How Do Learners of English Overcome Non-Understanding?: A Sequential Analysis of 'English as a Lingua Franca' Interaction*

Hiroki Hanamoto

Tokyo Denki University/Graduate School, Kansai University

Although there seems to be no doubt that English as a lingua franca paradigm has affected the focus of English language teaching toward the issue of mutual intelligibility, studies involving only non-native English speakers (NNS-NNS interaction) are still in their infancy. Using a sequential analysis, this study examines how Japanese learners of English communicate with non-native English interlocutors who do not share their L1 background, and analyzes how they overcome non-understanding when a breakdown in communication occurs from the perspective of English as a lingua franca. Data from video-recording and interviews were collected and the interactions in the three groups, including L1 speakers of Japanese, Malay and Chinese, were analyzed. The analysis reveals that ELF users' interactional modifications probably vary depending on the interlocutors and the given context, and also that non-understanding might not be overcome only through a particular modification pattern, but that a few different types of modifications and negotiation of meaning may be needed for a successful communication among the interlocutors. These observations suggest that English as a lingua franca interaction is cooperative and mutually supportive. Based on these findings, raising teachers' awareness of the lingua franca role of English and the need for implementing the training of negotiation skills for a successful communication are also discussed.

Key Words: English as a lingua franca, ELF interaction, sequential analysis, mutual intelligibility, non-understanding

Hiroki Hanamoto

1 Introduction

Now that English is commonly used as not only intranational but also international communication, we should accept the fact that many English varieties exist throughout the world and that there are a number of non-native English accents (see Jenkins, 2006; Kachru & Nelson, 2001 for further discussion of World Englishes). As English has rapidly grown in international contacts and communication, as Seidlhofer (2001) claims, the majority of English communication will take place between non-native speakers (hereafter, NNS) as a means of communication between speakers who do not share their L1 backgrounds. According to Meierkord (2000), "when speakers do not share each other's language but can resort to a third language for communicative purposes, they use a lingua franca, a language which is the mother tongue to neither of them." (p. 1).

Lingua franca or non-native/non-native interaction may differ from the other, so called native and non-native communication, as participants in English as a lingua franca (hereafter, ELF) interaction each have their individual cultural backgrounds regarding communicative norms and standards (Meierkord, 2000), and also they each have a unique set of rules of interactions. As a consequence, in the field of ELF, there have used various kinds of data and been many attempts to use both micro and macro approaches, including in-depth interviews, to investigate the three main areas (Seidlhofer, 2004); the mutual intelligibility between ELF users, the phonetic, lexical, and grammatical features distinguish the Inner Circle speakers (Kachru, 1996) from ELF users (e.g., Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2001), and the successful ELF pragmatic features in institutional settings (e.g., House, 1999; House & Kasper, 2000). However, the researchers are few, and they seem to mainly focus on only in non-institutional settings. Using a framework of sequential analysis, this study describes how Japanese learners of English communicate with non-native English interlocutors who do not share their L1 background, and analyzes how they overcome non-understanding when there is a breakdown in mutual intelligibility. Findings indicate the frequency of communication strategies such as repairs, clarification requests, understanding or confirmation checks, and repetition, and accommodation strategies are observed for signaling non-understanding in case there are problems of mutual intelligibility.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Intelligibility studies

Reflecting on today's phenomenon of non-native varieties of English

(Brutt-Griffler, 2002; Jenkins, 2006; Kachru, 1996), an increasing number of intelligibility studies of English by ELF users have been carried out as related to language learning. According to Smith and Nelson (1985), intelligibility can be classified into three categories, *intelligibility*, a recognition of a word, *comprehensibility*, a recognition of a meaning of the word, and *interpretability*, a recognition of the content of the word. Although Jenkins (2000) claimed that those three levels of understanding are not perfect in that they have varying definitions, those categories are the most basic and frequently cited in the intelligibility studies from the perspective of non-native speakers research. Moreover, with English gaining a more significant role as an international language, research on the intelligibility of different varieties of English appears to have become more important than ever.

