

CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDY OF A TANDEM SESSION II: TRANSCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

Analysis of negotiation of meaning

This chapter will start by looking at how the participants interacted with each other in the only tandem session conducted (lesson 1). After this session, it was deemed unnecessary to do any further data collecting. The reasons that lead to this conclusion will be discussed in chapter 5.

One of the key features of this session was the amount of and richness in negotiation of meaning. As mentioned before, there was a proficiency gap between the two learners, which could have had serious consequences for what occurred in each of the conversations (Thai first, then English). The discussion of the results will also take place in chapter 5. This chapter will report on what happened, and explain at certain intervals what was going on, illustrated by a partial transcript. That which was most relevant to the objectives of this current experimental study was transcribed. An analysis and breakdown of the amount and types of negotiation of meaning, as well as the phases of cognitive presence, will follow the transcript (table 2: Quantitative analysis of session 1).

Legend and terminology

T> indicates Thai participant

F> indicates Foreign participant

Overlap

If an utterance is indented, the amount of indentation indicates how soon an utterance is followed with a response, such as this:

T> Do you understand?

↓

F> No, I don't.

Here, while T> utters the final word of her question, F> already answers it. This indicates that there is an overlap in turns. The downward arrow (↓) indicates during which word of the previous utterance the overlap starts to occur.

If an utterance is not indented, there is no overlap. If a response follows afterwards, the downward arrow (↓) is at the end of the utterance. If an amount of silent time has elapsed in which either participant could have started a new topic, then there is now downward arrow at the end of an utterance.

T> Do you understand? ↓

F> Yes, I do.

In the example above, F> responds almost immediately after T>

Negotiation of meaning:*Clarification request**Confirmation check**Recast**Comprehension check**Explicit correction*Overt Indications of:

- *Agreement: OIC*
- *Non-agreement: OIDE*
- *Understanding: OIU*
- *Misunderstanding: OIM*

Cognitive presence level according to Garrison and Archer's (2004) framework

- **P1: Phase 1: Triggering event** – The posing of issues, dilemmas, or problems.
Application in tandem language learning: Can also be seen as a new language item offered for discussion with regards to language learning
- **P2: Phase 2: Exploration** – Engagement in brainstorming, questioning, and exchange of information. Application in tandem language learning: Possibly a back-and-forth interaction on the topic of the aforementioned language item, or possible answers given to direct questions
- **P3: Phase 3: Integration** – Construction of meaning from the ideas generated in the exploratory phase. Application in tandem language learning: Verification or comprehension check of the initial participant who offered the new item, tying back in to the initial problem.
- **P4: Phase 4: Resolution** – Finding, testing, and implementing a solution to problems presented in the triggering phase. Application in tandem language learning: perhaps an attempt by the person who triggered the event made to try

out the new language item in an independently constructed sentence, perhaps to resume the conversation or resolve any communication breakdown occurred before the triggering event

*These marks (**) indicate that it was not clear what was said.*

PAYYAP UNIVERSITY

TABLE 1: SCHEME FOR ANALYSIS OF NEGOTIATION OF MEANING

Adapted from Kötter (2003)

repair type	gloss (plus example from the corpus, if applicable)
Confirmation check	<p>A speaker's attempt to confirm that he has understood an utterance via the (partial) paraphrase (as opposed to repetition; see below) of this turn, which can simply be answered with <i>Yes</i> or <i>No</i>.</p> <p>T> P2: 1:42 <i>Confirmation check</i> Oh, you mean to say that farang eat more than Thai people, right? Not that thai people smile more than foreigners?</p>
Clarification request	<p>An <i>explicit</i> demand for an elaboration or a reformulation of an idea, which "require[s] a rerun of the troublesome utterance" in question (Aston, 1986, p. 136, in Kötter, 2003).</p> <p>F> <i>Clarification request</i>: Could you repeat that?</p>
Comprehension check	<p>A speaker's attempt to prompt another speaker to acknowledge that he has understood a particular utterance</p>

	<p>(Mitchell & Myles, 1998, p. 129, in Kötter, 2003).</p> <p>T> 6:18 <i>Comprehension check (English)</i> You understand my...question?</p> <p>F> Um, no.</p>
Explicit correction	<p>2:09 P1 <i>Explicit correction:</i> Derrick, you should say “Foreigners eat more food than Thai people”</p>
Recast (implicit error correction)	<p>A form-focused partner-related target-like reformulation of all or part of an incorrect utterance (Long, 1996, p. 434; Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46, in Kötter, 2003).</p> <p>F> I think there are many similarities between Thais and foreigners.</p> <p>T> 4:40 P1; <i>Recast of the previous phrase:</i> (F> repeats phrase word by word)</p>
Overt indication of understanding	<p>Overt indication that a speaker has understood a particular message.</p> <p>T> You have to say it this way, otherwise some people might not understand.</p> <p>2:20 <i>Comprehension check and code switch: (In English)</i> You understand that? (<u>Switch to Thai</u>) Do you understand?</p>

	F> 2:26 <i>OIU</i> : I understand
Overt indication of misunderstanding	<p>Overt indication that a speaker has not understood a particular message.</p> <p>T>**</p> <p>F> <i>OIM</i>: Um, I don't ...know that</p> <p>T> 5:32 <i>Comprehension check</i>: You don't understand, do you?</p> <p>F> Right.</p>
Overt indication of agreement	<p>Overt indication that a speaker agrees with what his partner said.</p> <p>T>...So I think they should both come to talk to each other, and don't fear anymore.</p> <p>F> 7:18 <i>OIC</i>: I agree with that.T> This is my opinion.</p>
Overt indication of non-agreement	Overt indication that a speaker does not agree with what his partner said.

