

The Importance of CCDL in English Education

Kyung-Ja Park
(Korea University)

Park, Kyung-Ja. (2001). The importance of CCDL in English education. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 7(2), 77-101.

Factors affecting foreign language learning task are diverse in nature due to the different social and cultural backgrounds so that learners have to somehow use strategies and expressions to adjust diverse factors to their learning environments. The main purpose of this paper is to show how important NNS vs. NNs interaction through CCDL can be in their enhancement of English proficiency by giving examples from their chatting conversation(written conversation) data collected for over two semesters. Chatting as a means of synchronous communication interaction between students from two different cultural backgrounds can act as a predictor of foreign language achievement. Chatting and Telemeet activities have their own advantages in enhancing communicative competence when learning English. By engaging in these synchronous communication activities learners of English from different cultural backgrounds can acquire unique strategies and expressions from which they learn from each other. In short, this study advocates the importance of strategies and patterns foreign language learners can acquire from interaction among culturally different peer groups.

I. Introduction

Learning a foreign language requires time and effort on the learner's part. Due to the learner's different social and cultural backgrounds, factors affecting foreign language learning are diverse in nature. Learners have to use strategies and expressions to adjust to their language learning environments. In the past language

* This paper is supported by a Korea University Grant.

was considered a system which consisted of a number of different components such as sounds, words, meanings and structure rules. Thus, in traditional foreign language classrooms the focus was on the forms of the language and how sentences are generated from these forms. The meanings and uses of these forms in speaking and writing were also a primary focus.

For the last few decades or so, language in use has been emphasized because language is viewed as verbal behavior. In recent foreign language classrooms research has been conducted on language use, the meanings people want to convey in speaking and writing, and the resources to express these meanings. In particular, choices in grammar and lexicon made by particular people on a particular occasion to convey some particular message has been the focus of attention. Discourse analysis, the description of language in use, generalizes about how language works by looking at actual utterances. Through discourse analysis, a better understanding of how to teach foreign languages, especially English as a foreign language can be obtained.

Many factors affecting foreign language learners have been studied such as motivation, learning strategies, L1 transfer, learning situations(setting), interaction, and teaching methodology in discourse (Faerch & Kasper 1983, Ringbom 1987, Oxford 1990, Pica 1991, 1993, 1994, Long 1985, Kasper & Kellerman 1997, Selinker 1972, Long, 1996 respectively). Of these factors, interaction has received much attention because of its role as a main source of language input as well as an effective way of providing a natural means to lower language anxiety. However, the research on interaction that have been conducted so far have limitations concerning their scope as the majority of the studies have focused solely on the types of interaction and the general influence of interaction on language acquisition. Moreover, the interaction that has been studied was mainly between NSs (usually teachers) vs. NNSs(usually students). In order to improve students' communication abilities, however, interaction among peer groups rather than that of student-teacher should be examined (Brown 1993, Brumfit 1984, Long 1976).

The purpose of this study is to examine the following questions:

- (1) What types of spoken language features are found in chatting sessions?
- (2) What types of signals do learners use to start/close a chatting session?
- (3) Are there any specific patterns according to different cultures?

- (4) What types of first two word combinations are used in chatting?
- (5) What types of compensatory strategies (CS) do learners use for chatting?
- (6) Is there any preference for a specific CS?
- (7) Can preference be correlated with the learners' language proficiency?
- (8) How do learners keep a balance between clarity and economy?
- (9) How do learners help each to foster understanding?
- (10) Are there any distinctive features in terms of the nature of interaction?

The main purpose is to show how important NNS-NNS interaction can be in enhancing proficiency. Examples are taken from chatting session (written conversation) data collected for the duration of two semesters. The written conversations show many common linguistic features as spoken conversation. Chatting as a means of synchronous communication interaction between students from two different cultural backgrounds can act as a predictor of foreign language achievement. Chatting and Telemeet activities have their own advantages in enhancing communicative competence when learning English. By engaging in these synchronous communication activities, learners of English from different cultural backgrounds can acquire unique strategies and expressions. In short, this study advocates the importance of strategies foreign language learners can acquire from interaction among culturally different peer groups.