What are features that promote mutual intelligibility? Some studies have indicated the importance of phonological features (Jenkins, 2000, 2006; Munro & Derwing, 1995, 1999), lexical and grammatical knowledge (Ellis, 2001; Haegeman, 2002; Hill, 2000), context for a topic (Field, 2004) or pragmatic cues (Kachru & Nelson, 2001; Meierkord, 2002). On the other hand, Gass and Varonis (1984) and Kennedy and Trofimovich (2008) have stated the effect of familiarity with English varieties on listeners' perception of non-native English. They have also reported that those who have had greater exposure to non-native English varieties find them more intelligible than those who have had less exposure. Similarly, many studies empathize familiarity through education with English varieties or exposure in education to non-native varieties (Clarke, 2000; Hanamoto, 2013a, 2013b, 2014). Therefore, we can conclude that there are some factors that are related with the interlocutor's mutual intelligibility.

A number of researchers (Jenkins, 2000, 2006; Matsuda, 2003; Seidlhofer, 2001) have investigated the teaching implications as classroom practices. In verity, there have been an increasing number of ELF studies taken from language classrooms (Jenkins, 2000, 2007), business settings (Firth, 1996; Haegeman, 2002), and conferences (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006; House, 1999). Moreover, on the issue of ELF corpus projects, there have been the extensive works by Ishikawa (2011), Jenkins (2000), Mauranen (2003), and Seidlhofer (2001). However, much of the data-based descriptive work carried so far has focused on pronunciation or vocabulary in institutional settings centered in Europe; little has been done to examine ELF interaction in Asian context, except some researches, Deterding and Kirkpatrick (2006) and Ishikawa (2011), have also included the speakers from Asian countries.

2.2 Interaction studies

Hiroki Hanamoto

In the second language acquisition (hereafter, SLA) research, conversational interaction enables SLA (Long, 1980, 1991; Mackey, 2002), and the investigation of interaction has focused on corrective feedback in the negotiation of meaning between native speakers (hereafter, NS) and NNSs (Hatch, 1983; Long, 1991). According to Long's (1991) Interactional Hypothesis, SLA is advanced by the NS or more competent speaker, and it is stated that the building block of learning a language can be found in negotiation for meaning, or the interactions, reformations, and feedback involved when people try to communicate.

Positive evidence is that a NS's or teacher's feedback is a very significant factor in language learning (Leeman, Mackey, & Oliver, 2003; Lyster, 1998). Lyster (1998) examined the relationships between feedback and error types and reported that both seems to be partly related to lexical, grammatical or phonological errors; however, the feedbacks and errors are usually related to differential effect in learner repair. Also, Chun, Day, Chenoweth, and Luppescue (1982) investigated the types and frequencies of the errors corrected by NS, and found that error correction and feedback in NS-NNS discourse is the significant factor on a range of those forms in language learning. Moreover, NSs' feedback or error correction seems to be softened by the learner's perception of being a language learner (Leeman *et al*., 2003).

However, Jenkins (2006) states that "mutual intelligibility" is the most satisfactory criterion for communication in ELF contexts, but that is something to be negotiated and developed by ELF speakers themselves rather than imposed from above by NSs or NNSs. Sato and Lyster (2007) found that there are significant differences in the interaction in NNS-NNS dyads from interactions between NS and NNS. They also report that the difference in interactions appears to be whether or not there is a great wall between the interlocutors. In the NS-NNS interaction type, NNS might feel incompetent compared to the speaker from an Inner Circle country and associate the NS with a hierarchically superior status, although the NNS does get feedback in making errors in phonological, lexical or grammatical areas. However, in ELF interactions, both NNSs would feel competent or confident based on their more equal status. Hanamoto (2013b) emphasizes that NNS learners who have interacted with NNSs who do not share their L1 backgrounds, feel more comfortable than they do with NSs, and are more willing to negotiate meaning. Therefore, interaction between NNSs appears to be different from NS-NNS interaction and that situation may allow NNSs to commingle and develop their unique communication strategies (Firth, 2009).