Student elected topic: Differences between foreigners and Thai people in Thailand

Thai conversation: partial transcript

Student elected topic: Differences between foreigners and Thai people in Thailand

T> How are you? Mister Derrick, right? ↓

ท/ สวัสดีค่ะ คุณคือเดอริคใช่ไหมคะ

F> Right

ฟ/ ใช่

T> How are you? ↓

ท/ สบายดีไหมคะ

F> Im fine

ฟ/ สบายดี

T> Um (pause) How long have you been here? ↓

ท/ อืม.. อยู่เมืองไทยมานานเท่าไรแล้วคะ

F> 12 years. ↓

ฟ/ 12 ปี

T> 0:39 Confirmation check: (Tone correction) Twelve years (pause)

ท/ 12 ปี

F> Yes

↓

ฟ/ ใช่

T> (English) One (pause; then in Thai) One year, right? Oh, twelve years! ↓

ท/ one....หนึ่งปีใช่ไหมคะ โอ 12 ปี

F> Twelve years (pause) in (pause)

Comment [C1]: (He means to say that he has been in Thailand for twelve years)

Comment [C2]: There then occurred some miscommunication here: the participants went back and forth, but F> in the end just copied T's final statement, perhaps without realizing that she was just verifying if she had understood him correctly. This happened a few times: F> thought he was being corrected, while in fact he was asked a question.

ฝ/ 12 ปี...ใน...

T> ...nine months ↓

ท/ 9 เดือน

Comment [C3]: (Because the word for 'in' in Thai sounds similar to nine, she thought she would help him by translating nine into the Thai word for nine. She appears to think he has been here for 12 years and nine months)

F> Nine months.

ฝ/ 9 เดือน

T> P1: Do you think Thais and foreigners are different? ↓

ท/ คุณคิดว่าคนไทยกับฝรั่งต่างกัน ไหมคะ

F> Yes,

↓

ฝ/ ต่าง

T> How are they different?

↓

ท/ ต่างยังไงคะ

Comment [C4]: (He did not understand what she had just said, assumed from his uninflected, flat repetition of her words; he understands that he has been corrected, but does not understand in what. He does not ask, however)

Comment [C5]: I considered this a P1 triggering event because it poses an issue related directly to the topic the participants had chosen, and moved the conversation forward.

F> Thai people eat more than foreigners. ↓

ฝ/ คนไทยกินมากกว่าฝรั่ง

T> *Recast; Confirmation check:* Smile.

F> Smile. ↓

T> *P1:* Well (pause) Why do you think they smile more than foreigners? ↓

ท/ ทำไมคิดว่าคนไทยยิ้มมากกว่าฝรั่งคะ

F> *P2:* Um, Farangs eat (pause) more (pause) fried rice with chicken (pause) than

ฝ/ อืม... ฝรั่งกิน... ข้าวผัดไก่...มากกว่า

Thai people. Eat Thai people. (English) I mean (Thai) Eat fried rice (pause) more

คนไทย...กินคนไทย...หมายความว่า...กินข้าวผัด...มากกว่าคนไทย

(pause) than Thai people.

T> *P2: 1:42 Confirmation check* Oh, you mean to say that farang eat more

Comment [C6]: F> pronounced eat similar to the word for smile; thus T> corrects the pronunciation and verifies that she has heard correctly

Comment [C7]: F> seems to think that he's being corrected on the word for eat, unaware that he's uttering a different word.

ท/ ใช่ คุณหมายถึง ฝรั่งเศสกินมากกว่า

than Thai people, right? Just as Thai people eat more than foreigners, right?

คนไทยใช่ไหมคะ เหมือนที่ว่าคนไทยกินมากกว่าฝรั่ง

↓

F> Right.

ใช่

T> *Confirmation check:* Not that Thai people smile more than foreigners, right?

↓

ท/ ไม่ใช่คนไทยยิ้มมากกว่าฝรั่ง ใช่ไหมคะ

F> Right.

ใช่

Comment [C8]: The foreigner actually explained in the interview that what he meant was that according to him, Thai people smile more, and foreigners eat more.

2:09 P1 *Explicit correction:* Derrick, you should say

ท/ เดริก ควรพูดว่า

“Foreigners eat more food than Thai people”

↓

ฝรั่งกินอาหารมากกว่าคนไทย

(F> repeats phrase word by word) ↓

T> You have to say it this way, otherwise some people might not understand what you eat.

ท/ คุณต้องพูดแบบนี้ไม่อย่างนั้นอาจมีบางคนไม่เข้าใจว่าคุณกินอะไร

2:20 *Comprehension check and code switch:* (In English) You understand that?

(Switch to Thai) Do you understand? ↓

ท/ You understand that?

คุณเข้าใจไหมคะ

F> 2:26 *OIU*: I understand

ฝ/เข้าใจ

T> And what else? ↓

ท/มีอะไรอีกไหมคะ

F> I then (pause) think Thai people (pause) are quiet. ↓

ฝ/ผมแล้วก็คิดว่าคนไทย...เงียบ

T> Excuse me? ↓

ท/อะไรนะคะ

F> *PI*: I then think Thai people are quiet. ↓

ฝ/ผมแล้วก็คิดว่าคนไทย...เงียบ

T> 3:08 *Explicit correction* Oh, Derrick, in order to speak correctly, you should say “I”, and the word “then” comes before this. In the previous sentence you said “I then think”, right? ↓

ท/ใช่เดริค ถ้าจะพูดให้ถูกจะต้องพูดว่าแล้วก็ ก่อน ผม..ก่อนนี้คุณพูดว่าผมแล้วก็คิดว่าใช่ไหมคะ

F> Right. ↓

ฝ/ใช่

T> You should change this to, “Then (pause) I think Thai people are quiet”