II. Compensatory Strategies

Compensatory Strategies (CS) are used by interlocutors when they encounter difficulties in conveying their message. When using CS, learners either reorganize or choose an alternative lexical item. This means that CS is closely related to clarity and economy of the message being delivered. The interlocutors first have to consider situation, previous discourse, and the knowledge they share before encoding their message. If their lexicon does not include the word they want to use, they have to either avoid using the word or to encode the message in other ways by using a CS.

It has been claimed that learners' use of CS is task related (Poulisse, 1997). In other words, the selection of a particular strategy depends on the effect of task (Poulisse, 1990). For example, for the following 4 tasks analytic strategies (i.e. conceptual analysis of an intended concept) are more frequently used whereas

morphological strategies (i.e. applying morphological rules of L2 to L2 vocabularies) are least used:

Task 1. description of or reference to specific things or pictures

Task 2. description of an abstract geometrical picture both in L1 and in L2

Task 3. telling a long story (4 stories) in one minute

Task 4. 15 minute interview

However, Poulisse has argued that (1) conceptual strategies are more prominent than linguistic strategies for task 2, (2) more advanced students tend to use less CS, (3) transfer strategies are frequent in task 4 but rare in task 1, (4) linguistic context also affects utterance (reference) length, and (5) physical setting affects reference length (for similar elements, a longer name is used for differentiation which requires extra effort).

III. Methodology

The data for this study includes 12 chatting conversations (32 conversation moves for opening and closing) between Korean and Japanese learners of English, collected from October 2000 to June 2001. All of the learners were participating in the Cross Cultural Distance Learning (CCDL) project between Waseda and Korea University for the second semester of 2000 and the first semester of 2001. The data is based on the observation and description of naturally occurring data. The CCDL project was initiated in 1999 in order to enhance students' English proficiency by encouraging them to interact with overseas partners on various topics such as culture, education, sports, fashion, dating systems, and religion.

The Korea University participants of the CCDL project in the second semester of 2000 totaled 30 students, all English majors taking a TEFL course for credit. Approximately the same number of Waseda students were also participating in CCDL. Out of the 30 Korean students I have selected P because she has been participating in CCDL since it began in 1999. P is a senior and a very diligent, hard-working student. She never missed any classes or any chatting appointment. By observing her CCDL chatting over the years we can tell how much her English has improved. We can also see the difference between her use of English and that

of her overseas partners.

On the other hand, P's overseas partners for 2000 and 2001 are different students: in 2000 a senior student at Waseda majoring in English education and in 2001 a freshman taking a Global Literacy course at Waseda. This is because participation in CCDL is obligatory at Waseda University whereas at Korea University it is optional.

Writing or written discourse implies that one is interacting with an unseen unknown partner. In this sense, writing can be interactional because the writer anticipates his/her partner's moves through discourse. In CCDL, overseas partners can actually see each other through a CCDL camera that is attached to each computer. Thus, like in spoken discourse there is a closer connection between process and structure in chatting conversations. In fact, during interaction via chatting participants try to use gestures when they have a hard time getting their message across.

There are obvious differences between chatting conversation and spoken conversation in terms of what one knows and what one can expect. For one thing, conversation is oral whereas chatting conversation is written. This implies that changes in phonetic and phonological features are not feasible. However, oral and written conversation share many features.

As part of the orientation for CCDL, the participants were briefed on how to keep logs of their chatting sessions. During the orientation, a graduate teaching assistant (TA) gave a tutorial where participants learned how to select partners, schedule their chatting time, make use of e-mail in setting up appointments, register via the internet, write profiles, write opinions in the notebook section of the CCDL home page, make changes in the notebook, ask questions, etc. After the orientation, participants were permitted to enter the Multi-Media Education Classroom at any time to chat with their overseas partners. However, the participants were required to make arrangements to chat through e-mail. One characteristic of CCDL is that almost all transactions have to be conducted through the internet whether it be visiting the homepage or doing e-mail. Participants were also advised to direct their inquiries to the professor or TA through the internet. In short, participants were advised to save all their chatting conversations before leaving the multimedia Education Room. By the time the semester ended, 40-50 pages of chatting conversations had been obtained. At the end of each semester, participants were asked to analyze their interlanguage on the basis of their chatting conversations. This was done in order to make participants aware of their English so they could

learn from their use of English in actual situations.

