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The study examines features of ten categories of negotiation in team teaching. Frequencies of repetitions, supports, questions, imperatives and rhetorical questions decreased as the proficiency level became higher. This shows that native speakers of English use negotiation devices in conversations with lower level learners in foreign language than with higher level learners. However, inclusive 'we', framed constructions and conversation fillers increased as the proficiency level advanced from junior high school to the university. As for 'okay', confirmation 'okay' occurred overwhelmingly more than framed and introductory 'okay'. The greater the frequency of the native speaker's 'okay' in utterances, the greater the confirmation 'okay' was. Introductory 'okay' in junior high school occurred more often than in senior high school and the university. This shows how learners' attention is focused towards utterances at the beginner's level. These conclusions might be helpful in understanding some features of NS-NNS negotiation in team teaching and in improving learners' communicative competence.

1. Introduction

Team teaching (TT) started in Japan in 1986. The number of native speakers (NS) invited as assistant English teachers (AET) in junior high schools and senior high schools was about 2,000 in 1990. The main purpose of TT is to improve students' communicative competence especially in speaking and listening. TT also aims to improve Japanese teachers of English (JTE). Since the start of TT, lots of studies have been reported. But only a few of these have clarified features of TT theoretically and experimentally.

A speaker and a listener use interaction effectively to carry out better communication. Negotiation is regarded as one type of interaction. The Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics defines negotiation as the activity the speaker performs to communicate
effectively. In short, negotiation might be considered as one form of interaction in conversation and the way toward mutual understanding by supporting conversation. Scarcella and Higa (1981 : 40) explain the ongoing negotiation process through which speaker and listner cooperate to sustain conversation and establish understanding when participating in face-to-face interaction. Communication is facilitated by filling in lapses in the conversation, indicating gaps in understanding, and repairing communication breakdowns.

Learning a second language in the classroom is generally performed in the setting without the use of natural language. Long and Sato (1983 : 270) offered two kinds of constraints which the classroom speech of SL teachers is affected by. One of them is by the classroom as the setting for the conversation, including the patterns of speech associated with role of teacher. Another arises from the limited linguistic proficiency of the student. These two facts show that the conversation in the classroom in quite different from the conversation native speakers use in natural settings. When endeavouring to understand features of TT, the teacher needs to recognize these differences.

Dore and McDemott 1982 : 396) pointed out that utterance organization and interpretation were interaction phenomena most completely analyzed in terms of what speakers and listeners accomplish with them. Language acquisition is possible through interaction. Chaudron (1988 : 9) suggests that NS’s speech to NNS (non-native speakers) is most effective for acquisition when it contains modified interaction. These interactions consist of ways of negotiating comprehensibility and meaning. Interactive modifications are more important for acquisition than modifications of NS speech that only result in simplified syntax and morphology. We do not treat the structure and form of language, but also have to pay attention to the importance of negotiation of interaction in the communication.

In an experiment which had effective results through the practical use of English in China, White (1989 : 219) confirms that the amount of mother-language use dropped dramatically when actual information exchange began and the continuity between the tasks emerged. In these environments, students were putting to use their language as a developing and negotiating dynamic system. Therefore, they did not use English as a static one based on the alien knowledge of the textbook.

The view often adopted regards communication as the progressive reduction of uncertainty. Brown (1989 : 98) tells that speakers fill in the gaps in each other’s knowledge, negotiating meaning and modifying their own knowledge representations as the discourse progresses. In the teaching of communication, the teacher must not be seen as a director of the student’s work, but as a counselor and guide. Allen, Frölich and Spada (1984 : 238) wrote of the importance of the relationship between the teacher and
students as co-participants and joint negotiators in the communicative activity. Such ideas are very important for improving students' communicative competence because English teaching in Japan is teacher-centered in the classroom.