ท/ คุณควรจะเปลี่ยนเป็น แล้วก็... ผมคิดว่าคนไทยเงียบ

↓
(F> repeats phrase word by word)

T> Anything else? ↓

ท/มีอะไรอีกไหมคะ

F> 3:20 *PI*: Two more... ↓

ฝ/อีก 2

T> Two more topics? ↓
ท/อีก 2 เรื่อง

Comment [C9]: T suggests the word 'topics' in Thai

F> Two more topics. ↓
ฝ/อีก 2 เรื่อง

T> P1: What sort of two things, what are they? ↓
ท/เรื่องอะไรคะ

F> I think Thai foreigners are bored of Thailand (pause). Thai country. ↓
ฝ/ผมคิดว่า คนไทยฝรั่งเบื่อประเทศไทย... เมืองไทย

T> 3:40 *Confirmation check:* Thai foreigners? Or Thai people (pause)
ท/คนไทยฝรั่ง หรือคะ

F> (repeats phrase word by word) Thai people (pause)
ฝ/ผมคิดว่า คนไทยฝรั่งเบื่อประเทศไทย... เมืองไทย

T> (continued) who are foreign, (pause) or
ท/คนที่เป็นฝรั่ง หรือ...

↓
F> Who are foreign (pause)
ฝ/คนที่เป็นฝรั่ง

T> (continued) Oh! You mean Luuk krung! (half thai half foreign people)
right ↓

Comment [C10]: It was not completely clear whether she had actually understood what he had said

ท/ อ้อ คุณหมายความว่า ลูกครึ่ง ใช่ไหมคะ

F> Yes, half thai half foreign people.
ฝ/ ใช่ ลูกครึ่ง

T> 3:49 *Confirmation check*: Bored of (pause) Thailand? Er, bored of Thai people, right? ↓

ท/เบื่อประเทศไทย..เออ เบื่อคนไทยใช่ไหมคะ

Comment [C11]: T> makes the mistake of substituting Thailand with Thai people, yet F> confirms.

F> Yes

ใช่

T> 3:58 *Explicit correction* Oh, so do you tthink that Luuk Krung or Thai people who are half foreign (pause) ↓

ท/โอ้ต้องพูดว่าลูกครึ่งหรือคนไทยเชื้อสายฝรั่ง...

F> (repeats phrase): Luuk krung (pause) ↓

ฝ/ลูกครึ่ง

T> Or (pause) ↓

ท/หรือ

F> (repeats word): Or ↓

ฝ/ หรือ

T> Or, or (pause) ↓

ท/ หรือ

F> (repeats) Or, or ↓

ฝ/ หรือ

T> (continued) Thai people (pause) ↓

ท/คนไทย..

F> (repeats) Thai people (pause) ↓

ฝ/ คนไทย..

T> (continued) who are half foreign ↓

ท/เชื้อสายฝรั่ง

F> (repeats) who are half foreign ↓

ฝ/เชื้อสายฝรั่ง

T> (continued) are bored with (pause)

พ/เบื่อหน่ายกับ

↓

F> (repeats): are bored with

ฝ/เบื่อหน่ายกับ

T> (continued) the characteristics of Thai people (pause) ↓

ท/ลักษณะของคนไทย

F> (repeats): the characteristics/behavior of Thai people

ฝ/ลักษณะของคนไทย

T> (continued): in Thailand? ↓

ท/ในประเทศไทย

F> (repeats): in Thailand?

ฝ/ในประเทศไทย

T> Was that too long? ↓

ท/ยาวไปไหมคะ

F> I want more. ↓

ฝ/เอาอีก

G> I think there are many similarities between Thais and foreigners.

ฝ/ผมคิดว่าคนไทยมีหลายอย่างเหมือนฝรั่ง

T> 4:40 P1; Recast of the previous phrase: I think there are many similarities between Thais and foreigners.

Comment [C12]: F> misinterprets T's question as: "Is there anything else?" or something similar, instead of her offer to perhaps simplify the sentence so F> would be able to understand.

Deleted: F>

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Comment [C13]: This recast or implicit correction is not noticed by F>, so T> continues to make it explicit. There was some spontaneous language teaching starting at 4:40: F> repeats the phrase, but makes another mistake. T> decided to give some metalinguistic information to help clear up the confusion. Therefore, this explanation might qualify as an explorative phase, since there is a direct solution given to F's problem. Unfortunately, he does not try to apply it.

ท/ ผมคิดว่าคนไทยมีหลายอย่างเหมือนฝรั่ง

T> P2: 4:55: You should use 'mi' in the sentence as well. Mi is a verb. So 'Thai people' comes first. I think Thais bear many similarities with foreigners. ↓

ท/ ควรจะมีคำว่ามี ด้วยนะคะ มี เป็นคำกริยา ดังนั้นคำว่าคนไทยมาก่อน ... คนไทยมีหลายอย่างเหมือนฝรั่ง

F>(repeats phrase word by word)

T> 5:07 Confirmation check: This is how you think, right?

ท/คุณคิดว่าอย่างนั้นใช่ไหมคะ

F> Yes.

ฝ/ใช่

T> 5:16 How are you now?

ท/แล้วยังงี้อีกคะ

F> There's nothing

ฝ/ไม่มีอะไร

T> Confirmation check: No further questions, right?

ท/ไม่มีคำถามใช่ไหมคะ

F> Right

ฝ/ใช่

T> Do you have any goals?

5:26 (code switch and comprehension check) (In English) You understand (Pao Mai)**?

ท/คุณมีเป้าหมาย ...do you understand เป้าหมาย

F> Um, tree?

G> ...ต้นไม้

Here F> seems to think she is referring to a tree; to F> the unfamiliar word sounds similar to tree.