The following table 1 illustrates the orientation materials for KU CCDL participants:

TABLE 1
Orientation materials for KU CCDL participants

<p>Dear CCDL participants at Korea University,</p> <p>This email is to inform that all the participants of Cross-Cultural Distance Learning Projects(CCDL project) at Korea University should register their profiles by the end of this weekend. As you have learned, or experienced during orientation, you should sign up in the course number 5 of CCDL homepage (http://www.project.mnc.waseda.ac.jp/ccdl).</p> <p>I'll give you the direction. Please follow the steps below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Type the URL(http://www.project.mnc.waseda.ac.jp/ccdl) in Internet explorer. 2. When the homepage is open, click "For students participating in this project", which is on the left side of the page. 3. Then choose(click) course number 5 "Korea University (Department of English Language : E) -- Waseda University (College of International Communication : A)" 4. The system will ask you User name and password. ID: cccl Password: participants 5. Click "Register your profile" on the left side of the page. 6. Choose & click "Korea University" 7. Fill in the form. Abbreviation will be illustrated at the bottom of the page. 8. REMEMBER your ID and password. Please, write them down in your paper. Your ID and password is necessary in many ways. <p>Since CCDL project is run using(chatting or speaking) English with Waseda University students, most of the instructions and information will be given in English. If you make an appointment with WU students, please ask them to meet in conference room number "10" first, so that TAs can easily find your partner. The room is open from 9:40 to 5:30 weekday till the end of June, except lunch time (12:20-1:20) closure. Questions and suggestions about Registration will be very welcomed.</p>
--

IV. Procedures of Data Analysis

The following procedures were used in analyzing 12 of P's chatting conversations. The analysis focused on the openings and closings of the chatting conversations.

In the opening/closing parts:

- (1) Extract the opening/closing parts
- (2) Examine the sequence
- (3) Analyze patterns
- (4) Analyze the first two word combinations
- (5) Examine expressions used to signal the opening/closing parts
- (6) Analyze form-function relationships
- (7) Examine communication strategies
- (8) Analyze language features such as: adjacency pairs, questions and imperatives, short response forms, discourse markers, adverbials and linking adverbials, pauses, hesitations, ellipsis and assimilation, prefaces and tags, incomplete forms, expressions conveying vagueness
- (9) Examine preferences in strategies according to cultural background

In the analysis, an attempt to formulate a general pattern or sequence of opening/closing chatting conversation, albeit tentative it is, is made to show the differences found between Korean and Japanese learners of English.

V. Results of Data Analysis

The result of the analysis of the 12 chatting conversations are as follows:

5.1. Opening signals

	Japanese	Korea
1) Hi	80%	75%
2) Hello	20%	25%

Here we can observe that both Korean Japanese participants prefer short forms to long form of greeting. The greeting word of 'hi' or 'hello' signals that the

chatting is going to start soon. It is very interesting to see that the Japanese participant uses small letters at the beginning of a sentence or an utterance without any exception whereas the Korean participant uses capital letters in the beginning but later starts to use small letters. This temporary loss of capitalization rules indicates how accommodation has a strong influence on the Korean participant.

5.2. Responses to opening signals

1)	hi	90%	Hello or hi	50%
2)	sorry. He do not come I sent e-mail, but it returned with the message, "mailbox is full"		Nice to see you again I'm sorry I'm late It's raining here Park hee jung hello I've just arrived who are you expecting	

In response to opening signals the interlocutors in this particular chatting conversation displayed the following: (1) the interlocutor repeated the same greeting which was given in the opening conversation. This shows adjacency pairs which are pervasive in oral conversation. Japanese participants made use of this type 90% of the time whereas Korean counterparts showed only 50%; (2) the interlocutors used expressions to convey feelings, to apologize for being late, to talk about the weather, and to explain why they were happy. It is interesting to note that there were few cases of small talk about the weather in the chatting conversations. Both Korean and Japanese participants seem to have a very narrow scope of exchanging interactions in terms of opening and closing chatting conversations.

