タイトル	Can Retrospective Feedback Improve ESL Speech?
著者	KOBAYASHI, Toshihiko
引用	北海学園大学人文論集, 4: 1-27
発行日	1995-03-31

Can Retrospective Feedback Improve ESL Speech?

Toshihiko KOBAYASHI

This case study investigates the effectiveness of retrospective feedback on ESL speech that the speaker himself (SAF) or someone else (OAF) gives. Two exchange students from Japan, who were taking ELI (English Language Institute) courses at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (UHM), were asked to make a two-minute spontaneous speech on a given topic. Immediately after each speech, a retrospective interview was conducted in Japanese to probe their utterances and provide necessary corrections and suggestions. The subjects' three subsequent speeches were compared in terms of expressions, grammaticality, and temporal variables. The metalinguistic judgements of two American English native speakers were also utilized in terms of three criteria: clarity of meaning, naturalness, and irritation levels. The results show that the OAF subject significantly decreased the number of grammatical errors in the second and third speeches. However, there was no systematic development of either subject's data in any variables from the first experiment to the last experiment. In this paper, some suggestions are made as to the possible development of this experimental procedure into a new systematic classroom technique to improve learners' SLA in oral production.

keywords: *retrospective feedback / metalinguistic judgements*

INTRODUCTION

Most adult ESL learners wish to speak English not only as fluently

but as accurately as adult English native speakers. It is commonly conceived that ESL teachers should be more tolerant of their students' oral errors than written errors. The reason is simply that teachers' error corrections take place while a learner is still engaged in speaking, whereas a written composition is corrected after the learner's act of writing. Thus the teacher's interruptive oral corrections very often inhibit speakers and sometimes even scare them into silence. Adult ESL learners, in particular, fear public loss of face and react to correction by choosing not to speak. Chastain (1971) stressed the need to create an atmosphere in which the students feel like talking. Nonetheless, no matter how supportive or non-threatening an atmosphere we may create, the learner still remains monitored by others. How can we overcome such seemingly inevitable pedagogical constraints?

After the audiolingual approach lost popularity in the early 70's, the "communicative movement" has reorganized the pedagogical paradigm of foreign language instruction. Through this transition, pedagogical emphais has been shifted from accuracy to fluency. Lantolf (1977) argues "insistence on communication does not imply that grammar and vocabulary are to be ignored" (p.248). He maintains that the goal of a language program is mastery of proficiency, not grammar. Littlewood (1981) argues that the concept of success in speaking a foreign language is determined by the nature of feedback from the purpose of an activity. If the purpose is to produce certain predetermined linguistic structures, success will be measured according to how accurately the structures are produced. If the purpose is to convey or comprehend meanings, success will be measured by how effectively communication takes place. Then how can the teacher nurture the learners' fluency in speech while keeping their accuracy

guaranteed?

Looking once again at the way feedback is conventionally given to a second language spoken and written product, one will notice that the writer is quite free of fear of making mistakes, while the speaker is monitored by others at the time of production. In recent composition theories, some researchers suggest that interaction between a writer and a reader take place regularly (Chaudron 1987; Zamel 1988) so that the corrector or editor can understand the true meanings intended by the writer. The procedure for teaching composition has been shifted from a product-oriented goal to a process-oriented goal. The corrector's active and positive involvement in the process of writing makes it possible for him/her to give accurate feedback on the writer's paper. Even in this procedure, the fact remains that the writer's initial writing takes place by him/herself. The writer brings his/her paper to his/her teacher or corrector, having an interview to probe into meanings in the composition. Based upon the feedback the writer receives from the corrector, he/she rewrites the paper and submits it again. It should be noted, however, that the student's initial design or ideas could be drastically altered by the suggestions from the teacher as the student's ideas become clearer and better described. That is why the student does not necessarily remember everything he/she had in mind when he/she started writing the composition. He/she has only to report his/her present ideas, which might be, to a certain extent, different from what he/she had originally intended at the time of the initial writing conference. This is because there is sufficient time for the writer to review his/her writing.

In oral production, on the other hand, there are time and psychological constraints such as loss of face on the part of student. This is particularly true of socially self-conscious adult L2 learners. For this

reason, the teacher must be much more concerned with the process of speech that the student goes through, and he must capture the particular moment of utterance at which the speaker has a problem, either in planning or production sessions. Then, how can we deal with our students' moment-to-moment particular problems in speech? Is it recommendable to make students pause in their speech everytime they have problems or make errors? The answer is no. For it could seriously deteriorate their speech fluency.