T> **

F> OIM: Um, I don't ...know that

ผ/ไม่รู้จัก

T> 5:32 Comprehension check: You don't understand, do you?

ท/ไม่เข้าใจใช่ไหมคะ

F> Right.

ผ/ใช่

T> 5:37 Comprehension check: Do you understand that which I'm saying?

ท/คุณเข้าใจที่พูดไหมคะ

F> which...

ผ/ที่

T> 5:44 Comprehension check; Reformulates question: Do you understand what I'm saying?

ท/คุณเข้าใจที่พูดไหมคะ

F> Um, don't speak

ผ/ไม่พูด

T> 5:49 You don't speak or you don't understand?

ท/ไม่พูดหรือไม่เข้าใจ

F> 5:51 Ah, I don't understand (F> finally understands what is being asked)

ผ/ผมไม่เข้าใจ

- T> 5:53 P1 *Explicit correction*: If you say ‘mai pood’ it means (in English)
don’t speak
น/ถ้าพูดว่า ไม่พูด หมายความว่า don’t speak
- F> Ok.
อ/โอเค
- T> 5:57 P1 *Explicit correction*: If you say “Mai khao jai” it means (in English)
I don’t understand
น/ถ้าพูดว่า ไม่เข้าใจ หมายความว่า don’t understand
- F> Ok
อ/โอเค
- T> 6:00 *Code switch*: (English) Yes, that’s right
น/ Yes, that’s right
- T> Derrick, how would you like to improve your Thai language? ↓ 6:14

น/ดิฉันอยากจะปรับปรุงภาษาไทยตรงไหนบ้างคะ
- Comprehension check; Code switch*: (English) You understand?
น/ You understand?
- F> Uh (long pause) ↓
- T> 6:18 *Comprehension check* (English) You understand my...question? ↓
น/ You understand my...question?
- F> Um, no. ↓
อ/ไม่
- T> 6:22 *Translation of question* (English) Um, what I mean, what you want to
improve, in Thai? ↓
น/ Um, what I mean, what you want to improve, in Thai? ↓

- F> (English) Um, tones. ↓
 ฟ/ Um, tones
- T> 6:27 Translation, Recast, Confirmation check (provides lexical assistance)
 (Thai) Sounds, right? ↓
 ท/เสียง ใช่ไหมคะ
- T> The sounds of which words? ↓
 ท/ เช่น! คำว่าอะไรคะ
- F> P1 6:35: (English) Um, vowels (In Thai) Um, 'Sarah teh' ↓
 ฟ/ Um, vowels...สระอะ
- T> 6:48 P1 (English) What does that mean? In English? ↓
 ท/ What does that mean? In English?
- F> Vowel sounds ↓
 ฟ/ Vowel sounds
- T> 6:49 P2 Recast; Translation, provides lexical assistance: Oh, vowel sounds. ↓
 ท/เสียงสระ
- T> Vowel sound "A", vowel /a:/, vowel /e:/ ↓
 ท/ สระเสียง อ... เอ้อ... อี
- F> Vowel sound "eu" ↓
 ฟ/ สระอู
- T> 6:55 P2 Explicit correction; Pronunciation correction: Oh, vowel sound "U"
 ท/ สระอู
- 7:06 P1 Why, is it difficult? ↓

Comment [C14]: This section of the conversation is quite interesting, because the pair almost completes a cycle of cognitive presence. It starts off at 6:35 by F> indicating that he has difficulty with the pronunciation of vowel sounds (a triggering event). The pair then goes back and forth, indexing all the difficult vowel sounds (exploration). However, to T> 7:06 question why he has difficulty with this, F> only responds the pronunciation is difficult. T> repeats an attempt to find out what he would like to know about it at 7:06. The pair responds that he also has difficulty with the tone.

This is when another cycle starts. T> takes control of the matter, by giving a list of tones (exploration), giving examples of how tonal changes affect meaning (exploration and integration) and also applies it to an example F> can understand. If she changes the tone for the Thai sound which means come, it means dog instead. F> understands this and they both laugh.

ทอ่านยากหรือคะ

- F> *Tries to pronounce sounds* The pronunciation...
 ฟ/ออกเสียงยาก
- T> 7:17 *Confirmation check*: The pronunciation is difficult, right?
 ท/ออกเสียงยากหรือคะ
- F> P1: The tones / eak/ / tho/ /tri/ / juttawa/ ↓
 ฟ/เสียงเอก โท ครี จัตวา
- T> 7:30 P2; *Explicit correction*; *Corrects pronunciation*: The sounds / eak/ /
 tho/ /tri/ / juttawa/
 ท/เสียงเอก โท ครี จัตวา
- T> P3: Um, Yes, if you make a mistake in their pronunciation, the meaning of
 the word changes too.
 ท/ถ้าออกเสียงผิดความหมายก็ผิด
- T> 7:42 *Comprehension check*; *Codeswitch*: (English) You understand
 my (pause) ↓
- U> ท/ You understand my...
- F> No. ↓
 ฟ/ ไน
- T> 7: 44 (English) I mean, that if your pronounce is wrong (*lists all the tones*),
 your meaning will wrong too.
 ท/ I mean, that if your pronounce is wrong (เอก โท ครี จัตวา), your meaning will
 wrong too.
- F> Oh, ok.
- T> 7:55 P3 (English) For example na (Thai) Let's check? Horse, dog
 (changes tone to illustrate change of meaning)
 ท/) For example na...นา นานา น้า นม

8:00 Comprehension check: You understand right? (changes all tones for four different meanings)

F> Alright.

T> 8:22 P3: (In English) If I say for example, Derrick, come here, in Thai (in Thai) Derrick, come here (In English) If I use a wrong sound, ...

n/) If I say for example.. เดริก มานี่...เดริก หมานี่

F> Repeats Thai phrase

ฝ/.. เดริก มานี่...เดริก หมานี่

T> (English) it means, Derrick...(laughs)

ท/หมายความว่า เดริก.....