A range of language features should be taught in foreign language classrooms. Opening a conversation and responding to it constitute a conversational routine, a speech event. Conversational routines make conversation easier because they routinize the sequence of events and the language forms used. Thus, there is a routinized chunk of language facilitating such a move. However, because such routines are culture-bound, it is difficult to teach them. In particular, the response part of the routine is very difficult to deal with. This might explain why both Japanese and Korean participants have a very restricted number of responses or follow-ups in the conversations. (Hugh Trappes-Lomas Lecture 13/12/00). According to Aijmer (1996) negative responses such as refusing an invitation are more difficult to manage than positive ones. In our data, responses to an opening

move seem to be difficult for the participants to manage.

5.3. Closing signals

	Japanese	Korean
1)	I had a very good time	Time is (almost) up 2
2)	Oh time has came	I'd rather chant another time
3)	Sorry I have next class	I wanted to see you...
4)	I hope you study hard for Tomorrows exam	what time is it? I have no watch.
5)	Oh time is almost over...	who is it, your friend?
6)		so.. why don't we continue to...?
7)		It's time you to go
8)	Sorry next chat start soon so I have to leave	
9)		well then.. time to go... and I'll send you e-mail

How to close a conversation is also difficult especially for foreign language learners because depending on a particular culture there are appropriate ways of closing conversations. For example, in Korean culture, one is considered to be rude if one closes a conversation with your elders very hastily or if one interrupts them to close the conversation. There are also some expressions one should use when closing a conversation. These expressions are not direct but indirect from which the interlocutor can infer that the conversation is about to close.

Both Japanese and Korean participants tend to use somewhat different expressions to indicate the closings of their conversation as can be observed from the above data. First, both Japanese and Korean participants prefer to use an indirect way of closing the conversations. However, the Japanese participants use more indirect expressions than their Korean counterparts. The Japanese participants close by (1) saying they had a very good time, (2) making an apology that he or she has to leave because of the next class, (3) wishing their counterparts good luck on their exams, and (4) expressing directly that the time has come to stop the conversation. On the other hand, the Korean participants use more direct expressions. They use 38% of direct closings whereas their Japanese counterparts use only 25%. The Koreans also tried to convey closings by (1) saying that they would like to see each other again soon, (2) asking what time it was, (3) suggesting

that he or she would like to chat some other time, (4) asking some irrelevant questions, and (5) telling his or her interlocutor that the time was up. Lastly, Korean participants were found to use a greater number of utterances.

5.4. Response to closing statements

	Japanese	Korean
1)	oh, I didn't notice that okay. thank you today bye yes 3 (me too)	Okay 2 (time goes so fast) yes, see you later that's okay thank you
2)	oh, i forgot time i have to go 2	
3)	do you have an appointment? I have an appointment from 2:00	
4)	now 1:57	
5)	next chat start soon	

The responses to the closings are also culture-laden. This element should also be introduced through instruction so misunderstandings do not arise in cross-cultural communication. From our data it is very interesting to observe that the Korean participants gave brief responses by either saying "(That's)okay" or "thank you" whereas their Japanese counterparts prefer to use long expressions most of which are indications or statements that he or she has something to do or hasn't realized that time was flying so fast. Although gratitude was expressed, no apologies were employed.

5.5. First two word combinations

	Japanese	Korean
(1)	Are u 2 Is he	are you who are
(2)	i'm	who is it? I'm 3 i'll too I'll
(3)	he do not	

(4)	it's fine in japan	That is okay 2 It's late It's me It's raining, It's too cold That's Okay
(5)	i have 4 i had i sent i want 3 i didn't i hope 2 i must go i have to 3 i forgot we can i can't	I've We haven't I delete I have no watch I think 2 I see
(6)		I'd rather
(7)	see you 8	See you 11
(8)	thank you today	Thank you
(9)	time has come time is almost over	Time is almost up Time is up It's time you to go It's good to see you Time goes so fast time to go I wanted
(10)		Don't you 2
(11)	do you have can you? 2 don't worry	Why don't we... let's talk about... would you mind if.
(12)		I mean you looks like
(13)		I guessshi
(14)	how are you?	what time is it? what have you been doing? what did you
(15)	as you know	
(16)	next chat 2 next Thursday home work my name is ...	your face your friend
(17)		thank you 2
(18)		good bye
(19)	in japan too	
(20)		nice to see you again

The first two word combinations used in openings and closings are very important lexical features of conversation. From the data it is observed that there is little difference observed in terms of preference concerning first two word combinations.

