

EFL Learners' Task-Generated Interactive Discourse

Abstract

This study investigated the use of different communicative tasks in promoting oral language development among English as a foreign language (EFL) learners in a Malaysian setting. It also examined the nature of oral discourse generated through the use of three distinct communication task types i.e. information-gap, jigsaw and decision-making.

Eighteen EFL undergraduates from a public university participated in this study. Full learner interactions recorded during the execution of each task type were transcribed verbatim. The oral discourse was then qualitatively analysed with a special focus on episodes of negotiated interactions, language related episodes (LREs) and learners' uptake of language input.

The findings showed that learners generated episodes of negotiated interactions when engaged in all three task types. However, the depth of the negotiated interactions differed between the different tasks. When engaged in the information-gap task completion, they demonstrated a procedural approach which included interaction episodes related to handling, organising and executing the task. However, when engaged in the jigsaw and decision-making task completion, they demonstrated an exploratory approach resulting in episodes of joint meaning-making, joint investigation, questioning and reasoning, problem solving and intense negotiation. In addition, data indicated emergence of collaborative dialogues and LREs in the learner interactions especially in the jigsaw and decision-making task types.

The results of this study seem to provide empirical evidence that language communication tasks do promote meaningful interactions among Malaysian EFL

undergraduates. Data clearly showed widespread generation of interaction episodes during task completion which evolved into LREs and became uptake of language input. These strongly suggest the existence of language learning opportunities and possibility of language development. Language communication tasks when effectively executed in a tertiary EFL setting can encourage meaningful oral discourse and expose learners to novel interaction episodes which are essential in language learning and acquisition.

Interaksi Pelajar Efl Ketika Melaksanakan Tugas Komunikatif

Abstrak

Kajian ini menyiasat penggunaan tugas komunikatif yang berbeza dalam menggalakkan pembangunan keupayaan lisan dalam kalangan pelajar yang berada dalam persekitaran bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa asing (EFL) di Malaysia. Ia juga mengkaji jenis wacana lisan yang dihasilkan ketika melengkapkan tiga tugas komunikasi iaitu *information-gap*, *jigsaw* dan *decision-making*.

Lapan belas pelajar EFL dari sebuah universiti awam telah terlibat dalam kajian ini. Interaksi pelajar ketika melengkapkan setiap tugas direkodkan sepenuhnya dan ditulis dalam bentuk transkripsi. Perbualan yang terhasil itu dianalisis secara kualitatif dengan tumpuan khas kepada episod interaksi berbentuk rundingan, episod interaksi berkaitan bahasa (*Language Related Episodes - LREs*) dan penerimaan serta penguasaan input bahasa oleh pelajar.

Hasil kajian menunjukkan pelajar memaparkan episod interaksi rundingan bagi ketiga-tiga tugas. Bagaimanapun, tahap penggunaan interaksi rundingan berbeza antara satu tugas kepada tugas lain. Ketika melengkapkan tugas *information-gap*, interaksi yang dihasilkan pelajar berbentuk pendekatan prosedur (*procedural approach*) yang merangkumi pengendalian, penyusunan dan pelaksanaan tugas. Bagaimanapun, ketika melaksanakan tugas *jigsaw* dan *decision-making*, mereka mempamerkan pendekatan penerokaan (*exploratory approach*) yang membawa kepada penghasilan episod pencarian makna secara bersama, siasatan bersama, persoalan dan pertimbangan, penyelesaian masalah, dan rundingan intensif. Selain itu, data menunjukkan kewujudan

dialog bekerjasama (*collaborative dialogue*) dan LREs dalam interaksi pelajar terutama dalam tugas jigsaw dan *decision-making*.

Hasil kajian ini menyediakan bukti empirikal bahawa tugas komunikatif sememangnya menggalakkan interaksi yang bermakna dalam kalangan penuntut universiti EFL di Malaysia. Data ini juga menunjukkan dengan jelas penzahiran episod interaksi ketika melengkapkan tugas yang diberikan bertukar kepada LREs dan penerimaan dan penguasaan input bahasa. Semua ini menyokong kewujudan peluang pembelajaran dan penguasaan bahasa. Tugas komunikatif bahasa apabila dilaksanakan secara efektif dalam persekitaran EFL di peringkat pengajian tinggi boleh menggalakkan perbualan bermakna dan mendedahkan pelajar kepada episod interaksi baru yang penting dalam pembelajaran dan penguasaan bahasa.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praises to Almighty Allah, the most merciful and the most benevolent for granting me the strength to embark on this journey.