F> Ok...(laughs)

G> ฝ/ โอเค

T> P3: (English) You understand? So you have to be careful when you use a sound, in Thai...(Thai) In Thai, there are sounds that belong to words which are the same as many other words, so Derrick needs to be careful
w/ You understand. So you have to be careful when you use a sound, in Thai

ในภาษาไทยมีเสียงเหมือนกันหลายคำดังนั้น เดริกต้องระวัง

F> (repeats phrase word by word)

T> (Thai) be careful (English) it means be careful

ท/ be careful แปลว่าระวัง

T> Recast: be careful

ท/ ระวัง

F> be careful (corrects 3 times)

ฝ/ ท/ ระวัง

T> ...when you speak Thai

ท/เวลาพูดภาษาไทย

- F> (repeats phrase word by word)
 T> 9:20 Do you have another question (Repeats in Thai)
 ท/มีคำถามอีกไหม
 F> I don't have another question
 ฟ/ไม่มีคำถามแล้ว

English conversation partial transcript

Student elected topic: Differences between foreigners and Thai people in Thailand

- T> P1: Explains about Thai people's fear of speaking to foreigners, and, regarding Thai stereotypes, ends with the question: How do they do?
 F> 1:09 Confirmation check: Um, How do... Thai people...? ↓
 T> Yes ↓
 F> Thai people (pause) think (pause) that (pause) if (pause) you (pause) speak softly, then (pause) you can communicate (pause) with Farangs better. ↓
 T> Did you think that? ↓
 F> Yeah. ↓
 T> Thank you
- T> P2: Still relating to Thai stereotypes and Thai-foreign interaction and misunderstandings that occur. Explains about Thailand's smiling culture. Ends with the question: *Siam Muang Yim*, did you hear that? ↓
 F> Clarification request: Could you repeat that? ↓
 T> Explains about the common misunderstanding of Thais who smile at foreigners, which foreigners interpret as an invitation to speak with them. Yet Thais actually hide their fear while smiling at a foreigner, and often don't speak any English.
 ↓

Comment [C15]: Regarding her earlier raised topic of Thai stereotypes and Thai-foreign interaction, T's offer as a possible reason or underlying factor for the issue is here considered a phase 2 utterance.

T> 2:25 *Confirmation request* (on pronunciation accuracy) Smy, Smile? (rising intonation, then pause) smile, is that right? ↓

F> Right.

T> Continuous explaining the meaning of Siam Muang Yim as the 'Spirit of Thai'

↓

F> P2: 2:42 *Recast and confirmation check*: summarizes T's> story (to confirm that information is understood correctly) So you mean it's the spirit of Thai (pause) the culture of Thai (rising intonation, pause) ↓

T> Yes, Thai people smile.

Then, T> goes on to explain about how she can see how some foreigners might feel offended if Thai people seem to refuse to speak with them or even run away. F> (misunderstanding): I don't think if farangs don't smile, then I don't think it's wrong, in their culture 3:41 *Comprehension check (after stating opinion)* Do you know what I'm saying? ↓

T> Yeah, I, I understand. But in Thai, think that, because Thai stereotype, they think that, about that.

T> Relates her own classroom experience about English classrooms in Thailand with native speaking teachers, saying that silence is often considered refusal to answer a question. Yet Thai people understand, yet don't know how to formulate their answer in English. Then she says: So that makes teacher angry them when teach. P1 4:32: When teach or teaching? ↓

F> P2 4:36 *Confirmation request*: So you think that's a bad thing? ↓

T> Yeah, that's a bad thing, for Thai people to do that with farang people.

F> 4:52: Do you have any other questions?

T> If farang people, they don't like to talking, if they don't like to talking? ↓

F> P1: 5:04 *Confirmation request and reformulation*: Oh you think that farang people don't like to talk? To Thai people? ↓

T> P2: Yes, what do you think? ↓

Comment [C16]: At 2:42, F> performs two actions, namely recast and confirmation check. To the observer, it seems as if the implicit correction was intentional, due to the stress added in his voice, to the words spirit and culture, indicating that he might use the word culture instead of spirit in this situation. Also, it could be that he is trying to verify if he understands T's> story correctly. It is also a phase 2 event, as F> recaps T's> reasoning. F> continuously shows overt signs of understanding, by saying Ok, Aha, right at certain intervals.

Comment [C17]: F> misunderstands T's> reference to smiling and impoliteness, interpreting that foreigners are impolite if they don't smile back at Thai people.

Comment [C18]: This is a request for metalinguistic feedback or a correction on language use, a phase 1 event.

Comment [C19]: This is a phase 2 event, as F> replies to T's> concerning the content of her story, yet F> ignores T's> request for a language correction. This is a partial exploration attempt by F> of the topic matter, as expressed, however there is no further follow up in the dialogue. There follows a short silence, after which F> states:

F> P2: Um, I think some are shy (pause) and some (pause) plain don't know how to speak in Thai.

T> P2: mmm-hmm...and, why farang person don't speak English with Thai person?

F> Um, Thai people, in Thai, um, I mean, some people, (long pause) some of them, they're too shy ↓

T> 5:58 P2: Confirmation check: Oh, they're too shy? ↓

F> Yeah. ↓

T> P3 6:10: So I think, they're character, how you say, so serious, farang people they look so serious, so Thai people, they're afraid of that, and Thai people, they think they don't like them, or...