In actual communication in English, native speakers' language activity becomes the main focus. But in the language classroom, teachers must not forget the existence of students as NNSs. NNSs' communication activity in English might be naturally different from that of NSs. Kachru (1985 : 223) reports recent studies on nonnative varieties of English establishing the fact that these varieties differ from the native varieties because their users have norms of communicative competence entirely different from these of NSs of English. This seems to point out the importance of NNSs' norms in conversation. This view might play a very important role when analyzing NSs' utterances towards NNSs' in TT.

2. Objectives and Hypotheses

In light of the ideas mentioned above, the researcher analyzed negotiation between NS and NNS in TT. The present study aims to clarify:
1. Some features of negotiation between NSs and NNSs,
2. Differences in negotiation patterns between NS and NNS in junior high school (JHS), senior high school (SHS) and university, and
3. Some features of ten categories of negotiation.

Scarcella and Higa (1981) reported the frequencies of repetition, support, question, imperative, inclusive 'we', framed construction, and rhetorical question in negotiation by child and adolescent second language speakers, and adult NSs. According to their results, the frequencies of these seven categories increased from adult to child. This fact seems to show that the frequencies increase as the proficiency level becomes lower. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be posited regarding the TT of NS's talk to NNS.
1. Frequencies of repetitions, supports, questions, imperatives, inclusive 'we', framed constructions, conversation fillers and rhetorical questions decrease as the proficiency level changes from junior high school to university.
2. Confirmation 'okay' is the most frequent among the uses of 'okay'.

3. Method

1. Subjects

Negotiation was analyzed from video tapes recorded in 1989 and 1990. NSs in JHS were male American teachers and two female teachers, one American and one Canadian. NSs in the SHS were one male American and two female Americans. The teacher in the university was an American speaker. Therefore, there were eight NSs in
2. Method

Classes recorded amounted to 21 in all. Six of them were recorded at three JHSs. Eleven were at three SHSs. The remaining four classes were at one university. The length of a class was 50 minutes at JHS and SHS, but 100 minutes at the university. Video recording and analysis used a Sony 8 mm video camera (CCD-V 200) and Victor S-VHS-Movie (GF-S 1000H). As for the analysis of the videos recorded, the researcher transcribed the interaction of AET, JTE and students, but the following teaching activities were excluded: (1) text reading, (2) pronunciation drills, (3) practice of forms repeated after the teacher by the students, (4) English songs, (5) group work, and (6) AET's talk to JTE.

4. Results

Here the researcher analyzed frequencies of repetitions, supports, conversation fillers, rhetorical questions, inclusive 'we', framed constructions, statements, questions, imperatives and 'okay'.

1. Total Frequencies of Categories in Proportion to NS Talk to NNS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>'we'</th>
<th>Framed</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Filler</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>3,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.301</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>5.404</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>20.864</td>
<td>6.825</td>
<td>41.504</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=3403.320$  df=7  $p<.005$

Table 1 shows the total frequencies of eight categories in JHS, SHS and university. The frequencies total 3,590. All tables in the study show significant differences in frequencies by $X^2$ test. From Table 1, statements were the most frequent of the eight categories (41.504%). The second most frequent category was questions, followed by repetitions (8.301%), imperatives (6.825%), supports (5.404%), framed constructions (4.345%) and inclusive 'we' (2.173%). Conversation fillers were rare (1.699%). Among questions, imperatives and statements, statements occurred significantly the most often. At half the frequency of statements was questions (20.864%). Imperatives showed the lowest frequency (6.825%). Repetitions were rather greater (8.301%) than the four categories other than questions, imperatives and statements. This means that the NS repeats the same utterances frequently to help his learners understand them. Supports
followed repetitions in frequency. The results show that NS used them as a device to stimulate learners' participation and sustain the conversation.

