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1. Introduction
Negotiated Interaction
When people sometimes face a communication breakdown in their daily life, they try to fill in the gap by casting clarification requests, i.e., a strategy used to ask for more information when something has not been comprehended (e.g., what did you say?, excuse me?, and you went where?), confirmation checks, i.e., a strategy used to confirm whether messages have been correctly comprehended (e.g., you mean you agree with him? and are you sure you aren’t going?), and comprehension checks, i.e., a strategy used to ensure whether an interlocutor has comprehended (e.g., do you understand what I mean? and do I make sense?) (Long, 1996). People often negotiate for meaning to seek for message comprehensibility and thereby sustain the flow of communication. In fact, interaction of this kind takes place not only in native speaker - native speaker (NS/NS) conversation but also native speaker - nonnative speaker (NS/NNS) and nonnative speaker - nonnative speaker (NNS/NNS) conversation. The following is an example of negotiated interaction (Pica, Young, & 1992a, cited in Pica, 1994, p. 511).

NS: and I have a garage on the side with three little black windows
NNS: three black windows?
NS: you know what a garage is?
NNS: no
NS: um, it’s attached to the house. It’s a building attached to the house in which you keep your cars and called a garage, OK, so it looks like a big house and a little house, but they’re attached
NNS: Oh, it’s a small house.
NS: Uhuh
NNS: Uhuh, and black roof?
NS: Uhuh
NNS: Yeah, oh, maybe, let’s see, yeah, I understand.
Interaction of this kind is known as negotiation, i.e., the act of trying to solve a communication problem occurring in conversation (Long, 1996). Pica (1994) succinctly summarizes that negotiation is “a process in which a listener requests message clarification and confirmation and a speaker follows up these requests, often through repeating, elaborating, or simplifying the original message” (p. 497). The process of negotiation seems to have great potential for language learning in that learners can be involved with significant elements of language learning in the process.

1.2 Elements of Successful Negotiated Interaction

Negotiated interaction involves five significant components that facilitate L2 development: (1) message comprehension; (2) L2 production; (3) selective attention; (4) positive evidence; and (5) negative evidence. First, through interaction learners can expose themselves to a good amount of L2 input provided by their interlocutors. Exposure to input alone, however, cannot necessarily lead learners to understand the meaning of input. In order to proceed on the path of L2 development, learners need to understand what a message means (Krashen, 1985). Negotiated interaction can enable learners to compensate for incomprehensibility of utterances, thereby making incomprehensible input comprehensible (Long, 1981, 1996; Pica, 1994).

In addition to comprehension of L2 meaning, negotiated interaction elicits learners to produce output as well. According to Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989), L2 learners need to have opportunities to produce output in order to “test hypotheses about the second language, experiment with new structures and forms, and expand and exploit their interlanguage resources in creative ways” (p. 64). Swain (1995) also maintains that “output may stimulate learners to move from the semantic, open-ended, nondeterministic, strategic processing prevalent in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production” (p. 128). Interaction involves learners in producing a good amount of output that plays a significant role in SLA.

Selective attention to L2 form is also necessary for learners to process input. Interaction effectively focuses learners’ attention on target forms or mismatches between their interlanguage and the target language (Long, 1996). For instance, Gass and Varonis (1989) present a good example in which interaction successfully enabled a learner to attend to form and notice her error in her interlanguage as opposed to the correct utterance produced by her partner. The learners in the example were given a task in which they were to go out to ask for directions to a train station. Their interaction with strangers was tape-recorded and particular utterances were transcribed as follows (cited in Gass & Varonis, 1994, p. 289):
As indicated above, Ana initially failed to produce the target form three times as in lines a, c, and e. However, she finally altered her erroneous form into the target one as in lines g and i. This example implicitly describes that a learner engaged in interaction first attended to form, noticed a gap between her incorrect form and the target one, and thereby modified her form correctly in the end. That is, in order to modify erroneous forms, learners must first pay attention to form, and notice their errors (Schmidt and Frota, 1986; van Lier, 1996). Gass and Varonis (1994) also argue that negotiations “crucially focus the learner’s attention on the parts of the discourse that are problematic, either from a productive or a receptive point of view” (p. 299). With such selective attention, Ana in the example appeared to notice a mismatch between her form and her partner Keiko’s form somewhere in the process of accomplishing the task.