5.6. Language features observed from chatting conversation

Here, it is emphasized again that chatting is not oral but written conversation. As in speech acts, chatting does not occur in isolation but is a functionally connected act that has sequence and involved turn taking. In order to examine the role of interaction in chatting, an attempt was made to find how many typically spoken language features were employed by the Korean and Japanese learners of English during their chatting. The types and tokens of spoken conversation features found areas follows:

1) Visual features

(1) gestures such as head nodding, hand waving, and hand crossing are frequently employed to foster understanding. Gestures made approximately 40% of the conversation better understood.

(2) facial expressions were normally employed by using emoticons such as

~~	drawling(lengthening the vowel of the word)
T^T	Crying
!	emphasizing the utterance,
!!	more emphasis
-.:;	Gloomy
^^	shy smiling
^ ^	Smiling
...	indicating continuation

Emoticons, a hybrid word of emotion + icons, are symbols that represent facial expression when writing e-mails or chatting with others. These are fillers which convey one's emotions and set the tone of the conversation. In this sense, they can be considered a form of body language in cyber space. The above-mentioned 7 types of emoticons are all that was observed from CCDL chatting between Korean and Japanese learners of English

The following table illustrates the types and tokens of emoticons used in one chatting conversation in 2001 and 2000.

	Waseda		Korea	
	2000	2001	2000	2001
^^ / ^_^	3	3	3	2
^^/ ^^*	0	0	2	2
~	3	0	0	0
...	2	0	26	12
!!	11	3	1	4

From the above table, the number indicates the tokens of a specific emoticon in 2000 or in 2001. Although only one chatting conversation was analyzed, some emoticons appeared to be preferred to others. For example, the Korean participant used *^^* frequently whereas the Japanese counterpart tended to use ^^ or ^_^ and never used *^^* or ^^*. The Korean participant also seemed to enjoy using the ellipsis marking of '...' at the end of utterances, which was seldom used by the Japanese counterpart.

To recapitulate, as for the types of emoticons used by the Korean and Japanese participants of there is (1) a limitation in number and (2) a difference in the use of specific emoticons. The Korean participants tend to differentiate types of emotional feelings more specifically. For example, they distinguish between just smiling and shy smiling.

2) Oral conversation takes place in a context of shared experience, information, and expectations

(1) Forms without precise meaning such as pronouns and incomplete forms such as different kinds of ellipsis and sentence fragments were used. If we look at just the first page of the chatting conversation we can find many examples of pronouns, ellipsis, and sentence fragments as is shown in the following:

Nearly almost all utterances of the opening and closing parts of the chatting conversations included the use of personal pronouns. The majority of pronouns consisted of the first person for the Japanese participants whereas for their Korean counterparts the second person singular was employed twice as much as the first

person singular. This indicates that the Korean participants talked about what they would do to their interlocutors such as thanking, promising to see them again soon, asking them to join in another chatting session, and so forth whereas the Japanese counterparts rarely made these indications.

	Japanese	Korean
Pronouns		
i	26 : 49%	13 : 30%
you	25 : 48%	24 : 60%
she	1 : 1.5%	1 : 5%
we	1 : 1.5%	1 : 5%

(2) Ellipsis and sentence fragments

Various types of incomplete forms were employed by participants to reduce energy and effort. The most favored by the participants are listed as follows:

Japanese	Koreans
Are u	sorry...
in japan too	I'll too
homework math	I mean...
me too	you late
we'll be	It's time you to go
this year	time to go
my classmates	yes
yes	I see...
	I don't...

The Japanese participants tended to prefer single lexical items, two word combinations, and sentence fragments whereas their Korean counterparts tended to use incomplete sentences or phrases and formulaic expressions. A type of telegraphic speech was preferred when the interlocutors shared the same background knowledge so that there was little possibility of being misunderstood. This is also an indication that chatting conversation is unplanned and takes place in real time, which typical of oral conversation.

