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Active learning can be promoted by introducing activities that encourage negotiation of meaning among Japanese EFL learners. Negotiation of meaning is defined as interlocutors’ endeavors to repair communication problems through the use of a variety of communication strategies such as comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests. Empirical studies suggest that communication strategies are teachable at least to a certain degree. The author designed four kinds of information-gap activities and tested them in eight classes (N = 54). Although some forms of negotiation of meaning were observed in every class, especially after the teacher’s feedback, students did not always use the strategies after the training. A questionnaire revealed that some students think negotiation of meaning is difficult. Others are afraid of annoying their interlocutors by negotiating meaning. Analyzing cultural and psychological barriers might offer a new avenue for developing students’ ability to use communication strategies.

Active learning can be promoted by introducing activities that encourage negotiation of meaning among Japanese EFL learners. Negotiation of meaning is defined as interlocutors’ endeavors to repair communication problems through the use of a variety of communication strategies such as comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests. Empirical studies suggest that communication strategies are teachable at least to a certain degree. The author designed four kinds of information-gap activities and tested them in eight classes (N = 54). Although some forms of negotiation of meaning were observed in every class, especially after the teacher’s feedback, students did not always use the strategies after the training. A questionnaire revealed that some students think negotiation of meaning is difficult. Others are afraid of annoying their interlocutors by negotiating meaning. Analyzing cultural and psychological barriers might offer a new avenue for developing students’ ability to use communication strategies.

The students’ aversion to engaging in conversation can be attributed to an over-focus on grammatical accuracy and translation in pre-tertiary EFL classrooms, which in turn comes from a heavy emphasis on preparation to pass difficult examinations at the secondary school level (Cook, 2009; Underwood, 2012). Understandably, students may be afraid to experiment even with the language that they do have, let alone with new things they are learning, in order to communicate. As such, they tend to be obsessed with speaking with correct grammar and feel responsible when they fail to make themselves understood. Teachers, on the other hand, often do not teach what to do when there is a communication breakdown. As a result, students lack practice in the act of negotiating meaning (Foster, 1998), of checking and clarifying what they say to each other, in order to achieve mutual understanding.

Fundamental to communicative language teaching (CLT) is the theory of communicative competence, set forth prominently by Hymes (1972). One component of the communicative competence model proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) is strategic competence. As Dörnyei and Thurrell (1991, p.16) observed, “The lack of fluency or conversational skills that students often complain about is, to a considerable extent, due to the underdevelopment of strategic competence.” They pointed out Tarone and...
Yule's (1989) observation that “there are few, if any, materials available at present that teach learners how to use communication strategies when problems are encountered in the process of transmitting information” (pp. 114-115), and argued for the inclusion of explicit training in communication strategies (CSs) as part of EFL classroom routines.

The underdevelopment of strategic competence is especially true in Japan, where most pre-university classroom time is spent developing grammatical competence, another component of Canale & Swain's (1980) model. A great deal of research has been devoted to CLT, including in the particular context of Japan (see e.g., Butler, 2011; Kavanagh, 2012; Sakui, 2004), and considerable literature on CSs points out the benefits of strategy training in classrooms (see e.g., Faucette, 2001; Lam, 2006; Naughton; 2006; Willems, 1987). There is, however, very little literature like Dörnyei and Thurrell's (1991) that offers detailed activity ideas for CS training, particularly ones suited for lower level learners in Japanese universities. This paper is an attempt to fill this gap by detailing activities that promote the use of CSs and negotiation of meaning in Japanese university EFL classes that focus on student–student discussion.

English Discussion Class (EDC) is a compulsory 28-week course using a communicative approach for all 1st-year students at a private university located in Tokyo, Japan. Although students learn phrases for negotiation of meaning called communication skills (see Figure 1) at the beginning of the course and are encouraged to use them in every lesson, they often do not try to understand their peers even when there is an apparent communication breakdown.

In order to respond to this problem, the following hands-on activities were designed. They were equipped with mechanisms that prompt students to negotiate for meaning when they have communication problems. Because these activities do not require special preparation or training other than activity cards and need less than 10 minutes to implement, they can contribute to improving teacher efficacy especially for less experienced teachers. Moreover, these activities heighten learner agency by helping learners engage in communication more proactively.