This has been a really long journey, with a lot of ups and downs. I am forever thankful to many.

- I have been fortunate to have Associate Professor Dr. Juliana Othman as my supervisor. Her encouragement, support and most of all, patience has motivated me to move forward and persevere. Thank you for the faith you have in me.
- My participants, for their willingness to sacrifice their time.
- My parents, for their unwavering support.
- Aainaa Nasha and Redza Hakimi, for their understanding that mommy is often 'lost'.
- Mohamad Azlan Jaafar, for putting up with everything. Thank you for believing in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--------------------|-------------|
| SYNOPSIS | ii |
| SINOPSIS | iv |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xiii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xiv |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | xv |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Background of the Study | 1 |
| 1.3 | Statement of the Problem | 3 |
| 1.4 | Objectives of the Study | 7 |
| 1.5 | Research Questions | 8 |
| 1.6 | The Framework | 8 |
| 1.7 | Significance of the Study | 19 |
| 1.8 | Definition of Terms | 20 |
| | 1.8.1 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) | 20 |

| | | |
|---------|----------------------------------|----|
| 1.8.2 | Tasks | 20 |
| 1.8.2.1 | Information-gap Task | 21 |
| 1.8.2.2 | Jigsaw Task | 21 |
| 1.8.2.3 | Decision-making Task | 22 |
| 1.8.3 | Negotiation for Meaning (NfM) | 22 |
| 1.8.4 | Language Related Episodes (LREs) | 23 |
| 1.8.5 | Uptake of Language Input | 23 |
| 1.9 | Chapter Summary | 24 |

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.1 | Introduction | 25 |
| 2.2 | Interaction Hypothesis | 25 |
| 2.2.1 | Negotiation of Meaning (NfM) and the Interaction Hypothesis | 27 |
| 2.3 | Output Hypothesis | 28 |
| 2.4 | Interaction and Output Hypotheses | 32 |
| 2.5 | Tasks | 33 |
| 2.5.1 | Task Types | 34 |
| 2.6 | Evidence of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) through | |

| | |
|--|----|
| Communication Tasks | 39 |
| 2.6.1 Tasks and Negotiated Interaction | 40 |
| 2.6.2 Investigating the Use of Tasks in EFL Contexts | 50 |
| 2.6.3 Tasks and Collaborative Dialogues | 55 |
| 2.6.3.1 Form-focused Tasks | 57 |
| 2.6.3.2 Communication Tasks | 61 |
| 2.6.3.3 Section Conclusion | 67 |
| 2.6.4 Tasks and Language Acquisition | 69 |
| 2.7 Chapter Summary | 75 |

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| 3.1 Introduction | 77 |
| 3.2 The Study | 77 |
| 3.3 Research Design | 78 |
| 3.4 Research Site | 79 |
| 3.5 The Participants | 80 |
| 3.5.1 Profile of Participants | 82 |
| 3.5.1.1 The Blue Team | 82 |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| | 3.5.1.2 | The Brown Team | 83 |
| | 3.5.1.3 | The Red Team | 84 |
| 3.6 | Tasks | | 86 |
| | 3.6.1 | Selection of Communication Task Types | 87 |
| | 3.6.2 | Task Completion | 89 |
| | 3.6.2.1 | Information-gap Task Type | 89 |
| | 3.6.2.2 | Jigsaw Task Type | 91 |
| | 3.6.2.3 | Decision-making Task Type | 92 |
| 3.7 | Data Collection | | 94 |
| | 3.7.1 | Pilot Study | 94 |
| | 3.7.2 | Actual Study | 94 |
| | 3.7.2.1 | Procedures | 95 |
| | 3.7.2.2 | Study Constraints | 96 |
| 3.8 | Analysis of Data | | 98 |
| | 3.8.1 | Data Coding and Analysis | 99 |
| | 3.8.1.1 | Research Question 1 | 100 |
| | 3.8.1.2 | Research Question 2 | 104 |
| | 3.8.1.3 | Research Question 3 | 105 |
| 3.9 | Trustworthiness | | 109 |

| | | |
|------|-----------------|-----|
| 3.10 | Chapter Summary | 111 |
|------|-----------------|-----|