NNS speakers tend to make efforts to adjust to what they think to become more mutually intelligible when they are aware of being unintelligible, with NNS interlocutors of other L1 backgrounds (Jenkins, 2000; Jenks, 2012). Recent researchers have reported that NNSs manage to overcome mutual intelligibility problems by sharing the processing with the

interlocutor to account for the needs of the specific situation and through communication strategies (Firth, 1996; Kasper & Kellerman, 1997) and accommodation strategies (Braidi, 2002; Derwing & Munro, 2001; Wong, 2000). However, much of these works have focused on the errors and feedback for enhancing English learners' language skills in interaction between teachers and NNS students, especially related to grammatical and phonological features; there are still only a few studies in non-institutional settings using a sequential analysis approach to display how NNSs communicate with NNSs of other L1 backgrounds from the perspective of ELF (House & Kasper, 2000; House, Kasper, & Ross; 2003, Watterson, 2008). Accordingly, the present study seeks to answer the following research questions through the interaction between NNSs who do not share their L1 background.

Research Question 1 How do Japanese learners of English communicate with non-native English interlocutors who do not share their L1 background?

Research Question 2 How do they overcome non-understanding when a breakdown in communication occurs?

3 Methodology

3.1 Participants

Thirteen NNSs voluntarily participated in this study; seven were Japanese and the others were international students. Twelve of them were undergraduate university students and one participant was a graduate student at a private university in Japan. The international students included those from Outer and Expanding Circles such as China, Malaysia and Turkmenistan. Their primary purpose for staying at the university was to major in science and engineering in order to become an engineer. Therefore, most of them considered that they needed to use English to communicate with people around the world in the near future.

The data analyzed for this study are based on three video-recorded ELF conversations in English involving six individuals in all, three Japanese and international students from China and Malaysia. Each pair had one Japanese student and one international student. The three Japanese participants, Hayata, Takuya and Yuka (pseudonyms), were native speakers of Japanese who were learning English. Takuya and Yuka were students in an upper-leveled English class and Hayata was in a lower class. Two international students, Jiunn and Hanisah (pseudonyms) were native speakers of Malay and used English as a second language, and the other, Kin (pseudonym), was from China and his first language was Cantonese. The international students have been living in Japan for three years and they have

learned Japanese in their home country and in Japan. They all appear to be intermediate speakers of Japanese, and Jiunn and Hanisah are higher intermediate speakers of English and Kin is an advanced learner of English. Yuka and Hanisah were female and the others were all male; their ages were early 20s.

3.2 Procedure

The author recruited participants by asking the Japanese and international students to video-record their interactions. The interaction between Takuya and Kin was recorded by the author at his office in the university where he works. The others' dyads were video-recorded by the participants themselves. The participants were not given any topics prior to the interaction and were encouraged to talk freely about whatever they would normally talk about. The author collected approximately twenty-minute interaction for each dyad, and additionally, interviewed the Japanese students after the data collection in order to obtain more information on their perspectives. Both types of data collection were conducted in 2013.

3.3 Data analysis

The author took an emic approach to the interaction data to see how the participants communicated with the interlocutors and to analyze how they overcame the non-understanding when there was a breakdown. The data analyzed for this study are on three video-recorded ELF interactions. When we examine video-recordings of naturally occurring interactions, researchers need to include the nonverbal signals sent because in face-to-face communication interactants are normally visible for one another and interactants use not only language but also other para-linguistics features such as gaze, posture, and gesture (Goodwin, 2003). Moreover, the author used a sequential analysis following the past studies (e.g., Jenks, 2012; Koshik, 2002; Markee, 2000; Matsumoto, 2011; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002). In the literature, they employ the sequential analysis showing the process in making unintelligible utterances clear as participants turn progresses. In this study, the approach is not conversation analysis (hereafter, CA), but CA inspired sequential analysis is adopted.

It is logical to assume that the length of sequence of the negotiation between the interlocutors mostly corresponds to the depth of the understanding trouble. The author defines non-understanding by following Bremer (1996). Bremer notes that when a non-understanding in communication occurs, at least a listener finds that there is a lack of shared understanding, and realizes that s/he cannot make sense of an utterance. Then,

the interlocutor may have two choices: the interlocutor displays the non-understanding, and essentially initiate a negotiation of meaning, that is repair or interactional modification, such as confirmation check, comprehension check, clarification request, self-repetition, other repetition (receipts through repetition) and meaning repairs suggested by Long (1980) and Pica and Doughty (1985). Another option is to avoid the display of the non-understanding and adopt a "let it pass" principle by Firth (1996). According to Schegloff (2000), repairs are "practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk…" (p. 207). That is, repair can be defined as a key marker resulting from some kinds of non-understanding.