In this case, Keiko’s utterance played the role of positive evidence, i.e., “models of what is grammatical and acceptable” in the target language (Long, 1996, p. 413). Ana successfully detected an error in her form as opposed to the target form provided by Keiko, winding up incorporating the target form. Thus, negotiated interaction enables learners to attend to form, thereby leading them to notice their erroneous forms.

What is more effective than positive evidence in making learners focus their attention on form is negative evidence, i.e., “information about ungrammaticality” (White, 1991, p. 134). Negative evidence, unlike positive evidence, tells learners what is not possible in the target language. Schachter (1984) also points out that what she calls negative input may cause learners to change their interlanguage hypotheses.

1.3 Corrective Feedback

Negotiated interaction can provide opportunities for learners to obtain both positive and negative evidence. The following is an example in which learners receive both types of evidence (Pica, 1987, p. 6):

- Ana: Can you tell me where is the train station?
- Keiko: Can you tell me where the train station is?
- Ana: Can you tell me where is the train station?
- Keiko: Can you tell me where the train station is?
- Ana: Can you tell me where is the train station?
- Keiko: Can you tell me where the train station is?
- Ana: Can you tell me where the train station is?
- Keiko: Can you tell me where the train station is?
- Ana: Can you tell me where the train station is?
a. NNS: And they have the chwach there.
b. NS: The what?
c. NNS: The chwach – I know someone that –
d. NS: What does it mean?
e. NNS: Like um like American people they always go there every Sunday
f. NS: Yes?
g. NNS: You kn – every morning that there pr – that – the American people get dressed up to got to um chwach.
h. NS: Oh to church – I see.

The NNS learner received negative evidence in lines b and d above. The learner noticed an error “chwach,” tried to negotiate for the meaning of the term in lines c, e, and g. Thanks to negotiation, the interlocutor finally perceived what the word was, giving corrective feedback, i.e., a type of negative evidence including positive evidence in line h.

According to Vigil and Oller (1976), corrective feedback from interlocutors is important for learners’ interlanguage development. Corrective feedback is significant in that it tells learners that utterances produced by them are deviant from the target language and that learners can alter their interlanguage based on the target form included in feedback. In the example above, the native speaker said, “Oh to church” in line h. “Church” is the target form represented by “chwach” in the learner’s output. Importantly, learners first must notice their errors in their interlanguage in order to incorporate the target form (Brock, Crookes, Day, & Long, 1986; Schmidt, 1990; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). Since corrective feedback is aimed at a part of learners’ interlanguage that is deviant from the target language and includes a target form as well, there is a high probability that learners will notice their errors.

1.4 Weakness of Negotiated Interaction

Negotiated interaction is likely to have great potential to have a good effect on L2 learning and pedagogy. However, it doesn’t always function in real life as expected. For one thing, real-life negotiated interaction often doesn’t provide such feedback to learners (Pica, 1994) because participants in normal conversations primarily focus on meaning. If they can understand what the interlocutors are saying, they rarely correct every error they make. As a result, learners tend to fall far short in corrective feedback on their speech in every day interactions.

For another thing, negotiated interaction concerns some types of errors such as lexis and some syntax. Many morphological errors, however, are often not treated in negotiation,
perhaps because they have little influence on the overall meanings of what is said (Brock et al., 1986; Pica, Kanargy, & Falodun, 1993). For example, a learner may say, “I don’t go fishing yesterday.” Although the learner obviously makes a morphological error in the utterance, the error will cause little influence on the interlocutors’ comprehension, with the result of being neglected in interaction.

Obviously, there is a need for more comprehensive research in order to investigate whether it is possible to determine a direct relationship between negotiated interaction and the development of L2 knowledge. Brock et al. (1986) conducted a study to investigate the effect of corrective feedback on learners’ L2 production. They categorized the type of feedback provided by NS interlocutors from explicit corrective feedback and implicit corrective feedback to feedback that suggests incomprehensibility of learners’ utterances. The results of the study showed that only 26 instances out of 152 (17.1%) assisted learners in incorporating feedback, indicating the ineffectiveness of corrective feedback in interaction. However, Brock et al. report that there were some instances in which NNSs incorporated corrective feedback given by NSs when they were engaged in communication games, thereby stating that the contexts in which negotiation takes place might be an essential factor in which learners can focus their careful attention on form. In other words, learners might be able to incorporate feedback if they are given much time to reflect on that. Brock et al. also suggest that the development of L2 knowledge won’t take place immediately; rather, it takes learners a certain amount of time to incorporate corrective feedback. Thus, unlike a study to look for evidence of immediate effect of corrective feedback in interaction, a study that can collect data over a period of time would be preferable in order to reach a solid conclusion as to the effect of corrective feedback in negotiation on L2 incorporation (Gass, 1988; Lin & Hedgcock, 1996).