**Negotiation Strategies**

Negotiation of meaning is defined as interlocutors’ endeavor to repair communication problems “by engaging in interactional work to secure mutual understanding” (Ellis 2015, p. 322). Negotiation of meaning is carried out by using a variety of CSs. Long (1983) classified these strategies into three categories: comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests. Comprehension checks are used when speakers attempt to ensure if other people have understood what has just been said. Confirmation checks help confirm listeners' own understanding of what other people have said. Clarification requests are made when listeners need more information to understand what others have said. As well as comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests, Ellis (2008) includes recast, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and explicit correction as negotiation strategies. Table 1 is the list of negotiation strategies suggested by Long (1983) and Ellis (2008) contrasted with EDC Communication Skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>Asking for repetition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you explain ...?</td>
<td>Could you repeat that, please?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does (X) mean?</td>
<td>Could you say that again, please?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. EDC communication skills. Reprinted with permission from Brereton, Lesley, Schaefer, & Young, 2018.*
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| Table 1. Long’s and Ellis’s Negotiation Strategies Compared With EDC Communication Skills |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Long’s and Ellis’s negotiation strategies | Equivalent communication skills taught in EDC | Examples |
| Comprehension check | Comprehension | “Do you follow me?” |
| Confirmation check | Paraphrasing | “Do you mean X?” |
| Clarification requests | Clarification | “Can you explain?” |
| Repetition | NA | A: “Effectly.” B: “Effectly?” |
| Elicitation | NA | A: “More ‘hoikuen’ is ...” B: “More nurseries are ...?” |
| Explicit correction | NA | A: “More ‘hoikuen’ is necessary.” B: “Oh, more nurseries are necessary.” |

Note. Negotiation strategies are taken from Long (1983) and Ellis (2008). EDC = English Discussion Class.

By employing negotiation strategies, second language learners are expected to adjust their speech and are also able to receive more comprehensible input. According to Long’s (1983, 1996) interaction hypothesis, learners acquire a second language best by receiving interactionally modified input; that is, when negotiation of meaning occurs.

Teachability of Negotiation of Meaning

There are two competing claims for and against the teachability of CSs. Dissenting views include Bialystok’s (1990) “What one must teach students of a language is not strategy, but language” (p. 147) and Kellerman’s (1991) “Teach the learners more language and let the strategies look after themselves” (p. 158). These claims, however, are not supported by empirical research as Yule and Tarone (1997) pointed out. On the other hand, there are several empirical studies that argued for the effectiveness of teaching CSs. Following are three such studies that focused on the teachability of negotiation of meaning among others.

Dörnyei (1995) argued that teaching CSs is not just about passing on information. He reported a study that investigated the effects of teaching three kinds of CSs including circumlocution (paraphrase) to high school students in Hungary. The training included awareness-raising discussions, explicit strategy teaching, and practice activities. For example, students compared and discussed various dictionary definitions for a word (awareness raising). Then, they were asked to describe objects and later more abstract notions (practice activities). The posttraining results showed a significant improvement in both quality and quantity of strategy use by the treatment group.

Nakatani (2005) examined how Japanese college students changed their use of CSs after receiving explicit oral communication strategy instructions including negotiation of meaning and reflecting on their strategy use in every lesson. The results showed that the students significantly increased their use of negotiation strategies compared to a control group and significantly improved their proficiency in oral communication tests. He also found that the students who received training made longer utterances and modified their speech to achieve comprehension.

Rabab’ah (2016) provided communication strategy training to university students in Jordan. The training included explicitly teaching oral CSs and certain phrases, matching words and their definitions, guessing words, and role play. The posttests showed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in the use of circumlocution (paraphrase), appeal for help, asking for repetition, and self-repair. However, no significant differences were found between the two groups in the use of clarification requests, confirmation requests, and guessing strategies. Another finding was that the training enabled students to try out their hypotheses about language as well as solve communication problems.

The above studies suggest that CSs are teachable at least to a certain degree. In view of these empirically supported insights, the present study suggests the use of various tasks to teach negotiation of meaning.
Using Tasks

Tasks are defined as activities that require “learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective” (Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001). There have been a number of studies conducted to investigate the negotiation of meaning that occurred during tasks. Although there are a variety of tasks, it has been found that some kinds of tasks encourage more negotiation of meaning than others. For example, pair work and group work promote more negotiation of meaning than teacher-fronted instruction (Doughty & Pica 1986; Johnson, 1995; Long & Porter, 1985; Pica & Doughty 1985).