The three interactions were transcribed and analyzed by the author. Transcriptions were adapted from Jefferson (1984) (see Appendix for transcription conventions). Lastly, the author conducted follow-up interviews with the Japanese students after the interactions to understand their attitudes towards ELF interaction and the role of ELF in order to achieve data triangulation (Denzin, 1978).

4 Results

4.1 The types of the participant's interactional modification

The transcriptions of the dyadic interactions are analyzed on the negotiation for meaning by the types of communication strategies such as confirmation checks, clarification checks, comprehension checks, self-repetitions and other-repetitions (receipts through repetition) and meaning repair to seek the characteristics of the Japanese and international students.

In Table 1, you can see the frequency of the strategies by the Japanese and international participants. It shows that some typical interactional modification patterns were observed in each interaction. Based on the data, the Japanese participants seemed to communicate with international students by carefully picking out interlocutors' utterances and also carefully choosing their own utterances. As Table 1 shows, the frequency of modifications such as confirmation checks and self-repetitions of Japanese participants was higher than that of the international participants. To sum up, the Japanese seemed to explain their responses by repeating what they had already said or what interlocutors said before, or made minor expansions without carrying out a comprehension check or attempting to expand at length on their or interlocutors' utterance. On the other hand, other- and self-repetitions were used commonly by international students. Even though the international students usually used self-repetitions in the same way as the Japanese, they seemed inclined to make a response by paraphrasing or expanding on their

own or Japanese participants' utterances without using a comprehension check. Based on the data, rather than using specific interactional modifications, each speaker seems to use specific ones to achieve efficiency of communication. In other words, NNSs' ways of using interactional modifications probably vary depending on the interlocutors.

Table 1. Frequency of Modifications in ELF Interactions (3 dyads)

Interactional features	Japanese students		International students	
	n	%	n	%
1. Confirmation checks	22	13.2	10	6.4
2. Clarification requests	8	4.8	0	0
3. Comprehension checks	0	0	0	0
4. Self-repetitions	81	48.5	63	40.4
5. Other-repetitions (Receipts through repetition)	52	31.1	73	46.8
6. Meaning repair	4	2.4	10	6.4
Total	167	100	156	100

4.2 Yuka and Hanisah's interaction

In this section, we will look at how the participants overcome non-understanding when they communicate with ELF speakers who do not share their L1 background through communication and accommodation strategies.

Yuka and Hanisah are both female students. Excerpt 1 shows part of a conversation in which they were talking about Hanisah's country Malaysia. After Hanisah's asking, Yuka initiates a request incorporating an other-repetition from Hanisah's part (line 145), and Hanisah uses self-expansion such as "have you heard a about Malaysia? before this" in response to Yuka's request (line 146 and 147). In line 148, Yuka shows understanding by saying "un", however, she initiates a request again using another modification, a confirmation check, and ultimately she shifts to a clarification request displaying humor tone in line 150. From line 153, Yuka came to understand what Hanisah had told, however partially, and after some turns for negotiation for meaning, Yuka finally succeeded in understanding clearly and indicated what she tried to explain in line 157 and 158. These lines clearly show that non-understanding might not only be overcome through a particular modification pattern; rather, a few different modifications and negotiation of meaning may be necessary for a successful communication among the interlocutors (Firth, 2009; Seidlhofer, 2001).

Excerpt 1: Have you heard about Malaysia?
 H (f)=Malaysian; Y (f)=Japanese

143. H: → ah: (.) before this (.) have you heard, about Malaysia? (.) about my
144.   country?
145. Y: → (.) u:m? have you?=
146. H: → =have you (.) heard: a (.) about Malaysia? (.) before this ((inclining
147.   face))
148. Y: → un. ((looking different direction)) ((nodding)) (.) u:m?
149. H: (.) $hahaha$
150. Y: → one more please ((signal for one)) (.) $hahaha$=
151. H: → =$hahaha$ (.) before this. have you heard: [ah: about Malaysia?
152. Y: [((nodding))
153. Y: → Malaysia?
154. H: un. ((nodding))
155. Y: → (.) name? ((hand moving))
156. H: a:ah. ((nodding))=
157. Y: → =name is (.) a name? ((looking different direction)) ah:: I hear: name
158.   only
159. H: °ah:: °