2. The Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not a learner could incorporate corrective feedback in negotiation so that corrective feedback could promote language learning. To do so, I conducted a case study in which an ESL learner whose first language was Japanese engaged in negotiated interaction with two interlocutors respectively, a native English speaker and a proficient nonnative English speaker of Japanese. In order to investigate the lasting effect of corrective feedback in negotiation, I planned the second session two weeks after the first session to see if the learner could incorporate and retain the corrective feedback for a certain period of time. The reason why my study originally consisted of two sessions was to see whether the learner could retain corrective feedback for a period of two weeks.
The reason why I adopted a picture-drawing task in this study was to increase the opportunities for the interlocutors to produce corrective feedback. Gass and Varonis (1986) demonstrated that picture-drawing tasks generated a greater amount of negotiation than did free conversations. Their study suggested that this phenomenon was due to the fact that the participants had to accomplish the task in a set period of time. The study also showed that drawers initiated more negotiation than did describers. In my study, therefore, the learner was always the describer and the two interlocutors were always the drawers. It was expected that the drawers initiated negotiation, thereby eliciting a lot of speech from the learner.

It was also decided to compare the performance of a NS/NNS dyad with that of a NNS/NNS dyad. Since the findings of this study are expected to be applied to English education in Japan, a NS/NNS pair corresponds to an English-speaking teacher and a Japanese learner, and a NNS/NNS to a Japanese English teacher and a learner.

This study planned to have two sessions. In the second session two weeks after the first session, the original plan was to have each of the two dyads perform the same task with switched pictures to see if the learner could successfully produce correct forms embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in the first session. Contrary to my expectation, however, it was found that little corrective feedback was given to the learner after transcribing the data of the first session. Therefore, I revised the procedure of the study by strongly encouraging the two interlocutors to give as much feedback as possible and adding another session in-between. This session was counted as the second session. The original second session became the third session in the revised procedure.

**Research Questions**

The research questions addressed in this study were as follows:

1) Does the learner incorporate correct forms embedded in corrective feedback the interlocutors have provided earlier?

2) Do the both NS/NNS and NNS/NNS dyads bring about the same outcome?

**3. Method**

**3.1 Participants**

This study involved three participants: a Japanese ESL learner, a native speaker of English, and a proficient Japanese nonnative speaker of English. Haruka was a Japanese ESL learner who attended an English course for adults in California. She received a regular formal English education at junior and senior high school in Japan. She went on to study English further at a private English language institute for two years. She had lived in America for one year by the time this study was conducted.
The two interlocutors were John, who was a native speaker of English and Yumiko who was a proficient nonnative speaker of English. Both of them were in the MATESOL program at the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS) in California. They were acquainted with the learner in order to facilitate negotiation between the participants (Tarone & Liu, 1995). Taking into account the Japanese classroom situation, the learner and the proficient nonnative speaker of English were both Japanese. The native English speaker was familiar with Japanese as he had taught English at college in Japan for more than 15 years.

### 3.2 Procedure

In the first session I assigned a picture-drawing task to each dyad, one between Haruka/John and one between Haruka/Yumiko. John wasn’t there while the learner was talking with Yumiko, and vice versa. Haruka and Yumiko didn’t use Japanese while doing a task. Haruka was always the describer who had to describe a picture for each of the two interlocutors. John and Yumiko had to draw the picture based on oral information provided by Haruka. Before the participants went about performing their tasks, I encouraged the interlocutors to negotiate for meaning with the learner when they faced difficulty in understanding the learner’s descriptions and to give corrective feedback on the learner’s errors, although they were not encouraged to correct every error in the learner’s speech. Rather, they were expected to correct any type of error (e.g., lexis, phonology, and morphosyntax) only if it impaired their ability to understand what the speaker had to say.

