oh I see.

A: My grandfather is a farmer.

B: Oh farmer? [I couldn't think of a comment. My partner seemed to be concentrating and didn't notice.]

A: So I helped him with his farming.

B: Oh that's nice!

A: His farm was very large and he was growing a variety of vegetables and fruits.

B: Ohhh. Uh-huh. [I didn't understand well what my partner said, but thought I should say something.]

A: He told me to cut watermelons with him.

B: Oh yeah? [I couldn't think of a comment.]

A: He seemed so happy because he wanted to work in the field with me.

B: Uh-huh.

A: He knocked watermelons before he cut.

B: Not? [I didn't understand a word.]

A: I thought it was strange and asked him why he knocked them.

B: Uh-huh.

A: He answered, "When I knock them and heard good sound, they are fit to eat."

B: Oh, I see. [I couldn't understand well, but I had some idea about the general meaning.]

A: Yes. So I thought farming is interesting.

B: Yes, I think so too.

A: Then I cut them and we brought them to the market.

B: Market? Uh-huh.

A: When we got to the market I was surprised it was very lively.

B: Lively? [I wasn't sure about word, but I had some idea.]

A: He was spoken to many people and introduced me to them gladly.

B: Oh, nice.

A: I was also happy.

B: Yeah.

A: The watermelons were displayed near the front.

B: Oh that's good.

A: Right away customer bought one of them.

B: Oh really? That's great!

A: When I saw the watermelons bought, I was very happy.

B: Yes, that's happy!

A: He was happy too.

B: Yeah? [I wanted to say more but couldn't think what to say.]

A: Now I live in Nagasaki, so I rarely see him.

B: Oh yeah? That's too bad.

A: But I hear he is fine.

B: Oh that's good.

A: I want him to come to Nagasaki and I will show him various places.

B: That sounds nice!

Appendix C

Redo 1 (Conversation Recorded After Listener's Edit)

Note. Additions by the listener are shaded.

A: I remember a great day I had

B: Uh-huh?

A: It's a precious memory for me.

B: Oh, please tell me!

A: A few years ago I visited my grandfather with my family during summer vacation.

B: Oh you did? That's nice.

A: The day was special because it was his birthday.

B: Birthday? Ohh, that's nice.

A: So I thought I wanted to do something special for him.

B: Oh I see.

A: My grandfather is a farmer.

B: Oh farmer? My grandfather is a farmer too. [Personalizing]

A: So I helped him with his farming.

B: Oh that's nice! I guess he was very happy. [Speculating]

A: His farm was very large and he was growing a variety of vegetables and fruits.

B: Oh he was? Wow!

A: He told me to cut watermelons with him.

B: Oh yeah? So how did that go?

A: He seemed so happy because he wanted to work in the field with me.

B: Uh-huh.

A: He knocked watermelons before he cut.

B: He not?

A: Yes.

B: What's not?

A: Knocked! [gesture]:

B: Ohh, I see. Knocked?

A: Yes. I thought it was strange and asked him why he knocked them.

B: Uh-huh.

A: He answered, "When I knock them and heard good sound, they are fit to eat."

B: Oh, I see. They are fit to eat.

A: So I thought farming is interesting.

B: Yes, I think so too.

A: Then I cut them and we brought them to the market.

B: Market? Uh-huh.

A: When we got to the market I was surprised it was very lively.

B: <u>Lively? What's lively?</u>

A: Um, many customers.

B: <u>Oh, I see. Lively?</u>

A: Yes. He was spoken to many people and introduced me to them gladly.

B: I bet he was proud of you. [Speculating]

A: I was also happy.

B: Yeah.

A: The watermelons were displayed near the front.

B: Oh they were? That's good.

A: Right away customer bought one of them

B: Oh really? That's great!

A: When I saw the watermelons bought, I was very happy.

B: Yes, I bet you were! [Speculating]

A: He was happy too.

B: Yes, I guess he was. [Speculating]

A: Now I live in Nagasaki, so I rarely see him.

B: Oh yeah? That's too bad.

A: But I hear he is fine.

B: Oh that's good.

A: I want him to come to Nagasaki and I will show him various places.

B: That sounds nice!

Appendix D

Redo 2 (Conversation Recorded After Speaker's Edit)

Note. The places where the speaker responded to listener cues are shaded. Listener moves are noted in boldface: the number of the move, [the number of words for each move], and (the type of move). BC = backchanneling.

A: I remember a great day I had

B: Uh-huh? **1 [1] (BC)**

A: It's a precious memory for me.

B: Oh, please tell me! **(meta-move)**

A: A few years ago I visited my grandfather with my family during summer vacation.

B: Oh you did? **2 [3] (BC)** That's nice. **3 [2] (comment)**

A: The day was special because it was his birthday.

B: Birthday? **4 [1] (BC)** Ohh, that's nice. **5 [3] (comment)**

A: So I thought I wanted to do something special for him.

B: Oh I see. **6 [3] (BC)**

A: My grandfather is a farmer.

B: Oh farmer? **7 [2] (BC)** My grandfather is a farmer too. **8 [6] (comment)**

A: Ohh really?

B: Yeah! **9 [1] [1] (BC)**

A: So I helped him with his farming.

B: Oh that's nice! **10 [3] (comment)** I guess he was very happy. **11 [6] (comment)**

A: Yes, he was. His farm was very large and he was growing a variety of vegetables and fruits.

B: Oh he was? **12 [3] (BC)** Wow! **13 [1] (comment)**

A: He told me to cut watermelons with him.

B: Oh yeah? **14 [1] (BC)** So how did that go? **15 [5] (question)**

A: Good. He seemed so happy because he wanted to work in the field with me.

B: Uh-huh. **16 [1] (BC)**

A: He knocked watermelons before he cut.

B: He knocked? **17 [2] (clarifying)**

A: Yes. I thought it was strange and asked him why he knocked them.

B: Uh-huh. **18 [1] (BC)**

A: He answered, "When I knock them and heard good sound, they are fit to eat."

B: Oh, I see. **19 [3] (BC)** I've heard it's important to check fruit before eating. [Generalizing] **20 [9] (comment)**

A: Yes. So I thought farming is interesting.

B: Yes, I think so too. **21[5] (comment)**

A: Then I cut them and we brought them to the market.

B: Market? **22 [1] (BC)** Uh-huh. **23 [1] (BC)**

A: When we got to the market I was surprised it was very lively.

B: Yes, sometimes markets are very lively. [Generalizing] **24 [6] (comment)**

A: He was spoken to many people and introduced me to them gladly.

B: I bet he was proud of you. [Speculating] **25 [7] (comment)**

A: I was also happy.

B: Yeah. **26 [1] (BC)**

A: The watermelons were displayed near the front.

B: Oh they were? **27 [3] (BC)** That's good. **28 [2] (comment)**

A: Right away customer bought one of them

B: Oh really? **29 [2] (BC)** That's great! **30 [2] (comment)**

A: When I saw the watermelons bought, I was very happy.

B: Yes, I bet you were! [Speculating] **31 [5] (comment)**

A: He was happy too.

B: Yes, I guess he was. [Speculating] **32 [5] (comment)**

A: Now I live in Nagasaki, so I rarely see him.

B: Oh yeah? **33 [2] (BC)** That's too bad. **34 [3] (comment)**

A: But I hear he is fine.

B: Oh that's good. **35 [3] (comment)**

A: I want him to come to Nagasaki and I will show him various places.

B: That sounds nice! **36 [3] (comment)**