4.3 Takuya and Kin's interaction

Excerpt 2 shows another case of interactional modification to overcome a short phonological non-understanding. The excerpt captures part of Takuya and Kin's conversation about the summer holiday. In line 65, after Takuya hears Kin's words "the beach bench", Takuya seems uncertain about whether his pronunciation of the initiated word is "beach" or "bench". Takuya immediately uses a confirmation check by asking "bench?" "beach?" in line 66. Kin responds to Takuya's request for self-repetition by saying "beach". In this short excerpt, the Japanese participant provides modification to the interlocutor in a situation that contrasts with Excerpt 1. Therefore, in ELF interactions, both interlocutors may need to collaboratively communicate with each other toward mutual understanding, separate from speaker or listener orientation. This finding corresponds to House (1999), Kordon (2006), Matsumoto (2011), Seidlhofer (2001), and Watterson (2008).

Excerpt 2: Beach? Bench?
 K (m)=Chinese; T (m)=Japanese

61. K: so: in summer holiday[:
62. T: [((nodding))

63. K: (.) in summer holiday you: (4.0) ((looking T's direction))
64. T: ((nodding))
65. K: → °in summer holiday °uh: will you go to the: beach (.) bench?
66. T: → a::h, u:m (.) bench? beach?=
67. K: =beach
68. T: a::h, u:m (.) ((inclining face and hand moving)) <u>Yeah:</u> YAYAYAYA, I
69.   will go to the beach

4.4 Hayata and Jiunn's interaction

Lastly, the unique characteristics of ELF interaction can be observed in Hayata and Jiunn. As has been noted above, Hayata's English level is lower, so his English communication pattern seems to be a little different from the other Japanese. Excerpt 3 illustrates one part of a conversation about their free time. This excerpt does not include any modification or negotiation of meaning. In line 76, Jiunn asks Hayata about his way of releasing stress. After a 5-second pause, Hayata starts his utterance and we can observe another 2-second pause. On the other hand, Jiunn just responds by saying "aha", "um" or nodding without giving modifications. As has been noted in the literature (Wagner & Firth, 1997), Kin's (Excerpt 2) and Hayata's long pauses have unique interaction patterns that ELF participants usually use to find their desire responses or indicate topic changes and end a conversation.

Hayata's comment in an interview refers to this behavior. He said that he could partly understand what Jiunn uttered, but that he needed time for the response. In addition, he told us that he felt secure using English to communicate with NNSs, but not with the teacher or NSs. Similarly, Yuka and Takuya said in an interview that they felt comfortable talking with other NNSs in English. Lastly, they told us that interacting with NNSs in English who do not share their L1 background is a good opportunity for the university students who want to be engineers.

Excerpt 3: Release your stress
 J (m)=Malaysian; H (m)=Japanese

76. J: what else do you (.) ((hand moving)) I mean, having like u::m (.) do
77.   you: what do you do: ((hand moving)) to (.) release. your (.) stress?
78. H: → (5.0) ((looking different direction)) um: I'm go to (.) <u>Bowling:</u> (.)
79. J: → aha ((nodding))
80. H: → u:m: and (2.0) *karaoke* (.) and [$volleyball$ and: (3.0) fu-futsal
81. J: →   [u::m ((nodding))   ((nodding))

5 Conclusion

This study has demonstrated one way of looking at naturally occurring interactions by investigating how Japanese participants communicate with non-native English interlocutors who do not share their L1 background, and by analyzing how they overcome non-understanding through the use interactional modifications. Although preliminary, this study suggests that ELF interactional modifications probably vary depending on the interlocutors and the given context. Second, it was found that non-understanding might not be overcome only through a particular modification pattern, but that a few different types of modifications and negotiation of meaning are used for a successful communication among the interlocutors. The responsibility for repairing troubles was shared with each participant, and this finding corresponds that collaborative and cooperative nature has been characteristic as key aspects of ELF interactions as emphasized by the literatures. Also, it has identified some communication patterns in the use of the ELF interactions and examples of the mutually supportive. The participants in this study tried to have communicated with each other regardless of their limited English skills. In particular, it seems that the Japanese participants' use of English is not partially accurate grammatically and phonologically. However, it is obvious that they tried to overcome the gap by using communication strategies and through a unique interaction. Accordingly, based on the data, we can conclude that both interlocutors need and share responsibility for repairing problems for resolving the non-understanding in the ELF interaction (Seedhouse, 2004; Seidlhofer, 2001; Watterson, 2008).