As mentioned earlier, the study ended up having three sessions. In the second session, the learner described the same picture to the same interlocutors. The interlocutors were encouraged to focus on giving corrective feedback on every error produced by the learner without drawing a picture this time. In the third session one week after the second session, the participants engaged in the same task but the pictures were switched so that each interlocutor had to draw a picture that was new to him/her. If Haruka incorporated corrective feedback given in the second session, it was thought that she could produce correct forms embedded in corrective feedback while she was describing the pictures in the third session. Below is Table A that sets out the change of the procedure of this study.

### Table A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Original Procedure]</th>
<th>&lt;The 1st session&gt;</th>
<th>&lt;The 2nd session&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haruka/John</td>
<td>Picture A</td>
<td>Picture B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haruka/Yumiko</td>
<td>Picture B</td>
<td>Picture A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Materials

The picture the learner had to describe to John (Picture A) was different from the one she had to describe to Yumiko (Picture B). Both of the pictures were adapted from Falconer’s (2000) book and had the same three cartoon characters but in respectively different scenes. The pictures were thought to be not too simple nor too difficult for the learner to describe, but it was speculated that the learner would have difficulty describing them to the interlocutors. The learner and the interlocutors couldn’t see each other. The researcher attended each session, observing, audiotaping and videotaping interactions between the participants.

4. Analysis

Speech produced by the participants of the two dyads throughout the sessions was transcribed. I consequently obtained four transcripts in total. I refer to the transcripts of the Haruka/John dyad during the second session as Data A (Appendix A) and the Haruka/Yumiko dyad as Data B (Appendix B). I refer to the transcripts of the two dyads during the third session respectively as Data C (Appendix C) and D (Appendix D). To begin with, I searched Data A and B for evidence of errors made by the learner and corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors. Then I compared Data A and D and Data B and C in order to see if she could incorporate correct forms embedded in the corrective feedback provided.

At first, I identified the learner’s errors and corrective feedback in Data A and B. Corrective feedback was defined as the interlocutors’ responses to the learner’s speech, i.e., responses that included correct forms as opposed to erroneous forms produced by the learner. The following are examples of error and corrective feedback:

<Data A>

3. H: In the museum, uh…the big picture is there, I mean…the big picture hanging on the wall.

4. J: There is a big picture on the wall.

There were some difficult cases to code. For example, I found it difficult to distinguish between corrective feedback and clarification request in some cases as follows:
The learner didn’t make any error in the first sentence in the example. It seemed that the interlocutor wanted to clarify the information provided by the learner in the second sentence. Therefore, I didn’t consider the response produced by the interlocutor as corrective feedback.

For another example, I found some cases in which Yumiko detected the learner’s errors, tried to offer corrective feedback, but ended up providing ungrammatical feedback as follows:

I didn’t count such cases as corrective feedback because they didn’t meet the definition of corrective feedback noted above. On the contrary, the following case was counted as corrective feedback:

In this case, Yumiko successfully gave corrective feedback on two errors, i.e., the lack of to be-verb and the misuse of prepositions although she failed to address the other error, i.e., lack of determiner. I considered her response as corrective feedback because she successfully offered corrective feedback on one error, which met the definition.

Then, I searched Data C and D for evidence of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback, i.e., the learner’s production of correct forms that had been embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in earlier sessions. The following is an example of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback:

In this case, Yumiko successfully gave corrective feedback on two errors, i.e., the lack of to be-verb and the misuse of prepositions although she failed to address the other error, i.e., lack of determiner. I considered her response as corrective feedback because she successfully offered corrective feedback on one error, which met the definition.

Then, I searched Data C and D for evidence of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback, i.e., the learner’s production of correct forms that had been embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in earlier sessions. The following is an example of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback:

In this case, Yumiko successfully gave corrective feedback on two errors, i.e., the lack of to be-verb and the misuse of prepositions although she failed to address the other error, i.e., lack of determiner. I considered her response as corrective feedback because she successfully offered corrective feedback on one error, which met the definition.

Then, I searched Data C and D for evidence of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback, i.e., the learner’s production of correct forms that had been embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in earlier sessions. The following is an example of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback:

In this case, Yumiko successfully gave corrective feedback on two errors, i.e., the lack of to be-verb and the misuse of prepositions although she failed to address the other error, i.e., lack of determiner. I considered her response as corrective feedback because she successfully offered corrective feedback on one error, which met the definition.