Looking back at the conference-style writing instruction, we notice that the procedure strikingly gurantees both accuracy and fluency in writing because of the separation beween the time for production (writing) and the time for feedback (writing conference with the teacher). Hendrikson (1978) discusses five issues in error correction.[1] Among them, he discusses the issue as to when learner errors should be corrected. He points out that there has been little empirical evidence to indicate when to correct L2 errors. Littlewood (1981) suggests that the teacher should often withhold structural correction (grammar correction), or postpone it until after the activity (speech). Lantof (1977) proposes that student conversations should be tape-recorded so that each student can edit his/her own tape for errors. He argues that if the student fails to detect his/her own errors, the teacher has to "probe more deeply into the problem in order to discover its source and formulate appropriate techniques"(p.248).

The author of this paper would like to propose the following procedures to solve this dilemma. First, the speaker talks on a certain topic into a taperecorder, then the teacher plays back the tape to have a retrospective review of the utterances and give feedback (including error corrections) if necessary. Second, the speaker makes two more speeches on the basis of the feedback he/she received. One possible

flaw in this design, however, would be the accuracy and reliability of the retrospective interview. This flaw seems to be corrected by applying recent theoretical developments of retrospective methods in L2 research inspired by Ericsson and Simon (1980). They claim that "verbal reports, elicited with care and interpreted with full understanding of the circumstances under which they were obtained, are a valuable and thoroughly reliable source of information about cognitive processes" (p.247). Since then, retrospective methods have been widely discussed and employed in L2 research (Cavalcanti 1987; Hayes and Flower 1983; Faerch and Kasper 1987; Grotjahn 1987; Dechert 1987; Holscher 1987; Krings 1987; Zimmerman & Schneider 1987; Haastrup 1987; Poulisse, Bongarts & Kellerman 1987; Gillette 1987). The author followed this research trend and adopted verbal reports for the research design.

Research questions

Lantoff (1977) suggests that teacher assistance should be extended only after the student fails to recognize his/her own errors. What differences may be observed in the data of the revised speeches corrected by the teacher and by the student him/herself? In other words, to what extent can the learner give effective feedback to his/her own speech in comparison with feedback from another? Can the learner him/herself pay full attention to both fluency and accuracy, to grammatical and/or lexical errors? Likewise, can we say the teacher's feedback also leads to improvement of the student's speech in terms of every aspect?

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

This study involved two subjects Kenji and Kazuya from Japan. Kenji was given feedback from the experimenter, other-assisted feedback (OAF); Kazuya gave feedback to his own speeches, self-assisted feedback (SAF). At the time of data collection (spring 1992), both of them were 22-year-old Japanese male ESL learners at the ELI (English Language Institute) at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa (UHM). They arrived in Hawai'i about three weeks before the first experiment was carried out. Both subjects started learning English, as is the case with most Japanese learners of English, when they entered junior high school (at the age of 13). Their exposure to English had, in general, been confined to formal school instruction when they were in Japan. The OAF subject's and the SAF subject's most recent TOEFL score were 533 and 530, respectively. They were close friends from the same Japanese university and roommates in a dormitory near the UHM.

Data elicitation[2)]

The process used to elicit utterances from both OAF and SAF subjects was that for the Public Speaking conducted in the 1st Grade Examination of the STEP (standard Test of English Proficiency) approved by the Japanese Ministry of Education. In that test, the examinee chooses one topic from two given topics (one is social, and the other personal) and thinks about it for a minute to plan a speech. Then, he/she speaks freely for two minutes on the topic. After the two-minute speech, the examiners (one is a native speaker of English and the other a Japanese L1 speaker) ask the examinee a few questions.

In this study, the procedure was simplified and the subjects were

given only personal topics each time data was collected since personal topics should be easier than social topics for L2 learners. The topics selected for the elicitation are shown in Figure 1. Each experiment was conducted at regular intervals of one week. The whole process lasted for ten weeks in the author's apartment. The physical environment for the experiments was held as invariable as possible by using the same recording equipment in the same room at almost the same time (8: 00 p.m.) throughout the data collection.

Figure 1 The topics selected for the elicitation

Experimens	Topics	Experiments	Topics
# 1	My dormitory	# 6	My ways of learning English
# 2	Cafeteria food	# 7	What I like about Hawai'i
# 3	My roommate	# 8	My future
# 4	My hometown	# 9	What I like about UHM
# 5	My hobbies	# 10	How I will teach English

Procedures

Figure 2 presents the procedure followed in each experiment.