T> 6:18 Confirmation check: Is that right? ↓

F> Yeah. ↓

T> P4: 6:20: But in my opinion, I think farang, they don't, um, they don't difficult for understand, they're really easy for understand, if, Thai people can understand English more than now, and Thai people don't, what you call that, don't run away when saw farang, just come and talk with them, and I think, um, sometime, um, for example, sorry! Anyway, some farang people would like to talk to Thai people, some farang people would like to learn to speak Thai language, they want to learn their language. So, if farang people are scared to speak to Thai people, they cannot improve their Thai anymore. So I think they should both come to talk to each other, and don't fear anymore. ↓

F> 7:18 OIC: Yeah, I agree with that. ↓

T> This is my opinion.

F> 7:26: Do you have any more questions for me? ↓

T> No, I have some questions about my English (pause) because some things in my English, I know I'm very, somethings I'm wrong.

F> 7:41 Like verbs, or (pause) ↓

Comment [C20]: The topic in the section above is about fear in speaking to each other, for both Thais and foreigners. Now, they seem to both have the opinion that there is fear to communicate from both sides. At 6:10 T> tries to integrate and summarize these ideas, seeks confirmation/verifies this with F>, and then at 6:20 constructs meaning of the ideas that there is anxiety felt by both parties, this causes the problem that neither will improve their language that way, applies the collected ideas to her opinion of both parties needing to approach each other with out fear.

Comment [C21]: Perhaps at 7:41, F> was trying to get a concept of what she meant by her issues in English, when she mentions that she is wrong about some things. On the other hand, he might have concluded from their conversation so far, that she makes mistakes in verb use: this might be why he offers this as an example, even though she has not specified anything yet.

T> Yes, verbs, or pronoun (pause) ↓

F> 7:46: Ok,

what specifically in verbs, do you, typic- and what do you, specifically, in verbs, are problems?

T> P1: 7:50 *Comprehension check*: For example, I'm talking in the past tense, but I use the verb one, do you understand verb one? ↓

F> P1: 8:03 So like -ed tense?

Tenses? ↓

T> P1: Yes, I don't use -ed tense, I use normal tense, something like that.

↓

F> P1: Or, um, -ing?

T> Yes, -ing too!

F> Um, what other things besides verbs, do you, want to practice, ↓ (pause) or, do better?

T> Maybe,

maybe now, maybe two only? ↓

F> Ok.

T> 8:34 And how do you help me? ↓

F> P2: Um, well if you say pass, like you say 'I pass you the ball,' um, first you'd say, 'Pass the ball'. Like: 'I pass the ball to you'. ↓

T> *Repeats phrase*

F> Yeah. ↓

T> P2; *Confirmation check*: Pass the ball!..to you? ↓

F> P2: Yeah. And then, if you want to say presently, 'You're passing the ball'...uh, 'I am passing the ball to you', you would use -ing. ↓

T> P2: *Confirmation check*: Yes. 'I passing the ball to you', yes, that means in mainly, I use -ing, that's right? ↓

F> Yes. ↓

Comment [7722]: Ask how when, which circumstances.

Comment [7723]: If she could question P1, she could use the -ing form. Such questioning could eventually be model for P2 in teaching P1.

- T> P2; *Confirmation check*: Passing, that's right? ↓
 F> P2: Yeah, that's like present tense. ↓
 T> Ok...thank you, and about my pronoun...

T> 9:41 *PI* For example, in the first time I learn English, and in the first time I speak English, if I would introduce my sister: My sister me. How do I change that?

F> Mi? ↓

T> Yes, my sister me. I introduce my younger sister to another person, but I say my sister me. ↓

F> You would say, uh, I have a younger sister, called Mi. ↓

T> I have...what? ↓

F> I have a younger sister, who is called Mi. ↓

T> No, no, I don't mean that, I want to tell them: that woman, that is my sister. ↓

F> Oh, I see. ↓

T> But sometimes when I'm talking quicker, I'm sorry, quickly, so I use wrong, the sentence, I use my sister me.

F> Ok.

T> And how do I change this sentence it's right?

F> Uh, my sister and I.

T> My sister what?

T> I say my sister me.

T> 10.38 *Comprehension check*: You understand my ↓ (pause) question?

F> No, I don't understand.

T> *Comprehension check*: I say my sister me, my that mean I, ↓ that right?

F> Confirmation

check: So your sister, who is called Mi? ↓

T> My sister that is called me? No, no, I don't mean that my younger sister called me. I mean me, I mean I have younger sister.

Comment [7724]: Especially after six or seven years of misunderstanding, the teacher should attempt to help L2 by questioning L2 how to clarify. Perhaps by means of direct translation, it becomes clear that it is L1 interference causing the problem.

- F> Oh ok, ok. So you and your younger sister...or my...I have a younger sister...who is called me. ↓
- T> 11:20 I, I have younger sister. Ok...maybe another example, maybe another question, would be more, for example one person who's a man right? ↓
- F> I'm sorry, what? ↓
- T> F1: For example, his name James. I want to say, this book, James book.
How do I say in the full sentence? ↓
- F> P2: This book belongs to James. ↓
- T> *Repeats phras / e*
- F> This book belongs to James ↓
- T> And I can say? ↓
- F> *Confirmation check: Sing?* ↓
- T> P2: His book.. ↓
- F> P2: His book belongs to James, yeah you could say that. ↓
- T> *Confirmation check: His book belongs to James? That right sentence? For me.*
↓
- F> P2: For you, you would say: 'That book belongs to James.' ↓
- T> *Repeats phrase; But when James say, he has to say* ↓
- F> P2: His book belongs to ↓
- T> *Repeats phrase* ↓
- F> P2...to him. Yeah ↓ .
- T> 12:30 P3; *Confirmation Check: So his and him...use with the...main person?*
↓ F> P4: Or he and him ↓
- T> Oh he and him...and she.. ↓
- F> Or her ↓
- T> Oh her.. and I... ↓
- F> And myself... ↓

T> Oh, and by myself... Oh, something like this? So if I use that word, my sentence will come to right sentence, that right? Thank you. Ok thank you for your opinion on farang and Thai stereo types too much, thank you see you next time, bye.