Two-way tasks, which require information exchange in both directions, induce more negotiation of meaning than one-way tasks with mono-directional information flow (Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987). Likewise, closed tasks, which require learners to reach a single and correct solution or a limited set of solutions, provide more opportunities for negotiation of meaning than open tasks with no determined solution (Loschky & Bley-Vroman, 1993; Pica, Holiday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989; Plough & Gass, 1993).

Activities

In order to promote negotiation of meaning among students, I designed four kinds of task activities and tested them in eight English discussion classes in the last lesson of the year as a review of EDC Communication Skills (negotiation of meaning). The participants were 54 first-year university students (29 male and 25 female) enrolled in a private university in Tokyo, Japan. Their English proficiency ranged from 180 to 655 on TOEIC. All the participants gave informed consent, and the project was cleared with the university’s institutional review board. Teacher’s notes were kept in every class to record students’ use of negotiation of meaning and other observations.

The activities used in this study are information-gap tasks. An information-gap task is characterized by several features: Only one outcome or answer is considered possible, appropriate, or correct and reaching it requires a verbal exchange of information among task participants (Ellis, 2003; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun cited in Pica, 2005). As all activities use only picture cards without words, they are adaptable to learners of any age group and of any English level. The level of English needed to describe the pictures, however, needs to be controlled so that it is slightly above the learners’ actual English levels. This is because the purpose of these activities is to encourage negotiation of meaning. If learners can describe everything easily and understand everything their partners say without trouble, negotiation of meaning can hardly be expected to occur. For example, the English level needed to describe the pictures in Appendix A is a little over that of university students with TOEIC scores of 300-500, but they are too easy for university students with TOEIC scores over 600. It is also important that the original pictures are recognizable to the learners when they see them at the end of the activity. For example, university students who have lived in European countries would easily understand the picture in Appendix C, but young students who have been brought up in Japan probably would not understand what they are doing. Each activity needs about 10 minutes for instruction, implementation, and teacher feedback. It is also possible to use two different sets of cards or two different activities in the test-teach-test teaching method, with a feedback session in the middle. Test-teach-test is a teaching method where “learners first complete a task or activity without help from the teacher. Then, based on the problems seen, the teacher plans and presents the target language. Then the learners do another task to practice the new language” [British Council, n.d.]. In such cases, it should take about 15 minutes for the whole process.

Activity 1: Spot the Difference

In this activity, students try to identify the differences between two pictures while looking at only one picture.

Preparation

Prepare a set of picture cards (Cards A and B: refer to Appendix A) for each pair of students. The two pictures should look similar to each other, but not be exactly the same. Suitable pictures may be found online and in commercially available activity books. Alternatively, teachers can create their own picture cards. One way of making them is to draw any picture on a piece of paper, make a photocopy, and add or erase some parts of the original drawing. Another idea is to arrange many things on a table, take a picture of it, rearrange them, and take a picture again.

Procedure

Step 1: Put students into pairs.
Step 2: Give instructions to the students.
• Students in the same pair will get similar but different pictures.
• Each pair should find as many differences as possible between the pictures.
• Students should not show their pictures to each other.
• Students can only use English.
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- Students should not use gestures.
- Students have 5 minutes for the activity.

Step 3: Give a different card to each student in each pair.

Step 4: After 5 minutes, stop the activity and ask how many differences they have found.

Step 5: Allow students to quickly compare the pictures by showing them to each other.

Step 6: Give feedback on the use of negotiation of meaning and any other language items as needed.

Activity 2: Jigsaw Storytelling
In this activity, students have different parts of a four-frame comic strip. They alternately explain the pictures, trying to tell a story together.

Preparation
Prepare a set of picture cards by cutting a four-frame comic strip into two (Cards A and B: refer to Appendix B). When choosing a story, the more difficult for students to guess the whole story, the more negotiation of meaning should occur. According to Robinson (2001), more cognitively complex interactive tasks are likely to prompt comprehension difficulty, thus leading to greater amounts of negotiation of meaning. Suitable pictures may be found online and in commercially available comic books. Make sure to choose picture-only comic strips because when there are words, students tend to depend on them and do not try to describe the situation using their own resources. Although students generally enjoy working on comic strips with a twist ending, any sequence of pictures can be used. For example, it is possible to use parts of furniture assembly instructions without showing the final product and have students guess what it will become.

Procedure
Step 1: Put students into pairs.
Step 2: Give instructions to the students.
  - Students in the same pair will get different parts of the same picture story.
  - Students explain the picture to each other to find out what the whole story is.
  - Students should not show their pictures to each other.