Then, I searched Data C and D for evidence of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback, i.e., the learner’s production of correct forms that had been embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in earlier sessions. The following is an example of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback:

In this case, Yumiko successfully gave corrective feedback on two errors, i.e., the lack of to be-verb and the misuse of prepositions although she failed to address the other error, i.e., lack of determiner. I considered her response as corrective feedback because she successfully offered corrective feedback on one error, which met the definition.

Then, I searched Data C and D for evidence of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback, i.e., the learner’s production of correct forms that had been embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in earlier sessions. The following is an example of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback:

In this case, Yumiko successfully gave corrective feedback on two errors, i.e., the lack of to be-verb and the misuse of prepositions although she failed to address the other error, i.e., lack of determiner. I considered her response as corrective feedback because she successfully offered corrective feedback on one error, which met the definition.

Then, I searched Data C and D for evidence of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback, i.e., the learner’s production of correct forms that had been embedded in corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors in earlier sessions. The following is an example of the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback:
<Data C>
23. H: I think it’s sunny day. Next one, it’s in the middle of left hand side. She is standing up.

Another example of incorporation of corrective feedback is as follows:
<Data A>
7. H: The picture is uh…two ballerina.
9. H: Dancing…they are wearing a tutu.
10. J: Ok, they are wearing tutu. Uhhuh. Both ballerinas?
<Data D>
19. H: And this picture…there are two ballerinas...

What was difficult to code as incorporation of corrective feedback was the lack of a be-verb in the form of the present progressive. The learner produced the form of the present progressive in some cases but not in others as follows:
<Data B>
25. H: And pig wearing swimsuit.
26. Y: Is pig wearing a swimsuit?
124. H: Son pig is wearing just like pants.
125. Y: Uhhuh.

The learner gave an inconsistent performance in terms of the present progressive. I suspected that she knew the forms and the rules of the present progressive, but she sometimes failed to produce the correct forms. However, as shown in the example above, the learner was given corrective feedback when she couldn’t use the form correctly. To summarize, it was difficult to determine the source of the learner’s correct uses in Data C and D. This consideration could change the results of incorporation of corrective feedback very much because there were many cases in which the present progressive should have been used in Data C and D. I finally decided not to count the errors in relation to the present progressive as errors.

In order to further study her comprehension of this grammar point, I counted the number of the learner’s successes in terms of the present progressive in each data set and
divided it by the number of cases where it was required of her to use the present progressive. The figures I obtained for correct use of the present progressive were 87% (13/15) in Data A and 75% (15/20) in Data B. In the third session, I obtained 100% (10/10) in Data C and 87% (13/15) in Data D.

As a result of coding, I found 13 instances of corrective feedback in Data A and 27 in Data B. I also found 3 instances of incorporation of corrective feedback in Data C and 2 instances in Data D. The ratios of the learner’s incorporation were 11% (3/27) in Data C and 15% (2/13) in Data D. The total figure was 13% (5/40).

In order to increase the reliability of coding in this study, I introduced another coder, Mutsumi, who was a graduate student in the MATFL Japanese program at MIIS. Before she started coding the data, we agreed on the critical definitions of the following terms: corrective feedback and the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback. Furthermore, in order to have more accurate mutual understanding of code procedures, we coded the first page of Data A together.

After reviewing and discussing the results of our coding, we ended up agreeing upon 13 instances of corrective feedback in Data A and 24 in Data B. I also found 3 instances of incorporation of corrective feedback in Data C and 3 instances in Data D. The ratios of the learner’s incorporation were 13% (3/24) in Data C and 23% (3/13) in Data D. The total figure was 16% (6/37).

5. Discussion

What does the figure this study finally generated mean? The figure 16% showing the learner’s incorporation of corrective feedback is a very low number. This figure is very close to the figure (17.1%) Brock et al. (1986) obtained. This study demonstrates that the learner could incorporate a small number of correct forms embedded in corrective feedback the interlocutors had provided one week before. Therefore, the answer to the first research question is that it cannot be said that corrective feedback in negotiation alone is effective for language learning.