2. Frequencies by Category

The relative frequencies of the eight categories of negotiation are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequencies of Eight Categories in Proportion to Total NS Talk in JHS, SHS and University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>JHS(%)</th>
<th>SHS(%)</th>
<th>University(%)</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>100(8.511)</td>
<td>179(11.886)</td>
<td>19(2.096)</td>
<td>71.082**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive 'we'</td>
<td>8(0.681)</td>
<td>29(1.926)</td>
<td>41(4.510)</td>
<td>36.259**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>34(2.894)</td>
<td>61(4.050)</td>
<td>61(6.711)</td>
<td>71.706**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>85(7.234)</td>
<td>99(6.574)</td>
<td>10(1.100)</td>
<td>50.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler</td>
<td>16(1.362)</td>
<td>21(1.394)</td>
<td>24(2.640)</td>
<td>7.505*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>279(23.745)</td>
<td>313(20.784)</td>
<td>157(17.272)</td>
<td>13.283**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>42(3.574)</td>
<td>156(10.359)</td>
<td>47(5.171)</td>
<td>50.884**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>455(38.723)</td>
<td>588(39.044)</td>
<td>447(49.175)</td>
<td>33.083**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1175(100)</td>
<td>1506(100)</td>
<td>909(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  * p < .005

2.1 Repetitions

Repetition is the tendency for NSs to repeat previous utterances and requires the NNS's attention. Allwright (1988:216) suggests that repetition is a recurrent technique thought to have potential accelerating effects on language acquisition. It gives time for learners to process input. The following is an example of repetition. It gives time for learners to process input. The following is an example of repetition.

AET: Okay. *I will ask, I will ask* an easy 'yes or no' question. Okay? For example, *today is Friday. Today is Friday.* Yes or no.

Student: No. (JHS)

Such repetition is notably absent in the native speaker talk to adolescents in ESL (Scarcella and Higa 1981:414). The frequency of repetitions for SHS (11.886%) was greater than JHS (8.511%). On the other hand, the frequency of repetitions of the university was notably the least (2.096%). Therefore, the frequency of repetitions decreases as the level of proficiency advances from JHS to the university.
2.2 Inclusive 'We'

Inclusive 'we' is used to make the learners more actively involved in the conversation between the native speaker and the students.

AET: Okay. We're going to review last lesson. Okay? we'll have a short … very short game activity. Okay?

The frequency of inclusive 'we' was the least (.681%) in JHS, followed by SHS (1.926%) and the university (4.510%). Therefore, this showed the opposite result from hypothesis 1. The difference might derive from the difference between the negotiation of NS's talk to NNS in EFL in the classroom in Japan and in ESL in the United States.

2.3 Framed Constructions

One of the most interesting negotiations concerns the use of utterance boundary markers referred to as framed constructions. "Okay", "now", "well" and "so" are used at the beginning of utterances, while the confirmation checks at the ends of utterances consist of short tag questions with rising intonation such as "right", "isn't it?" and "okay". But "okay" at the end of an utterance is often used with falling intonation. In the following example, framed construction occurs in the italicized utterances.

NS: Okay. What does the agriculture mean? What does the agriculture mean? Okay? (University)

The frequency of framed constructions was greater in the native speech in the university (6.711%) than in the native speakers in JHS (2.894%) and SHS (4.050%). Framed constructions also presented the opposite result from hypothesis 1.

2.4 Supports

Support plays an important role for the NNS to receive positive feedback. "Good", "right" and "all right" are used as supports by NS. These supports encourage NNSs by capturing the learners' attention. Support is seen in the following example.

Student: Negative.

AET: That's right. He wants negation. Uh, one more question, one more question. Okay? (SHS)

From the results, the frequency of supports decreased as the proficiency level increased from JHS (7.234%) to the university. NS's supports at the university were rare (1.100%).

2.5 Conversation Fillers

Conversation fillers keep the conversation going and allow time to think of the right word or phrase to use next. These fillers were often used by the native speakers.

NS: Drama, well. A. This is something not popular in Western countries about the
subject study. (University)
NSs often use such fillers as “let me see”, “well”, “uh”, “you know” and “let’s see”. Conversation fillers were present to some degree in native speakers of JHS (1.362%) and SHS (1.394%). The frequency in the university was slightly higher (2.640%) than in JHS and SHS. The opposite result from hypothesis 1 occurred in conversation fillers.