Activity 3: Half-Picture Info Gap
In this activity, each student gets only half of the original picture. They explain their picture to each other trying to figure out together what the original picture was.

Preparation
Prepare a set of picture cards by cutting a picture into two (Cards A and B: refer to Appendix C). The picture can be cut in half horizontally or vertically or any other way. Just make sure to cut it so that it is difficult for both students to guess what the whole picture is. Please note, however, it is more difficult to find suitable pictures for this activity than other activities because the picture should not make sense when cut in half, and it should make sense when put together. Certain kinds of nonsense illustrations, surrealist paintings, and pictures of unique inventions can be used for this activity. Alternatively, a picture may be cut out into a very complicated shape (for example, a twelve-rayed star shape) so that the whole picture cannot be easily guessed.

Procedure
Step 1: Put students into pairs.
Step 2: Give instructions to the students.
  - Students in the same pair will get half of the same picture.
  - Students explain the picture to each other to find out what the whole picture is.
  - Students should not show their pictures to each other.
  - Students can only use English.
  - Students should not use gestures.
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- Students have 5 minutes for the activity.
- Step 3: Give a different card to each student in each pair.
- Step 4: After 5 minutes, stop the activity and ask the students what they think the picture is.
- Step 5: Allow students to quickly show the pictures to each other.
- Step 6: Give feedback on the use of negotiation of meaning and any other language items as needed.

Activity 4: Back-to-Back Drawing
In this activity, students sit back-to-back. One of them describes a picture while the other one tries to draw it.

Preparation
Prepare a picture card (refer to Appendix D) and a piece of paper. The picture should not be too simple so that students need to make an effort to describe it. For example, pictures of several objects in complicated positional relationships and pictures of objects in unusual shapes are suitable for this activity. Line drawings in black and white are more suitable than photographs.

Procedure
Step 1: Put students into pairs.
Step 2: Give instructions to the students.
- In each pair, one student gets a picture card and another one gets a piece of paper.
- Students sit back-to-back.
- The student with a picture card describes the picture. The student with a piece of paper draws a picture according to their partner’s description.
- Students should not show their pictures to each other.
- Students can only use English.
- Students have 5 minutes for the activity.

Step 3: Give a picture card to one student and a piece of paper to the other student in each pair.
Step 4: After 5 minutes, stop the activity and ask the students to show their pictures to each other.

Step 5: Give feedback on the use of negotiation of meaning and any other language items as needed.

Discussion
Students’ Use of Negotiation of Meaning
Overall, students seemed to be actively engaged in the activities. Picture-only activity cards were easily accepted by the students who usually seemed reluctant to read English. Some forms of negotiation of meaning were observed in every class. For example, repetition and confirmation checks (paraphrasing others) were observed in all eight classes, and comprehension checks were spotted in four classes. In the four classes where two activities with teacher feedback in between (test-teach-test teaching approach) were used, more instances of negotiation of meaning were recorded in the teacher’s notes in the second activity than in the first activity. This may be because the feedback raised awareness of negotiation strategies among students. My feedback included an example of students’ interaction, how negotiation of meaning helped them out of communication breakdown, and what other expressions can be used in more formal occasions (see Figure 2).

Reasons Why Students Do Not Use Negotiation of Meaning
Although many students used some kind of negotiation strategies during the information-gap activities, the next challenge is how to get students to internalize the
strategies and get them to actually use them when they communicate in other classroom activities, for example, peer-peer discussions. Despite the fact that these students had learned negotiation of meaning phrases (communication skills) at the beginning of the semester, many of them did not always use them even when they experienced communication breakdowns. If that is the case, knowing the reasons why they do not sometimes use strategies might help design a whole course of communication strategy training. With this in mind, I administered a short questionnaire to students in eight classes in the last lesson of the semester (see Appendix E for the questionnaire). A total of 53 students responded to the questionnaire, which asked how often students use communication skills and why they do not always use the skills for five kinds of negotiation strategies: checking understanding (comprehension check as a speaker), saying that you do not understand (comprehension as a listener), paraphrasing others (confirmation as a listener), paraphrasing yourself (confirmation as a speaker), and clarification (as a listener).