Figure 2 Procedures

Task No	Tasks	Length	Task No	Tasks	Length
# 1	A topic presentation	unlimited	# 6	2nd speech & recording	2 minutes
# 2	1st planning	1 minute	# 7	2nd retrospection	unlimited
# 3	1 speech & recording	2 minutes	# 8	2nd planning	1 minute
# 4	1st retrospection	unlimited	# 9	3rd speech & recording	2 minutes
# 5	2nd planning	1 minute	# 10	Overall observation	unlimited

(1) A topic presentation & (2) 1st planning

Both of the subjects were shown a paper on which a given topic was written. The subjects were given a minute to think about the topic before starting their speech.

(3) 1st speech & recording

The subjects were then asked to talk about the topic freely into a microphone for two minutes for recording. While making a speech, they were free to watch a stopwatch so that they could finish their speech on time. The experimenter went out of the room at the time of data collection to avoid any unnecessary threat or embarassment.

(4) 1st retrospection

Immediately after the subjects finished their two-minute speech, the tape was played back for retrospection and feedback on the speech. (Kenji and the experimenter listened to the whole speech once, while no conversation took place at this stage.) The subjects were asked to recount what they had actually wanted to say, what messages they had failed to convey, etc. Next, the tape was played back again, but this time sentence by sentence, and stopped whenever the experimenter felt necessary to give feedback. Feedback was given in terms of corrections, suggestions, and praise.

Corrections

The experimenter gave grammatical, semantic, and phonological corrections. The grammar was strictly monitored because error correction at this stage would not hinder any fluency of speech. Semantic errors often occurred when the subjects literally translated some ideas from Japanese. Phonological errors were least monitored among the three corrections. Since the target was comprehensible speech, only major errors that might affect the comprehensibility were corrected.

Suggestions

Besides error corrections, some suggestions were made as to word choice, or expressions. When the tape was stopped, the experimenter verified in Japanese the actual meaning that the subjects desired to convey. The question took the following example forms (translated from Japanese):

i) What did you want to say at this point?

ii) What did you mean by ____?

iii) Do you want to add something new that you missed at this point?

After receiving answers from the subject, if necessary, the experimenter made some suggestions in a rather supportive manner, but did not force the subjects to follow every suggestion. The suggestion took the following forms, for instance:

iv) If I were you, I would say ____.

v) It would be much clearer if you used this word ____.

vi) Your meaning would be better understood if you gave some examples.

For improvement of discourse organization, use of some transitional words such as "first of all," "then," "therefore," "on the other hand" were suggested.

Praise

Feedback in the form of praise or encouragement is unequivocally one of the most important element in L2 teaching. The subjects were encouraged to maintain good expressions in their subsequent speeches rather than disuse them. This interaction lasted approximately fifteen to twenty minutes, during which period the subjects were only allowed to make mental notes.

(5) 2nd planning

After the retrospective interview, the subjects were given one minute to prepare for their second speech. They were again not allowed to take any notes, but only think about possible change.

(6) 2nd speech & recording

Based upon the feedback provided by the retrospective session, the subjects, made a second speech on the same topic. They were free to add whatever relevant items to their previous speech but discouraged from changing the whole content.

(7) 2nd retrospective interview

Upon finishing the second speech, the tape was played back once again to probe into their utterances. Almost the same procedures were followed as in the first retrospective interview. The experimenter also pointed out some parts that the subjects did not correct or change according to the feedback in the first retrospection.

(8) 3rd planning

This is almost the same as the first planning. This time again note taking was not allowed.

(9) 3rd speech & recording

Based on all the feedback he received so far, he made another speech on the same topic.

(10) Overall retrospection

The tape of the third speech was played back with only brief feedback. Then the tape was rewound to the first part of speech and played back without stopping for interaction. while listening to the tape, the subjects were asked to pay attention to the progression in the three speeches. When the tape came to the end of the third speech, the subjects were invited to freely comment on anything about their experiences with emphasis on the impovement in their speeches. Here, they

have a free face-to-face conversation for a few minute.

Analyses

Identifying variables

In this study, the amount of feedback was the independent variable that was expected to effect the improvement of oral production. The improvements were judged in terms of various criteria, which were the dependent variables in this study. The focus of this study was thus on the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. Some indepedent variables were subjectively analyzed by the experimenter, as will be explained below.