On taking a closer look at the data, the researcher discovered some useful insights. First, the type of error the learner made might have to do with the incorporation of corrective feedback. The second coder and the researcher worked together and categorized 37 instances of corrective feedback into three types of errors: lexis, morphosyntax, and phonology. The instances of these errors were categorized as 6, 30 and 1 respectively. Furthermore, we categorized 6 instances of incorporation of corrective feedback according to the types of error given corrective feedback as follows: 2 morphosyntactic errors, 3 lexical errors, and 1 phonological error. These results also correspond to those of the
previous results produced by several researchers (Brock et al., 1986; Pica, Kanargy, & Falodun, 1993). It seems that the learner could readily understand corrective feedback due to a phonological error. Presented below is the event:

<Data A>

53. H: other side of the [ceiling]?
55. H: Ceiling, ceiling.

I asked the learner about this error after all the sessions were over. She said that she knew the word ceiling before this study, but didn’t know how to pronounce it. It is therefore reasonable to think that John’s corrective feedback on her pronunciation was succinct and salient enough for her to reproduce the correct pronunciation and retain it for as long as a week with the help of prior knowledge of the word.

To take a close look at the 3 lexical errors, I also found that corrective feedback due to lexical errors to be clear and direct. Below is a good example:

<Data B>

136. H: And daughter pig is holding swimsuit swimball.
137. Y: Beach ball?

As shown above, the corrective feedback due to the lexical error is so clear that the learner could easily understand what was wrong with her speech. I also asked the learner about these lexical errors after the sessions. She replied that she had known the correct forms though producing erroneous ones in 2 out of 3 instances. As a result, it appears that the interlocutors helped remind her of the correct forms.

One possible reason why she could not incorporate much corrective feedback on morphosyntactic errors appears to be the ambiguity of corrective feedback. Unlike feedback from phonological and lexical errors, corrective feedback from morphosyntactic counterparts seems to have required the learner to process complex linguistic information as appears below:

<Data B>

21. H: pig looking at the sky.
22. Y: Ok. Pig is looking up into the sky?

It is obvious that the corrective feedback given above was direct but uninstructive in that there was no further information as to when to use look at and look up into respectively and the difference between them in the example above. In short, such direct feedback didn’t
provide enough positive evidence for the learner to figure out the meanings and usages of the two expressions although it played a role as negative evidence.

Another thing to discuss is the difference in the number of instances of corrective feedback the two interlocutors provided to the learner. There may be several possible reasons for this phenomenon. It is to be assumed that one major reason is the difference between the two interlocutors’ approach to their tasks. Further information enabled me to highlight these differences. John focused more on overall meaning. It seems that he wasn’t so concerned about the learner’s errors in light of the fact that he didn’t provide corrective feedback very often even though the learner made many errors. Rather, he often provided clarification requests to the learner as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
43. & \quad H: \text{And mother pig looking at daughter maybe daughter side.} \\
44. & \quad J: \text{Ok. Like she is talking.} \\
45. & \quad H: \text{Yeah. Maybe she is talking.}
\end{align*}
\]

On the other hand, Yumiko focused more on form so that she provided about twice as much corrective feedback as John did. I suspect that this is due to the difference in how they interpreted my instructions to correct every error produced by the learner. Yumiko was nervous about the results of the first session. She was unable to provide feedback as she had difficulty providing accurate forms to the learner. In the second session she could regain her composure.

It is also reasonable to think that their differences in this area can be attributed to their different views on communication. Unlike Yumiko, John seemed to focus on communication rather than on form. It is feasible to assume that NS and NNS view errors in a different way. After conducting a study of students’ L2 performance with NS and NNS teachers, Galloway (1980) also reports that “overall, the native speaker did, indeed, seem to be listening for the message, while the non-native teacher appeared to be focusing more on grammatical accuracy” (p. 430). This result has revealed a very important difference between native teachers and their nonnative counterparts. This also reminds nonnative teachers of the fact that they need not correct all of their students’ mistakes. After all, meaning is much more important than form in communication. One of the main reasons for learning a foreign language is to communicate with others rather than to speak it without errors.

There are a couple of weaknesses in this study. First, it might be difficult to determine the sources that led to the learner’s production of correct forms during the third session. This study cannot completely exclude the possibility that the learner learned the
correct forms through other means rather than corrective feedback provided by the interlocutors. Given the situation in which the learner goes to school to study English and has many opportunities to interact with native speakers of the target language, it would be more difficult to exclude such a possibility.