The results of the questionnaire showed that the majority of the students (79%) said they always or often use comprehension checks as a speaker. For the other strategies (comprehension checks as a listener, paraphrasing others, paraphrasing yourself, and clarification), however, the number of students who sometimes use and rarely use the strategies exceeded the number of students who always or often use them. The major reason for not using paraphrasing others, paraphrasing yourself, and clarification was “It is difficult to use the skill.” This indicates strategy training may be effective to acquire these kinds of skills. What is worth noting is that some students answered that they do not use some strategies because they are afraid others would be annoyed if they used them. For example, 25% gave this reason for not saying, “Sorry, I don’t understand.” Further, 23% cited this reason for not using clarification requests. There could be cultural and psychological reasons behind these responses that are worth further examination.

Conclusion

The hands-on activities for EFL teachers to readily teach CSs and to promote negotiation of meaning outlined in this paper are a tentative realization of MEXT’s vision for active learning in classrooms. These activities allow for raising awareness, encouraging students to be willing to take risks, teaching CSs directly, and providing opportunities for practicing strategies. By using these activities, it is possible to increase the students’ use of CSs at least temporarily. The next challenge is how to have students continue to use CSs effectively in communication elsewhere. The survey revealed that the major reason for students not using paraphrasing and clarification was that they thought these skills were difficult. There is scope for designing other types of CS training. Another finding was that a certain number of students did not use some strategies because they were afraid others might be annoyed if they used them. Given this, future directions could include analyzing the cultural and psychological barriers that might prevent students from using the CSs, changing the task complexity according to students’ ability and interests, and developing a syllabus that is focused on expanding and practicing students’ repertoire of CSs.
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Appendix A
Example of Picture Cards for Spot the Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card A</th>
<th>Card B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Reprinted with permission from Niigata Prefecture. The original images can be found at https://www.pref.niigata.lg.jp/sec/shobo/1356854863978.html


Appendix B
Example of Picture Cards for Jigsaw Storytelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card A</th>
<th>Card B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Card A 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Card B 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Card A 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Card B 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Card A 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Card B 3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Card A 4" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Card B 4" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C
Example of Picture Cards for Half-Picture Info Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card A</th>
<th>Card B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Card A" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Card B" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The original image can be found at https://www.oldbookillustrations.com/illustrations/funeral/

Appendix D
Example of a Picture Card for Back-to-Back Drawing

![Card](image11)
Appendix E
Communication Skills Questionnaire

Communication Skills Questionnaire

1. How often do you use Checking Understanding as a speaker?  回答が難しい場合はいかがでしょうか？

- Do you understand?  おわる\n  1. Always  いつも理解\n  2. Often  もう少し\n  3. Sometimes  すこし\n  4. Rarely  らめたに

If you do not always use the skill, why not?  使用しない理由を教えてください

1. 1. I can't understand the topic.  1. 我かりに\n  2. 2. I don't follow what is being said.  2. よる
  3. 3. The speaker is not clear.  3. よる\n  4. 4. The speaker is not clear.  4. よる\n  5. 5. The speaker is not clear.  5. よる\n  6. 6. The speaker is not clear.  6. よる

2. When you have difficulty understanding each other during the discussions, do you use the following skills?  ディスカッションで、お互いの理解がつがらないときは、以下のようなスキルを使えますか?

(1) Saying that you don't understand.  言っているところがわからないとき\n
- Sorry, I don't understand.  すみません、わかりません
- Sorry, I don't follow you.  すみません、理解できません

Circle one answer.  一番にチェック\n
3. Paraphrasing Yourself  自分の意見を言える

- I mean...  いわが
- What is my saying is...  私の言っていることは...
- In other words...  他に言えるよう
- The opposite way...  反対の

Circle one answer.  一番にチェック

If you do not always use the skill, why not?  使用しない理由を教えてください

1. 1. I want to make clear my point.  1. 引き出す
  2. 2. I want to make clear my point.  2. 引き出す
  3. 3. I want to make clear my point.  3. 引き出す
  4. 4. I want to make clear my point.  4. 引き出す

4. Clarification  詳める

- Can you explain?  詳められ
- What does [X] mean?  [X] とは
- Could you repeat that, please?  詳められる
- Could you say that again, please?  詳められ

Circle one answer.  一番にチェック

If you do not always use the skill, why not?  使用しない理由を教えてください

1. 1. I'm too lazy to use the skill.  1. よる
  2. 2. I'm not very interested in the topic.  2. 聴きな
  3. 3. The speaker is not clear.  3. 聴きな
  4. 4. The speaker is not clear.  4. 聴きな

Please turn over.  次のページに\n
Thank you.