Native judgement

To impove the inter-rater reliability, two native speakers of American English (one from Oregon and the other from California) were asked to listen to all of the speeches (sixty) and to make metalinguistic judgements, speech by speech. Three 10-point scales, which moves from positive to negative (thus, the lower the number, the more positive the rating, and vice versa) were used to rate each speech in terms of the following criteria:

(1) clarity of meaning
(2) naturalness
(3) irritation

Clarity of meaning is the degree to which the listeners understand what the speaker says. *Naturalness* is the degree to which the native speakers feel the speech as "approximating the target language norms" (Santos 1988: 70). *Irritation* is the negative counterpart to *naturalness.* It refers to the extent to which native speakers of English feel irritated

from non-native speakers' speech. As an instruction to the raters, both of them were emphatically instructed to base their judgement upon their own dialect of American English. For each experiment, the native speakers listened to the three speeches in random order so that prejudgement would be avoided (prejudgements coming from the expectation that the second and the third speeches would naturally display improvements over the first).

Each native speaker's scale values for 60 speeches were added up from the first experiment to the tenth experiment to gain mean scores for the first, the second, and the third speech in each criterion. One three-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) was utilized to see whether there were significant differences between the means for three different variables: the three criteria for rating, the speech order, and the speakers. Since it is reasonale to expect that their speeches would improve after repetition, the alpha level was set at .05, directional.

Discourse Analysis

The total of sixty speeches were all transcribed (see the Appendix) in order to facilitate accurate evaluation of the following variables: 1) articles; 2) prepositions; 3) verb choice; 4) verb agreement; 5) tense; 6) aspect; 7) noum choice; 8) relative nouns; 9) adjective choice; 10) adverb or adverbial choice; 11) conjunctions; 12) infinitives. Grammatical errors were pointed out by the above-mentioned raters separately, and only those uniformly judged to be ungrammatical were identified as clear errors. The number of clear grammatical errors identified in all the speech data were added separately from the first, second, and third speeches. The three totals of grammatical errors in each speaker's data were analyzed by two one-way chi-squares to detect any decrease in error frequency. The number of each temporal variable: 1) number

of words; 2) filled pauses; 3) unfilled pauses; 4) repeats of a word or a phrase, which were identified in all the speech data, were also added separately for each speech. The numerical relationships were examined by eight one-way chi-squares.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the error categories consisting of the twelve items the subjects made in their speeches. The largest and the second largest numbers of errors were found in the use of articles and prepositions, which is often the case with Japanese L1 speakers' English interlanguage. The OAF subject made fewer errors progressively from the first to the second and third speeches in every grammar item except verb agreement and conjunctions. Contrary to the OAF subject's

Table 1 Grammatical errors

subjects	OAF subject			SAF subject		
speech order	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
error category	12	7	6	29	26	10
1)articles	11	1	5	10	9	12
2)prepositions	2	1	0	6	3	4
3)verb choice	2	1	0	6	3	4
4)verb agreement	3	4	3	7	12	9
5)tense	2	2	1	11	12	8
6)aspect	1	0	0	4	4	8
7)noun choice	2	0	3	4	3	1
8)relative pronouns	0	0	0	0	1	0
9)adjective choice	7	4	2	7	3	1
10)adverb choice	3	0	1	1	3	3
11)conjunctions	0	1	0	0	0	0
12)infinitives	1	0	0	0	3	0
total	46	21	21	85	82	60

reduction of error frequency, the SAF subject lessened grammar errors progressively in only four items.

Table 2 presents frequencies of errors in each speech occasion. First, there is no steady chronological reduction from the first experiment to the tenth experiment. This may be because the period for the experiment (two months) was not long enough for the subjects to improve their English speech in terms of grammatical accuracy. Second, unlike the error reduction according to the error category, both speakers showed steady reduction of the number of errors only in five occasions out of the ten experimental occasions. The SAF subject made almost two times as many grammatical errors as the OAF in total frequencies from the first to the tenth experiment. This explains the substantial error reduction that was observed not between the first and second speech but between the second and third speech.

Table 3 indicates the results of rating by two native speakers in terms of the three criteria. The figures shown are the means comput-

Table 2 The Numbers of Grammatical Errors

subjects	OAF subject				SAF subject			
speech order	1	2	3	total	1	2	3	total
# 1	5	3	3	11	10	13	10	33
# 2	6	4	3	13	8	3	3	14
# 3	5	3	2	10	9	16	14	39
# 4	8	1	3	12	10	14	5	29
# 5	0	3	0	3	8	6	5	19
# 6	12	4	4	20	16	16	13	45
# 7	10	6	2	18	10	4	3	17
# 8	6	2	3	11	8	6	2	1
# 9	2	3	5	10	6	3	5	14
# 10	4	3	3	10	5	8	6	19
total	58	32	28	118	90	89	66	30

ed from the ten experiment data. We can see from Table 3 that Rater 2 rated more strictly than Rater 1 in *clarity of meaning* and in *irritation*. For the sake of statistical convenience, the two raters' values were added together to gain a grand mean. The eighteen grand means were investigated by using a three-way ANOVA to demonstrate their significant differences as seen in Table 4.