PAYAP UNIVERSITY

TABLE 2: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF SESSION 1

<u>Negotiation of meaning</u>				
	Thai conversation		English Conversation	
	T>	F>	T>	F>
Repair move				
<i>Clarification request</i>	-	-		1
<i>Comprehension check</i>	9	-	3	1
<i>Confirmation check</i>	10	-	8	6
<i>Explicit correction</i>	7	-	-	-
<i>Recast</i>	8	-	-	1
Overt indications of:				
Agreement	-	-	-	1
Non-agreement	-	-	-	-
Understanding	-	1	-	-
Misunderstanding	-	1	-	-
 <u>Codeswitching</u>				
	T>	F>	T>	F>
	20	2	1	-
 <u>Inquiry phases</u>				
Repair move	T>	F>	T>	F>
1: Triggering	10	4	4	3
2: Exploration	10	4	13	12
3: Integration	4	-	1	1
4: Resolution	-	-	2	-

Cycle of cognitive presence: eliminated the need for further sessions

At 9:41 T> Explained that this was a situation in which she used to make a lot of mistakes, because of the difference in sentence structure when using possessive forms in Thai. The possessive pronoun follows the object in Thai: 'my sister' literally translates into 'sister of mine' or in abbreviated form even 'sister me'. Perhaps F> did not know about this structure in Thai, and therefore had not been exposed to instances in which this mistake occurred. He probably did not recognize this as a 'typical' mistake and thus cannot deduce the meaning of the sentence.

Participant takes initiative

However, as T> had already explained that this was a mistake she used to make and does not make anymore, it was fairly irrelevant to the context of the discussion. Despite not being instructed to do so, T> just seemed to want to take advantage of the fact that she was speaking to a native speaker and wanted to be corrected on some grammar points besides having a meaningful conversation. This was perhaps partly because she had set 'improving verb tenses and sentence structure' as some of her goals and objectives for this session. However, in this instance there might have been other matters at hand. She clearly indicated that she does not make this mistake anymore, so why would she ask of F> how she would need to be corrected on such a hypothetical error?

In the discussion following the session, it turned out that she was just trying to assess her interlocutor's ability to correct her. This was off-task, but perhaps not without

reason. One might argue for T's> case that she would need to know how accurately her partner can correct her, to have more realistic expectations of what she might gain from future sessions with the same partner. Perhaps she picked up an error in F's> earlier suggestion at 9:41 that 'passing' is present tense, when in fact it is present continuous tense.

Once again this shows the relative value of being corrected by a native speaker. Since T> is a learner of English and has been instructed by language teachers, her knowledge about English grammar rules might exceed that of her partner's knowledge (even though it is his native tongue). At 11:41 T> attempted to illustrate her confusion with possessives once more, by giving an example of a book belonging to a hypothetical James. She asks: "There is a book, it's James's book, how can I say this in a full sentence?" And F> answered "This book belongs to James." Then T> verified once more, repeating F's> suggestion. Then she applied it in a different setting, as if she were the third person. F> suggested that she should use "His book belongs to James" or "His book belongs to him" and using "That book" instead of "This book" when saying "That book belongs to him". From this, T> deduced pronoun rules for his and him, she asked "his and him use with the main person?". She then continued to verify if it works the same way for other pronouns, for "she and her" for example. Unfortunately, F> makes another mistake by saying that "I" would become "myself". Regardless of accuracy, this is an example in which the full cycle of inquiry was actually completed.

Cognitive presence achieved by the participants sooner than expected

That completion of the cycle of inquiry was one reason for not continuing collecting data for the current study. Very likely, students will often find their own ways around a given lesson plan, outline, or system to make it work for them. Since every learner will experience tandem learning differently, the way this experience is expressed will vary also. As also occurred here, students did more than was expected or asked of them, in fact they were not even aware of the fact that they were ahead of what was planned for the course. Thus, task objectives arise as individuals both consciously (via preparation of notes) and sub-consciously (out of the resulting events that occur in their conversation) co-construct the purpose of their collaboration.

Unexpectedly, participants took control and responsibility of their own learning by choosing to stray from the topic and focus on language. In both conversations, explicit discussion of language was deemed necessary by both sides. Thus, we can draw on the results of this study to aid in estimating the necessary degree of teaching instruction and teaching presence or intervention to be applied in future tandem learning.

Asymmetrical language repair and collaboration

It appears that most of the language repair moves were made by T> in both conversations. Most significant is the amount of codeswitches T> made in the Thai session. She switched from Thai to English (see the table in Appendix F) often, as compared to F>, mostly to check comprehension (also relatively high) or to translate

vocabulary. This can probably be explained because of the language proficiency gap between learners. T> was much more capable and confident in English than F> was in Thai. On the other hand, F> made very few code switches (only two in the Thai conversation and one in the English session). We might speculate that F> attempts to adhere to the task rule of speaking in the target language unless it is absolutely necessary to switch. However, he does not attempt to accommodate T> either by switching to Thai in the English session. This is one reason T> switched so often, perhaps because it was more necessary and helpful for F>. The opposite might not have helped T> that much.