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 4.1 | Introduction | 112 |
| 4.2 | Research Question 1 | 114 |
| 4.2.1 | Interactional Modifications | 116 |
| 4.2.2 | Engaging in Task Completion | 121 |
| 4.2.3 | Negotiated Interaction | 131 |
| 4.2.4 | Summary of Findings on Research Question 1 | 143 |
| 4.3 | Research Question 2 | 147 |
| 4.3.1 | Language Related Episodes (LREs) | 148 |
| 4.3.2 | Lexical LREs | 150 |
| 4.3.3 | Grammatical LREs | 161 |
| 4.3.4 | Orthographic LREs | 166 |
| 4.3.5 | Summary of Findings on Research Question 2 | 168 |
| 4.4 | Research Question 3 | 170 |
| 4.4.1 | Modifying Lexis | 171 |
| 4.4.2 | Modifying Form | 178 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----|
| 4.4.3 | Modifying Spelling | 182 |
| 4.4.4 | Summary of Findings on Research Question 3 | 184 |
| 4.5 | Chapter Summary | 187 |

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 5.1 | Introduction | 190 |
| 5.2 | Summary of the Main Findings | 190 |
| 5.3 | Research Question 1 | 194 |
| 5.3.1 | Learners' Oral Discourse | 194 |
| 5.3.1.1 | Procedural to Exploratory | 195 |
| 5.3.1.2 | Negotiated Interactions | 199 |
| 5.4 | Research Question 2 | 211 |
| 5.4.1 | Collaborative Dialogs | 211 |
| 5.4.1.1 | Emergence of LREs | 212 |
| 5.4.1.2 | LREs and Language Learning Opportunities | 213 |
| 5.5 | Research Question 3 | 224 |
| 5.5.1 | Uptake of Language Input | 224 |
| 5.5.1.1 | Uptake of Language Input and Language | |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| | Acquisition | 225 |
| 5.6 | Section Conclusion | 230 |
| 5.7 | Contributions, Implications and Recommendations | 232 |
| | 5.7.1 Negotiated Interactions | 233 |
| | 5.7.2 Collaborative Dialogues | 236 |
| | 5.7.3 Task Types | 238 |
| | 5.7.4 Use of L1 | 242 |
| 5.8 | Limitations of the Study and Further Suggestions | 243 |
| 5.9 | Chapter Summary | 246 |
| | References | 248 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Figure 3.1 | A Roadmap - Answering the Research Questions | 108 |
|------------|--|-----|

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| Table 2.1 | Communication Task Types for L2 Research and Pedagogy Analysis Based On Interactant (X/Y) Relationship Requirements in Communicating Information (INF) to Achieve Task Goals | 36 |
| Table 3.1 | Profiles of Participants | 86 |
| Table 3.2 | Task Types Used in the Study | 89 |
| Table 3.3 | Chronological Procedures of Data Collection | 96 |
| Table 3.4 | Transcription Conventions | 99 |
| Table 3.5 | Description of Categories | 102 |
| Table 3.6 | Categories of Language-Related Episodes (LREs) | 105 |
| Table 3.7 | Categories of Uptake of Language Input | 107 |
| Table 4.1 | Duration of Task Completion | 113 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 Information-gap Task (How to Use a Nasal Spray - IG1)
- Appendix 2 Jigsaw (Newspaper Jigsaw - J1)
- Appendix 3 Jigsaw (Picture Dictation - J2)
- Appendix 4 Decision-making (Accident - DM1)
- Appendix 5 Decision-making (Global Issues - DM2)
- Appendix 6 Consent Letter to Participants
- Appendix 7 Analytical Framework of Peer-Group Interaction
- Appendix 8 Excerpts of transcriptions on teams' learner interaction using IG1
- Appendix 9 Excerpts of transcriptions on teams' learner interaction using J1
- Appendix 10 Excerpts of transcriptions on teams' learner interaction using J2
- Appendix 11 Excerpts of transcriptions on teams' learner interaction using DM1
- Appendix 12 Excerpts of transcriptions on teams' learner interaction using DM2
- Appendix 13 List of abbreviations