Table 3 Native judgement

subjects	OAF subject			SAF subject		
clarity of meaning	R1	R2	Grand	R1	R2	Grand
the 1st speech	2 0	3.4	2.7	1.9	3 5	2.7
the 2nd speech	2.0	2.8	2.4	2.0	3.1	2.6
the 3rd speech	2.0	3.2	2.6	2.0	2.9	2.5
naturalness						
the 1st speech	5.1	4.4	4.8	4.1	4 1	4.1
the 2nd speech	5.0	4.2	4.6	3.9	3.6	3.8
the 3rd speech	4.8	4.2	4.5	3.9	3.5	3.7
irritation						
the 1st speech	4.4	5.8	5.1	4 1	4.8	4.5
the 2nd speech	4.5	5.4	5.0	3.8	4.4	4.1
the 3rd speech	4.2	5.0	4.6	3.9	4.3	4.1

Table 4 shows that there are significant differences between means for speakers, criteria, and order at $p=.05$. There was also an interactive effect between speakers and criteria. This means that one might cautiously interpret that any significant differences apparent in the means for speakers and criteria could have occurred by chance alone. We therefore can reliably say only that there were siginificant differences between means only for the speech order. The grand means in Table 3 represent the raters' more positive evaluation of each criterion from the first to the third speech, except for the OAF subject's *clarity of meaning*.

Table 4 Three-Way Univariate ANOVA

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Subjects Effects				
A (SPEAKERS)	39.200	1	39.200	6.849 ***
Subjects within groups	103.022	18	5.723	
Within Subjects Effects				
B(CRITERIA)	554.711	2	277.356	137.322 *
AB Interaction	22.800	2	11.400	5.644 **
B+Subjects within groups	72.711	36	2.020	
C(ORDER)	13.378	2	6.689	1.165
AC Interaction	0.133	2	0.067	0.012
C+Subjects within groups	206.711	36	5.742	
BC Interaction	1.356	4	0.339	0.382
ABC Interaction	2.467	4	0.617	0.694
BC+Subjects within groups	63.956	72	0.888	

*p<.001 **p< 01 ***p<.05

Table 5 tells the frequencies of the four variables. The total numbers of the frequencies were examined by eight one-way chi-squares. The results show that the observed error frequency relationships among the three speeches were significant in the OAF subject and the SAF subject's total numbers of words, and in the SAF subject's total number of filled pauses. The rest of the relationships were statistically insiginificant. However, they show systematic numeric reduction from the first to the third speech except for the OAF subject's total number of unfilled pauses.

It should be noted that these four variables are closely related to fluency of speech. It should be also noted that the SAF subject produced far more words than the OAF subject with far more filled pauses. The OAF subject showed much more unfilled pauses, in other words, became silent more often in his speech. Accordingly, the native

speaker's reactions in Table 3 show that the SAF subject's speeches sound more natural and less irritable than those of the OAF subject.

Table 5 Temporal variables

Experiment occasions		# 1	# 2	# 3	# 4	# 5	# 6	# 7	# 8	# 9	# 10	total	
words	OAF												
	1	116	105	99	120	79	103	116	114	113	113	1078	*
	2	120	101	112	110	128	134	132	121	115	86	1159	*
	3	154	82	96	155	111	134	133	137	144	126	1272	*
	SAF												
	1	162	140	143	144	157	138	138	138	120	126	1406	**
	2	163	139	170	162	165	134	139	152	138	126	1488	**
	3	148	166	166	168	162	152	159	166	155	152	1594	**
F-pauses	OAF												
	1	5	5	5	3	1	0	1	2	2	2	26	
	2	0	1	4	2	1	2	0	1	2	1	14	
	3	3	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	1	3	13	
	SAF												
	1	5	4	2	4	5	5	9	5	2	10	51	***
	2	2	5	3	6	3	5	7	3	5	6	43	***
	3	3	3	0	4	1	6	1	1	2	8	29	***
U-pauses	OAF												
	1	8	16	19	15	19	17	14	6	11	21	146	
	2	7	9	15	8	12	15	17	8	9	16	116	
	3	7	7	15	6	10	14	13	11	11	24	118	
	SAF												
	1	16	16	15	16	11	7	18	12	10	7	128	
	2	6	14	11	10	15	5	4	7	8	11	91	
	3	10	9	9	5	8	4	7	6	8	9	75	
repeats	OAF												
	1	6	5	3	6	0	0	0	3	1	3	27	
	2	4	1	3	1	0	2	2	4	5	2	24	
	3	4	0	1	2	0	2	1	1	3	3	17	
	SAF												
	1	3	3	4	5	2	4	4	4	2	2	33	
	2	3	5	5	2	7	1	2	3	2	6	36	
	3	4	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	0	21	