(3) Use of pauses, lexical fillers, discourse markers, short response forms, adverbials, repetitions, hesitations

Both Japanese and Korean participants frequently used pauses, hesitations, fillers, and repetitions, all of which are oral conversation features to reduce effort thus

gaining maximum efficiency. In case of pauses, both Korean and Japanese learners of English used them in almost every utterance in 2000 whereas in 2001 the Korean participants made more use of them than their Japanese counterparts. Pauses in chatting conversation is indicated by the symbol of " ... " which means that although the speaker or writer has something more to say, he or she is refraining from doing so.

From the above table, we can find a very interesting comparison between Japanese and Korean learners of English. That is both Japanese and Korean participants predominantly use the lexical filler, yes(yeah). However, the Koreans use of the lexical filler of 'ok' is significant whereas that of 'um' is not observable from the data. The primarily used marker for both the Japanese and Korean participants was the lexical filler of 'yes.' However, the priority hierarchy of other lexical filler use was different as seen in the following:

Japanese:

yes -> oh - > ok -> mm.. -> well

Korean:

yes - > ok - > oh - > well - > mm..

In Korean and Japanese the equivalent form of the lexical filler, 'yes,' is normally employed in everyday conversation, which may be a possible explanation for the predominant use of this particular lexical filler. As for the use of 'ok' and 'oh' one possible explanation can be found from the English teaching methods used in both countries. In Korea, the variety of American English is taught in most school whereas in Japan British English is normally taught. The most widely used junior high and senior high school English textbooks used in Japan contain typical British lexical items. For example, lorry for truck, underground for subway, lift for elevator, among others, and not mentioning differences in accent and pronunciation. This could explain why 'ok' and 'well' which are typically used in American English are preferred by the Korean participants.

	Japanese		Korean	
	2000	2001	2000	2001
oh	25%		12%	
ok	15%		40%	
yes/yea(h)	55%		45%	
mm..	5%		0%	
well	0%		3%	

The expression of 'I think,' conveying vagueness was often used when the participant was not clear of what and how to say something.

(4) High frequency of questions and imperatives

As for the use of adverbials and linking adverbials the following table show how they were used:

Japanese	Korean
there 1	almost 2
but 1	today 1
today1	so 4
very 1	late 3
late 3	later 2
later 2	then 3
soon 1	now 1
so 1	up 3
	just 1
	rather 1
	today 1
	almost 1
	here 1
	well 1
	but 1
	really 1
	again 1
	fast 1
	and 1

From the above it is apparent that the Korean participants use a wider range of adverbials and conversational linking adverbials with conjunctions compared to their Japanese counterparts. The Japanese participants use a very limited number of adverbials among which the most frequently used adverbials are "late" and

"later", which total of overall adverbial use. The following shows adverbial use in both Japanese and Korean participants in order of frequency:

Japanese Participants		Korean Participants	
1. late or later	46%	1. late or later	17%
2. so	9%	2. so	13%
3. very	9%	3. up	10%
3. there	9%	3. then	10%
3. soon	9%	5. almost	7%
3. today	9%	5. today	7%
3. but	9%	6. just	3%
		6. now	3%
		6. rather	3%
		6. almost	3%
		6. here	3%
		6. well	3%
		6. really	3%
		6. again	3%
		6. fast	3%
		6. but	3%
		6. and	3%

Among the above listed items, "but" and "and" are conjunctions. It is interesting to note that the Japanese participants predominantly used certain lexical items for their opening or closing chatting conversation whereas their Korean counterparts used different varieties of lexical items in the same context.

The types and token ratio of use of adverbials and conjunction is as follows:

Japanese: 8 types/11 tokens

Korean: 18 types/30 tokens

Although the data on adverbials in this study is very limited (only 132 conversation moves for the chatting conversations) in quantity, it provides a window through which we can infer what to expect from chatting participants.

3) Interactive features of conversation

There are many interactive features of conversation which are observed from our data. For example, adjacent pairs such as "Hi - Hi, Can you ...? - Yes" are used. In particular, adjacent pairs such as "hi - hi" and "bye - bye" are very frequently

observed. However, high frequency questions and imperatives are not observed. This is probably because of the specific situations the data was collected in. As previously mentioned, short responses such as "hi, ok, yeah" are frequently observed but interestingly only the lexical item of "okay" was observed. Neither "sure," nor "alright" is used by both of the participants. Nor can we find frequent use of "let's..." which is one of the expressive features of conversation. Positive evaluating adjectives such as "nice, lovely" and intensifying coordination such as "nice" are not used. Only the interjections or lexical fillers "oh" and "ah" are employed by the participants.