Taking these findings into account, we can consider some implications. In interaction studies, as Sato and Lyster (2007) point out, there are significant differences in the interaction between NNS and NNS, and between NS and NNS. However, as this initial study shows, in naturally occurring ELF interactions, collaborative repair strategies seem to be characterized as one of key aspects of ELF communication. Although the negotiation of meaning usually occurs in NS and NS-NNS conversations, the phenomenon of responsibility for repairing or resolving non-understanding seems to be more in ELF interactions, because participants in ELF have their individual cultural backgrounds regarding communicative norms and standards (Meierkord, 2000).

Many NNS teachers of English seem to emphasize the teaching of standard NS model in classroom practices. Maley (2009) reports that most English teachers are unaware of the non-native English interaction. Without the teachers' understanding of the varieties of English in the world and the lingua franca role of English, learners cannot be aware of the uniqueness of the English use. Thus, it is crucial for teachers to recognize the need for a successful interaction rather than a single, set form of communication, phonology, grammar and lexical features. Seidlhofer (2001) claims that NNS

teachers of English play an important role as accessible users of ELF. It is therefore essential to implement an ELF approach in classroom practices to develop learners' strategic skills for collaborative negotiation of meaning to manage miscommunication and achieve mutual intelligibility in ELF interactions (Seidlhofer, 2001).

Lastly, I would like to point to the shortcomings of this study. Particularly, it was limited in its scope to three Japanese and three international participants and also there was limited representation of backgrounds among the international students. More participants taken from other Outer and Expanding Circle countries need to be examined. Also, there are still only a small number of studies in naturalistic settings using a sequential analysis to display how NNSs communicate with NNSs of other L1 backgrounds from the perspective of ELF. Thus, it may be difficult to generalize from this study alone. Further research considering these shortcomings is necessary.

References

Braidi, S, M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/ nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning, 52*(1), 1-42.

Bremer, K. (1996). Causes of understanding problems. In K. Bremer, C. Roberts, M. Vasseur, M. Simonot, & P. Broeder (Eds.), *Achieving understanding: Discourse in intercultural encounters* (pp. 37-64). London: Longman.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World Englishes. A study of its development.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Chun, A. E., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., & Luppescue, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and corrections: A study of native-nonnative conversation. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(4), 537-547.

Clarke, C. (2000). Perceptual adjustments to foreign accented English. *Research on Spoken Language Processing*, *24*, 321–335.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: An introduction to sociological methods.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Derwing, T., & Munro, M. J. (2001). What speaking rates do non-native listeners prefer? *Applied Linguistics, 22*(3), 324-337.

Deterding, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Emerging South-East Asian Englishes and intelligibility. *World Englishes, 25*(3), 391-409.

Ellis, N. C. (2001). Memory for language. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 33-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Field, J. (2004). *Psycholinguistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*(2), 237-259.

Firth, A. (2009). The lingua franca factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 6*(2), 147-170.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of nonnative speech. *Language Learning, 34*(1), 65-89.

Goodwin, C. (2003). Pointing as situated practice. In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where language, culture and cognition meet* (pp. 217-241). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Haegeman, P. (2002). Foreigner talk in lingua franca business telephone calls. In K. Knapp & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua franca communication* (pp. 135-162). Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Hanamoto, H. (2013a). Intelligibility and acceptability of collocations from an EIL perspective: A study based on a corpus of speech by Japanese learners of English. In S. Ishikawa (Ed.), *Learner corpus studies in Asia and the world, vol, 1* (pp. 161-178). Kobe: Kobe University.

Hanamoto, H. (2013b). How does the experience of exposure to non-native English varieties relate to learners' language attitudes toward EIL?: A mixed quantitative and qualitative study of Japanese students of science and engineering. *Asian English Studies, 15*, 125-140.

Hanamoto, H. (2014). Relationship between learners' exposure to English varieties and their intelligibility and comprehensibility: A quantitative approach on non-native English varieties. *Asian English Studies, 16*, 61-80.