*P<.001 **p<.005 *** p<.05

CONCLUSION

In sum, the results showed that the more words and less pauses/ repeats used, the clearer and more natural, hence less irritable, speech sounds to native speakers of English. The results sound quite predictable. Comparing the two subjects, the OAF subject reduced grammatical errors at a greater rate than the SAF subject. This answers research questions presented earlier: Can the learner himself pay full attention to both fluency and accuracy, to grammatical and/or lexical error? The results show that there is a limit of the speakers' judgement and that the SAF subject was viewed more positively than the OAF subject. This seems to deny the question: Can we say the teacher' s feedback also leads to improvement of the student's speech in terms of every aspect? It seems almost impossible to have speakers with exactly the same profiency level involved in this type of research. To make the study more reliable, more subjects must be involved to creat larger test pools.

In conclusion, retrospective feedback improves both frequency and accuracy of ESL speech. It is expected, however, that ESL learners' oral proficiency should improve substantially not just temporarily. In other words, just as the speeches improved from the first to the second and the third in this study, their overall proficiency should improve gradually as time goes. To see the long-term improvement of learner proficency, more time must be spent for the research.

Pedagogical implications

One valuable finding in this study is that there is a limit to the learner's ability to monitor his own grammatical errors. In other words, it is the teacher that plays an important role in guaranteeing the

accuracy of the student's speech. Fluency seems to be less teachable because it requires the speakers to expose themselves more to natural interaction outside the classroom. The study lasted only two months, which is not long enough to demonstrate optimal development of oral proficiency.

One implication from this study is that this technique could be revised for more feasiblity in pedagogical settings. The teacher may taperecord students' in-class speeches, and then let the class listen while he gives feedback. It may also be useful to have students give self-feedback to their speeches on a certain topic as homework. The students would then be asked to submit their recorded tape and receive further feedback from the teacher.

NOTES

1) He discusses the following five issues: 1) Should learner errors be corrected?; 2) If so, when should learner errors be corrected?; 3) Which learner errors should be corrected?; 4) How learner errors be corrected?; 5) Who should correct learner errors?
2) This experiment was conducted in spring 1990 in Honolulu, Hawaii. The early version of this study was presented at the JACET 29th Annual Convention at Kanda University of Foreign Study in 1990.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his heartfelt thanks to Prof. Satoshi Okano for his suggestions about an early draft of this paper. The author would also like to appreciate Mr. R.D. Kizziar for suggesting corrections to the final draft. The author is solely responsible for any inadequate expressions or mechanical errors left uncorrected on this paper.

References

Cavalcanti, M.C.(1987). Investigating FL reading perfromance through pause protocols. In Fearch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in second Language Research. Clevedon: Multilingual Matter Ltd.*, 230-250.

Chastain, Kenneth (1971). *The development of Modern Language Skills: Theory of Practice.* Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, Inc.

Chaudron, Craig (1987). Research on metalinguistic judgements: a review of theory, method, and results. *Language Learning, 33,* 343-377

Dechert, Hans W.(1987). Analysing language processing through verbal protocols. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 96-112.

Ericsson, K.A. and Simon, H.A.(1980). Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review, 87,* 215-251.

Faerch, C, and G.Kasper (1987). From practice to process--introspective methods in second language research. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 5-23.

Gerloff, Pamela (1987). Identifying the unit of analysis in translation: some use of think-aloud protocol data. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 135-158.

Gillette, B.(1987). Two successful language learners: an introspective approach. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 268-279.

Grotjahn, Rudiger (1987). On the methodological basis of introspective methods. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 54-81.

Haastrup, Kristen (1987). Using thinking aloud and retrospection to uncover learner's lexical inferencing procedures. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 197-212.

Hayes, J.R. and Flower, L. (1983). Uncovering cognitive processing writing. In P. Mosenthal et al. (eds.), *Research in Writing: Principles and Methods.* N.Y : Longman.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1978). Error corrector in foreign language teaching: recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern language Journal, 67, 1*: 41-55

Holscher, A. and D.Mohle (1987). Cognitive plan in translation. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 113-134.