Second, the findings of this study cannot be generalized because this is a case study focusing on a single learner in a particular context. The aim of a case study is usually “to describe the case in its context” (Johnson, 1992, p. 76). Nunan (1992) states that “a major barrier in doing case studies concerns the extent to which a particular finding can be generalized beyond the case under investigation” (p. 81). Therefore, the findings of this study will not be appealing in terms of generalization. However, Nunan argues that “the investigation of a single instance is a legitimate form of inquiry” (p. 75). Bailey (1999) also maintains that a case study is valuable because it gives “illuminating insights and vivid exemplars” (p. 14). Furthermore, van Lier (in press) points out that “insights from a case study can inform, be adapted to, and provide comparative information to a wide variety of other cases, so long as one is careful to take contextual differences into account” (p. 7).

Thus, although it may be difficult to argue for its generalization, a case study has potential to inform teachers and researchers of valuable information. As such this study will be able to help those who have an interest in effective language learning and pedagogy to gain further insights in the field.

6. Conclusion

This study has provided some insights on language learning. As mentioned earlier, it is hard to say that corrective feedback in negotiation is effective for all aspects of language learning from the results of this study. Corrective feedback on phonological and lexical errors, however, may have the potential to help in language learning. In addition, corrective feedback in negotiation seems to enhance learners’ prior knowledge. A good example of this statement is the case of the present progressive mentioned above. There were more cases in the third session in which the learner could produce the forms of the present progressive correctly than in the second session.

Furthermore, this study has revealed a difference between a native speaker and a nonnative speaker in communication. Nonnative speakers tend to be too concerned with forms rather than meaning. Too much attention to forms could lead learners to be fearful of making mistakes and apprehensive of speaking English in public. Learning English should be fun and intriguing, yet, language classrooms can turn to be dreadful and embarrassing places for many learners. Teaching professionals including myself have to bear this in mind once again.
In order to reach more solid conclusions on the effect of corrective feedback, further research is needed. Further research could involve more learners from beginner to advanced level of L2 competence to see if there are differences of incorporation of feedback according to learners’ level of L2 competence. This study involved only one learner who was at a high-beginning level. More participants with a variety of English competence could give a lot more information to help reach more thorough conclusions. Another possibility is to employ a different task other than the picture-drawing task so that it might generate more negotiations and corrective feedback. Moreover, gender can also be addressed by making same sex and heterosexual pairs. In order to obtain more information, gender may play a role and lead to different styles of speech and communication. In conclusion, I hope that further research will show the effect of corrective feedback in more depth.
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要旨

ネゴシエーションの中でのフィードバック効果
—英語学習者が二人の対話者から得た矯正的フィードバックの習得率の検証—

金子 義隆

言語学習におけるネゴシエーションの効果は近年多くの研究者の関心を集めてきた。それによってネゴシエーションのメカニズムが明らかになってきた。特に、ネゴシエーション中に受けたフィードバックは重要な働きをしている。この研究では、ある日本人の英語学習者が英語母語者と堪能な日本人英語話者のコミュニケーション中心の活動の中で起きるネゴシエーションを取り上げ、その中で学習者が受けた corrective feedback（矯正的フィードバック）のもたらす効果について実験し、分析した。学習者が二人の対話者にある絵を描写し、対話者が英語学習者から受けた情報からその絵を描くタスクに従事する。その過程で起きる意味の negotiation の中で学習者は矯正的フィードバックを受けた。1週間後同じタスクに従事したときにどの程度それらを習得できているか、また対話者がネイティブとノンネイティブでは違いがあるのかを分析した。その結果、約16%のフィードバックを2回目のタスクで活用できるようになっていた。どんな効果的な指導法であっても、学習者が一度で100%理解できてしまうことは当然有り得ないことを踏まえて、この数字を考えると決定的であるとは言えない。むしろ、さまざまな指導法の一つとして下記の点を踏まえながら活用するとき、効果が期待できるであろう。また、比較的ネイティブの対話者は意味を重視し、あまり文法的な形にこだわらなかったが、ノンネイティブは逆のことが観察できた。結果として、両者に決定的な差は確認できなかった。つまり、ネイティブ・ノンネイティブの違いよりも、いかに明確で的確なフィードバックができたかが学習効果を高めたようだ。また、矯正的フィードバックは、既習事項や語彙や音韻系のエラーに対しては効果的であると観察できた。しかし、形態・統語系のものには効果が見られなかった。