Hatch, E. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation* (pp. 47-69). Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

House, J. (1999). Misunderstanding in intercultural communication: Interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility. In C. Gnutzmann (Ed.), *Teaching and learning English as a global language: Native and non-native perspectives* (pp. 245-267). Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (2000). How to remain a non-native speaker. In C. Riemer (Ed.), *Kognitive aspekte des lehrens und lernens von fremdsprachen* (pp. 101-118). Narr: Tübingen.

House, J., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Misunderstanding in social life: Discourse approaches to problematic talk*. London: Longman Pearson.

Ishikawa, S. (2011). A new horizon in learner corpus studies: The aim of the ICNALE project. In G. Weir, S. Ishikawa, & K. Poonpon (Eds.), *Corpora and language technologies in teaching, learning and research* (pp. 3-11). Glasgow, UK: University of Strathclyde Publishing.

Jefferson, G. (1984). On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social actions: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 346-369). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 157-181.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenks, C. J. (2012). Doing being reprehensive: Some interactional features of English as a lingua franca in a chat room. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(4), 386-405.

Kachru, B. (1996). Norms, models and identities. *The Language Teacher, 20*(10)*,* 1-13.

Kachru, B., & Nelson, C. (2001). World Englishes. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analyzing English in a global context* (pp. 9-25). London: Routledge.

Kasper, G., & Kellerman, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives*. London: Longman.

Kennedy, S., & Trofimovich, P. (2008). Intelligibility, comprehensibility, and accentedness of L2 speech: The role of listener experience and semantic context. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *64*(3), 459-489.

Kordon, K. (2006). You are very good-establishing rapport in English as a lingua franca: The case of agreement tokens. *Vienna English Working Papers, 15*(1), 58-82.

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35*(3), 277-309.

Leeman, J., Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning, 53*(1), 35-66.

Long, M. (1980). *Input, interaction, and second language acquisition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, LA.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.),

Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learners repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*(2), 183-218.

Mackey, A. (2002). Beyond production: Learners' perceptions about interactional processes. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3-4), 379-394.

Maley, A. (2009). ELF: A teacher's perspective. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 9*(3), 187-200.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Matsuda, A. (2003). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, *22*(4), 483-496.

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communications and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(1), 97-114.

Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(3), 513-527.

Meierkord, C. (2000). Interpreting successful lingua franca interaction. An analysis of non-native/non-native small talk conversations in English. *Linguistik Online5*. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://linguistik-online.com

Meierkord, C. (2002). 'Language stripped bare' or 'linguistic masala'? Culture in lingua franca communication. In K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Lingua franca communication* (pp. 109-133). Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Processing time, accent, and comprehensibility in the perception of native and foreign-accented speech. *Language and Speech*, *38*(3), 289-306.

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1999). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, *49*(1)**,** 285-310.

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). The role of group in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 233- 248.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 693-735.

Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (Eds.). (2007). Conversational interaction in second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(2), 205-243.

Hiroki Hanamoto

Schegloff, E., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 3-31.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). Conversation analysis methodology. *Language Learning, 54*(supplement 1), 1-53.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a descrition of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 209-239.

Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Direction and resources. *World Englishes*, *4*(3)*,* 333-342.

Wagner, J., & Firth, A. (1997). Communication strategies at work. In G. Kasper & C. Meierkord (Eds.), *Communication strategies* (pp. 323-343). London: Longman.

Watterson, M. (2008). Repair of non-understanding in English in international communication. *World Englishes, 27*(3), 378-406.

Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at "first and second sayings". *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*(4), 407-424.

Hiroki Hanamoto
Department of Science and Engineering
Tokyo Denki University
Ishizaka Hatoyama-machi, Hiki-gun, Saitama
350-0394, JAPAN
hiro_warriors@hotmail.com

Appendix
Transcription Conventions

[	overlapping utterances
=	slight overlap between utterances
(.)	short pause of less than 1 second
(2.0)	longer pause; 2-second pause
:	extend sound or syllable
.	falling intonation
,	continuing intonation
?	rising intonation
-	cut-off
<u>Yeah</u>	emphasis
YAYA	increased volume
° °	decreased volume
$	smile voice
(( ))	nonverbal action