Krings, Hans P (1987). The use of introspective data in translation. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 159-176.

Lantolf, James. P. (1977). Aspect of change in foreign language study. *The Modern Language Journal,* 242-251.

Littlewood, W.T. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction.* Cambridge University Press.

Porter, Patricia (1986). How learners talk to each other: input and interaction in task-cented discussions. In R.R. Day (ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 200-222.

Poulisse, N,T.Bongarts and E.Kellerman (1987). The use of retrospective verbal reports in the analysis of compensatory strategies. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 5-23.

Santos, Terry (1988). *Professor's reactions to the academic writing of nonnative-speaking students. TESOL Quarterly, 22, 1,* 69-90.

Zamel, V. (1988). Writing: the process of discovering meaning. In Michael H.Long and Jack C.Richards (eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings.* New York: Newbury House Publishers, 267-278.

Zimmermann, Rudiger and K.P.Schneider (1987). The collective learner tested: retrospective evidence for a model of lexical search. In Faerch and Kasper (eds.), *Introspection in Second Language Research.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 5-23.

APPENDIX: TRANSCRIPTION

Note: One slash shows a .5-second unfilled pause

THE OAF SUBJECT: KENJI

Experiment 1: My dorm

First Speech

My dorm is terrible./ There is no wind in my room. And / I can cook just a little, but there is no kitchen in my dorm, so I can not cook at all. On Friday night, especially, uh, the, some of the residents play music with full volume. So I can't study at all./ But //// There is one good, uh, there is one good aspect of my dorm. It's very near to the University. So, uh, I can, can go on, go back to my dorm very quickly. Uh, another bad, another bad aspect is / dirtiness in my dorm. Uh, especially in the / rest room or shower room, there is very, very dirt, and /// spoil. So, I / can, I feel / uncomfortable.

Second Speech

My dorm is terrible. My room is on the third floor, but no wind come to my room. The second reason why I dislike my dorm is dirtiness, especially, in the / rest room or shower room. I can find a many stains and / I want, I want to, I want them to change the curtain. The third reason is that there is no kitchen in my dorm. I can cook / just little at home in Japan. But here I cannot cook at all. However, / there is one good point in my dorm, about my dorm. Uh, my dorm is very close to my University. So / I can attend / my class and ///// without, without getting up so early./// When I left something, uh,

Third Speech

My dorm is terrible. My room is on the third floor. But no wind comes to my room. The second reason why I dislike my dorm is that, uh, there is no kitchen in my dorm. I used to cook in Japan. But here I can't cook (LAUGHT), I can not cook just, uh, at all. Third reason is, uh, its dirtiness, especially, in the rest room or shower room, there are many stains everywhere. Uh, the forth reason is // its noisiness, especially, on the, especially, on Friday nights, many residents / have a party. So, they play music in full volume. But there is one good point about my dorm. It's very close to my university. So, I don't have to get up early.// When I left something in my dorm, I could pick it up and get / could get back to a class / classes. That is why I dislike my dorm. I would like to change the apartment.

Experiment 10: How I'll teach English in the future

First Speech

I have studied / the / communicative language teaching / in Japanese high school education so far. So, I'd like to use this method / to Japanese high school students in my class. First, I use the / I use/ especially // the dialogue // and /// I want to use dialogue, and / and / from the beginning / from the beginning to / to the ending of class. I want to use almost English / and / of course I will use classroom English, then, uh, I want to, I want to utilize / the // language teaching that my ES / ELI teachers are using, or / I'll use the ESL method which I will study from now./// Then, uh, // I wanna use the // use my experience in Hawaii and whatever.

Second Speech

I have studied English teaching in / at my / university in Japan and here

in Hawaii so far. And, I really think that Japanese high school English teachers must make use of the / communicative language teaching. So, I came, I came here through the scholarship of Japanese / Japanese ministry of education. So, uh, //// I wanna use / the method. First, I really, I really wanna use the dialogue / which I can produce // real conversation / or ///// the I can use some / English ///// English words / or phrase // very effectively.