2.6 Questions, Imperatives and Statements
Questions, imperatives and statements were analyzed in NS talk to NNS. One report indicates that child second language learners heavily use questions and imperatives (Scarcella & Higa 1981:415). NS in JHS used questions the most often (23.745%), followed by NSs in SHS (20.784%) and the university (17.272%). Frequencies of questions decrease as the proficiency level advances from JHS and SHS to the university. Imperatives occurred the most often in SHS (10.359%), followed by the university (5.171%). On the other hand, the frequency for JHS was least (3.574%). Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not supported for imperatives.

Statements had the most heavy use among these three categories. NSs in JHS and SHS used statements for 38.723% and 39.044% of total utterances. Moreover, the frequency of use in the university was almost half of the total utterances (49.175%). Question is an instrument to stimulate students’ participation in conversation in order to talk out answers. Long (1981:148) suggests that the cohesion of question-answer constructs the adjacency pair.

2.7 Rhetorical Questions
Rhetorical questions have interrogative form but they are not requests for information. Rather they are rhetorical because they do not express a question with the presupposition of the listener’s reply. The following example containing rhetorical questions was reorganized in the speech of NS in SHS.


(JHS)

Table 3 shows the frequency of rhetorical questions. No rhetorical questions were found in any classes of JHS. The frequency of rhetorical questions was calculated for NS in SHS (930%) and the university (1.320%). The frequency in the university was a little more than that of SHS. This result was not similar to Scarcella and Higa’s result concerning what is found very often in native speaker talk to children.
Table 3  Frequency of Rhetorical Questions in Proportion to Total Utterances of NS in SHS and University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Senior HS</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X^2=120.992</th>
<th>p&lt;.005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhetor Q</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 Okay
In TT, ‘okay’ occurred very often in AETs’ utterances. Its function was different according to the situation of the utterances. Clark and Carlson (1982 : 365) suggest that the speaker tacitly obtains the participants’ cooperation without telling them everything. This is called a partial informative. Interaction through language originally has these features. ‘Okay’ is one of the typical examples. The functions of ‘okay’ videotaped were divided into three kinds: confirmation, framed and introductory ‘okay’. From Table 4, confirmation ‘okay’ occurred the most frequently (53.491%) among the three kinds of ‘okay’, followed by framed ‘okay’ (29.421%) and introductory (17.088%).

Table 4  Total Frequency of ‘Okay’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Confirmation</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Introductory</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X^2=137.292</th>
<th>p&lt;.005</th>
<th>df=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>360(53.491)</td>
<td>198(29.421)</td>
<td>115(17.088)</td>
<td>673(100)</td>
<td>p&lt;.005</td>
<td>df=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Framed ‘okay’ is a kind of confirmation ‘okay’ at the end of utterances so that about 70% of the occurrence ‘okay’ is considered as confirmation. The following are the three kinds of examples of ‘okay’.

2.8.1 Confirmation ‘Okay’
Italicized ‘okay’ has the function of the AET’s confirmation of his own utterance to students at the end of the utterance.

AET: July 4th is a very big holiday in America, because it is America’s birthday. Independence day. Okay ? (JHS)

2.8.2 Framed ‘Okay’
Framed ‘okay’, which occurred for about 1/3 of all okays, appeared before and after framed constructions as in the following example.


2.8.3 Introductory ‘Okay’
Introductory ‘okay’ has the role of introducing utterances before the NS utters a
sentence or phrase. It accounted for about 1/5 (17.088%) of all okays. In the following example, introductory 'okay' occurs in the italicized utterances.

AET: Okay. When you ask your question? When you ask... Okay. True is right hand.
False is left hand. Okay?

2.9 Frequencies of 'Okay' in Each School

Table 5 shows the frequencies of the three functions of 'okay' in JHS, SHS and university. Confirmation 'okay' occurred most frequently in SHS (65.505%), followed by the university (47.414%) and JHS (40.260%). Framed 'okay' was the most frequent in the university (37.069%). The second most frequent framed 'okay' was that in SHS (26.829%), and the third was in JHS (22.727%). Concerning the introductory 'Okay', the frequency in JHS was the highest (37.013%). The next highest frequency was in the university (15.517%). The frequency in SHS was the lowest (7.666%). Therefore, confirmation 'okay' was used most often by AET in SHS. Framed 'okay' was used most often by NS in the university, and introductory 'okay' by AET in JHS.