The influence of a proficiency gap

Furthermore, T> made use of techniques such as explicit and implicit corrections (recasts). These were not used at all by F>. Perhaps T> saw the need to do more language correcting, maybe because of F's> comparatively lower language ability. And F> was either less aware, or did not consider T's> need for correction. Which brings up another matter: the level of cognitive presence was mainly achieved due to T's> efforts in collaborating and solving the issues that were brought up. At times it seemed remarkable how F> would bring up some issues, and then drop them to move on to the next issue. An example of this was going from the problem F> indicated to have with vowel sounds, then without any exploration or resolution, switching to the topic of tones. This indicates that there could be a difference in autonomous and collaborative ability besides just a language proficiency gap. Had F> attempted to resolve issues more, he would have helped himself concerning his language problems, and his partner by helping her with her problems. In the English session, F> did

provide more input in exploration and brainstorming. In fact, explorative (phase 2) utterances in the English conversation were the only category that he outweighed T> in, of both conversations. However, these utterances helped little in directing the issue further; only on one occasion did it aid in resolving problems.

It is possible that the synchronous nature of this session worked less favorably for F>. At his level, a transliterated version could have helped F> in his comprehension in the Thai session. Or even thai script in an on-line chat could have made a difference, as F> is literate in Thai. Also, it might have saved confusion in some of his misunderstandings of T's> spoken English.

Reflecting on teaching presence

The second reason for halting further data collection in the sessions which were initially planned, was that there was enough data to reflect on regarding teaching presence. The data suggests differing levels of autonomy between F> and T>, which aids in understanding how to appropriate and improve teaching presence. For example, a teacher might be able to help by asking her to make her problem more clear or state the difficulties she had more explicitly. She did this by giving examples however, so one way of providing teacher aid would have been by asking F> how he intended to help her, or what else he would need to know to help her. One method of teacher intervention could have been to tell participants to make one's goals clear to the other participant before starting. For example, a request for the native speaker to pay conscious attention on the accurate use of these would have resulted in a more satisfactory and useful experience for T>. It seems that F> had considerable difficulty in making language rules explicit. However, distinguishing and pointing out to T>

what 'sounds right' from what 'sounds wrong' might have just been within F>'s grasp in terms of teaching ability. Therefore, we must not only question the value of a native speaker, but also constantly evaluate the need for instruction on autonomy, while the session is in progress.

Participant suggestions for further improvement

Did you achieve your goals?

T> Yes I achieved any goals, about my pronouns, and my words, because when I talking some times, because I don't know when use -ing and when use -ed, for past verb.

F> I learned that I could switch some verbs and nouns the other way, and speak more clearly in Thai, and vowel sounds, and tonal sounds.

How did you feel/experience this class? Useful? Suppose this was done at a commercial language school? What did you like or dislike?

F> I'm happy of my conversation more than before, because I can talking and I can understand another person who use not my native language. And I can improve my conversation.

T> I liked it, it was a useful language class. I liked the fact that I could enhance my tones and vowel sounds and stuff. I probably wouldn't get corrections on these as pointedly in a normal classroom.

Do you feel there is anything that you would not get in a normal classroom? What differences did you experience as compared to a normal classroom?

T> Wouldn't get as explicit correction in a normal class on his tones.

F> I think in the classroom, people don't talk about their opinion too much. They have to sit and listen, to what teachers teach, and then when they go out of the classroom, they don't use language too much. They just have to listen and answer questions. So this is good.

Any drawbacks?

F> Drawbacks in communication and lack of eye contact.

What went well? Regarding both language and ideas?

T> I think both together, language and ideas, went OK.

F> The tones. And how to speak correctly in Thai.

What went not so well?

F> Miscommunication

T> I think so!

F> Mainly on the he/she, me/ my younger brother! [Issue]

What could improve for next time?

F> Better communication...in the flow of conversation.

T> It can use for the conversation in real life, not when we study only. *Perhaps a misunderstanding of the question*

What else would help you? Preparation or techniques? Or prefer to get the hang of it by yourself?

F> Maybe if you taught us..techniques, it would go faster, the learning process..

T> Yes I think so, it would quicker than this, and more clear, maybe?

What if you would have more directions, such as an assignment with specific goals?

Would it be useful, or more difficult?

F> Maybe more difficult.

T> Yes.

If you could change this lesson, what would it be?

Working on tones

What about the lesson content: is there anything that would need to change or improve?

No comment

T> Maybe open your opinion for everybody, you can know an opinion from another person, and you can find out what people think about your culture. Also the conversation with another person, you don't know them.

From your notes, or from what you remember, what did you correct your partner on?

F> Past tense

T> I corrected my partner on sentence and tones and word suggestions. The tones on and sound on the first sentence he said, 'Foreigners smile more than thai people', he want to say 'Foreigners eat more than thai people', but the sound I hear is 'smile'. That's why I told him to put the word 'food' at the end of the sentence, so if other people hear him, they don't understand anymore, it changes the meaning of the sentence, and makes them think negative for foreigners.

Anything you noted but did not say?

F>; T> No.

Participants' evaluations

Students were happy with their achievements, reflecting also on the need for setting goals, and self-evaluation in achieving goals as a way to improve motivation and sense of direction. This navigation is thus not only necessary before a session, but reflection also helps in plotting a route for the next one. As F> pointed out, he felt that he needed to learn how to communicate better. Although learners reported that more structure added to the task (as was originally planned for the next sessions) would increase difficulty, learners said they would benefit from learning more techniques related to tandem learning. Overall, learners mentioned benefits of tandem learning over drawbacks. Even when asked how tandem learning compares to classroom learning, there were mainly comments made in support of tandem learning, with the only drawback mentioned being the fact that they could not see each other which made communication more difficult. No longer can the learner rely on facial expressions or hand gestures to indicate meaning. But just as many language learners experience when talking over the phone, proficiency of verbal skills is then heavily tested. Rightfully so, F> said he needed to improve his communicative abilities. Perhaps F's> judgement of his needs arose from this session. He might have already known this to be a fact. However, his goal was to improve on his tones and vowel sounds, not his communicative skills.