Third Speech

I have studied English language teaching / and /// at / at my university in Japan and here in Hawaii so far. And I'm very interested in the / communicative language teaching method, so I want to use this method / in my classroom. In the classroom / uh, I wanna use just English as much as possible / and //// àlso I wanna use / my experiences here in Hawaii and ///// Of course, I wanna make use of some, some techniques which now my ELI teachers are using ////// uh. Now I'm very interested in the // effectiveness of the dialogue and // actually / I'm studying that I'm actually studying dialogue and so / I think dialogue is / a / one of the best kind of the language teaching / techniques which I can provide the / the real English situation. So, /////

THE SAF SUBJECT: KAZUYA

Experiment 1: My dorm

First Speech

My dorm, the Atherton YMCA is quite a interesting dorm. Uh, it is located in University Avenue, and near to the UH, the campus. It costs only 756 dollars for one semester. And the room is // the room is wide

and quiet. So, it is very convenient for me. But my dorm is the warmest one / in this dorm. Uh, in this dorm, especially in the third floor, there are many interesting guys, uh, one of them is the / the /// the guys who loves / only / the oriental girls. So now there are many Japanese girls on the third floor. So, every night he wanders the / the third floor and try to get girls. One of the girls in / from Hiroshima is, uh, she also tries to attract the Caucasian So, maybe she can be his girlfriend. So, uh, another guy is from Butan. Maybe he comes from a wealthy family, so in Thanksgiving, he / he'll gop to the / uh / Kawaii island with two Japanese girls. Hai.

Second Speech

My dorm Atherton YMCA is, is not interesting place. It is located in University Avenue, so it is very near to the Uni, UH campus. So, it is very convenient to go to the class. But, and / there are many breeze in many rooms but my room faces to the parking lot, so there are no breeze, so, my room is the warmest, warmest room in this dorm. Sometimes many guys / uh / play the stereo loudly so, very noisy, so that's why / I can study in the night time. But there are many interesting guys on the, especially, on the third floor. One of them is // the guy from California. and he likes only oriental girls. Now on the third floor there are many Japanese girls. So, every night he wanders the third floor and try to get one of them. Luckily the / one of the girls try to attract cauccasian boys, so sometimes, uh, she went to his room and do something.

Third Speech

My dorm Atherton YMCA is not a good place to live. But very interesting. Almost the room / uh / in almost the room, breath from

Manoa valley came into the rooms. But my dorm, uh, in my room no breath comes because it faces to parking lot. So, my room is the warmerst one / in this dorm. And in the midnight, especially, on the third floor, /// some people play the stereo very loudly even in the midnight. That's why nobody can study.// But on the third floor there are many interesting people. One is a man from California. He likes / only the oriental girl, so he, every night he wanders the 3rd floor and try, tries to get // uh / Japanese girl. Luckily one of the Japanese girls also try to get the Cauccasian and boys. So, sometimes she went to / she goes to his room.

Experiment 10: How I will teach English in the future

First Speech

In the future, I wanna teach English in comunicative way. Uh, at thebeginning of the class, as an ice breaker, uh, I make students sing a song, or uh, play games. So, through such activities, uh, they will get ready for the class. And in the class, I'll speak English as much as possible. In Japan, man recently, uh, // the teacher explains, explain about grammar in Eng. in Japanese. Uh, it is not good for the students' English proficiency (CLEAR THROUGHT TWICE), so uh, at first, uh, I'll introduce new structures overly, and make students= repeat my speech. And then, /// I'll make students practice such / the structures more and present structures on the blackboard. Ah, so, and after that I use a pair work or role play, uh, so it helps the students, the the comunicative ability.

Second Speech

In the future, I wanna teach in communicative way. Uh, at the beginning of the class, as a ice breaker, uh, I want students sing a song or um,

I, I'll give them a game. Ah, through these, through these activities, they will get ready for English class. And, and in the class, I'll speak English as much as possible. Uh, in Japan the teachers have, have explained new structures in Japanese. It does, it isn't it does , it doesn' t help the, the students' communicative competent at all. So, I will introduce the new structure, uh, orally, and then, uh, the students will repeat after me. After that, / the / using / using such a structure / uh / the / some / students will / the / speak it and many times.. And then I'll present the structures on the blackboard.

Third Speech

In the future, I'll teach English in a communicative way. At the beginning of the class, as an ice breaker, uh, I want students to teach to sing a song or do some games. Uh, through this activities they will, they will get ready for the class. And in the class, uh, I want to speak English as much as possible. Uh, in Japan, teache, teachers explain grammars in Japanese in the class. It does not help the students' ¥comunicative competence at all. So, uh, for example, when I introduce some structure, uh, at first I'll introduce it orally and then, students will repeat aftet me. And after that, the students will practice such a structure orally. Sometimes, as a pair work or roll play, and after that I'll present the structure from the blackboard, so, uh, it is not perfect but, uhm it is nearer to the / natural, natural situation than, the / method / which was used before.