Table 5 Frequencies of Three Kinds of 'Okay' in JHS, SHS and University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JHS(%)</th>
<th>SHS(%)</th>
<th>University(%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2=73.071$</th>
<th>df=4</th>
<th>$p&lt;.005$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>62(40.260)</td>
<td>188(65.505)</td>
<td>110(47.414)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framed</td>
<td>35(22.727)</td>
<td>77(26.829)</td>
<td>86(37.069)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td>57(37.013)</td>
<td>22(7.666)</td>
<td>36(15.517)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154(100)</td>
<td>287(100)</td>
<td>232(100)</td>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

Concerning negotiation, we would like to conclude with just the simple features of the result. Hypothesis 1 was supported for repetitions, supports, questions and imperatives, but not for the inclusive 'we' and framed constructions. That is, frequencies of repetitions, supports, questions and imperatives decreased as the proficiency level became higher from junior high school to the university. Therefore, native speakers of English use more negotiation devices in conversations with lower learners in foreign language teaching than with higher level learners. They provide a more supportive atmosphere, and try to constantly check whether or not learners can understand their input.

Hypothesis 1 was not supported in regard to inclusive 'we' and framed constructions, because they increased as the proficiency level advanced from junior high school to the university. The reason might derive from the differences of situations between EFL and ESL. In English language teaching in Japan, NSs' utterances tend to be longer as the
proficiency level goes up from junior high school to the university. NS might use inclusive 'we' more frequently in order to attract learners' attention to his conversation. At the level of junior high school, NS may use 'I' and 'you' more than 'we' because his focus tends to be on short sentences with the basic grammatical structures from the textbook.

Framed constructions increased according to level from junior high school to the university. In the EFL classroom, NS seems to use more framed constructions to make learners understand some patterns of utterances. This teaching situation is rather different from the natural situation of conversations. Especially, the native speaker might use more framed constructions to check learners' understanding of his utterances.

Conversation fillers increased as the proficiency level advanced so that hypothesis 1 was not supported. More frequent use at the university level reflects the necessity to take enough time to think of the right word or phrase for the native speaker in proportion to the greater length of utterances. Hypothesis 1 was supported, too. The frequency of rhetorical questions decreased as the proficiency level advanced. Rhetorical questions may not be needed at the advanced level, because learners will be able to understand without much use of these questions.

When AET's teaching in TT situations was video-taped, the researcher recognized many occurrences of 'okay'. 'Okay' shows the illocutionary act of partial informative. Then the context used became the important clue. Confirmation 'okay' occurred overwhelmingly over framed and introductory 'okay'. If we added the type of framed 'okay' that has the function of confirmation, confirmation 'okay' would reach 70%. This result made the researchers understand how great its role was. The analysis of these three functions of 'okay' showed differences among JHS, SHS and university. Especially the frequencies of framed 'okay' increased from JHS to the university. This suggests that the greater the number of NS's utterances is, the greater the work of confirming the meaning is. Introductory 'okay' at JHS occurred more often than at SHS and university. This indicates conscious or unconscious attempts to focus the attention of beginning-level NNS towards utterances that are about to be uttered. The reason why confirmation 'okay' occurred rather frequently in JHS, SHS and university seems to show features of NS's utterances in EFL classes. Krashen (1976: 165) suggests that teachers must engage learners in informal environments in order to make the language acquisition device more effective. He distinguishes between two language environments. One of them is "exposure-type" informal environment. The other is the "intake-type" environment. Only the latter can provide direct input for language learning. This shows the importance of negotiation between NS and NNS.

The considerations stated above could clarify several features of negotiations in TT. These results might be fundamental information for improving students' communicative
competence in TT.
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