One very interesting thing is that one Japanese participant insistently keeps on using abbreviated forms such as U(for you), CU(for see you), and CU 18ter(see you later). This particular Japanese participant kept on using the small letter i for I in the beginning of an utterance without almost no exception, which affected the Korean partner.

4) Patterns of opening and closing chatting conversation

In opening and closing of chatting conversations one would expect a certain sequence would be followed. In other words, one would expect when an opening or closing is about to occur. It is also expected that the opening and closings will be polite and non face-threatening. Hasty termination of a chatting conversation may appear rude to the interlocutor. In order to establish an amicable social relationship between participants it is important to not open or terminate a conversation in haste or vice versa. The following questions are discussed in this section:

1. Are there any patterns specific to different cultures?
2. Are there any differences between the data collected in 2000 and in 2001?
3. Are there any words or phrases preferred by Japanese and Korean learners of English as termination signals?

The data analyzed here was taken from 13 separate chatting conversations from 2000 and 7 separate chatting conversations from 2001.

Openings of chatting conversation from our data followed one of the following sequences:

- (1) Greeting - Greeting

- (2) Greeting + Apology - Greeting + Replying to Apology
- (3) Greeting - Apology - Replying to Apology
- (4) Greeting - Greeting - Identification(interlocutor) - Identification(interlocutor)
- (5) Greeting - Greeting & Naming - Identification - Confirmation(Identification of himself)
- (6) Greeting - Greeting - Apology - Query - Repeat the query + Paraphrasing
- (7) Greeting - Greeting - Compliment - Explanation
- (8) Greeting - Greeting + Apology
- (9) Greeting - Greeting - Phatic Communion - Phatic Communion
- (10) Greeting - Greeting - Query - Reply + Query - Reply + Greeting - Greeting + Phatic Communion of Greeting
- (11) Greeting - Greeting - Statement of Problem - Apology + Promise of no recurrence
- (12) Greeting - Greeting - Apology - Reply - Thanking + Query - Reply
- (13) Greeting - Greeting + Long Greeting - Apology - Reply

From these sequences we can infer patterns specific to our participants. First, no pre-utterances occur prior to the openings in the chatting conversation. The Korean and Japanese participants directly move to openings, without providing any background information. Without any exceptions, they all say "hi" to initiate a chatting conversation. As they become more acquainted with each other the openings become longer, followed by an apology, query or statement which are in return followed by a reply.

The initiator of openings either employs short greetings or short greetings followed by an apology referring to tardiness. This usually occurs in the first turn. In the second turn, the interlocutor employs a greeting which is either used alone or followed by an apology, reply, identification, or another long greeting. In the third turn, the initiator employs a reply, query, or identification among others. In the fourth turn, the interlocutor responds. This is the pattern of a typical conversation routine. The final statements preferred by the initiator and his or her interlocutor are a reply to the query, phatic communion on weather followed by a short greeting, or a short greeting followed by a long greeting respectively.

The following pattern can illustrate the point:

1st turn Speaker A

- Greeting : 1) short greeting
 2) short greeting + apology
- 2nd turn Speaker B
 Greeting: 1) short greeting
 2) short greeting followed by some other statements or long greeting
- 3rd turn Speaker A:
 Various statements : 1) phatic communion on weather
 2) reply
 3) apology (followed by reason)
 4) query
 5) identification
- 4th turn Speaker B:
 Various forms of statement: 1) identification
 2) short confirm (followed by long confirm)
 3) query
 4) reply
 5) phatic communion on weather
 6) apology (followed by solution suggested)
 7) thanking(followed by statement then by query)
- 5th turn Speaker A:
 Reply by confirmation, agreement, or phatic communion on weather
- 6th turn Speaker B:
 Final greeting followed by long greeting

From our data it is observed that patterns of opening chatting sequence usually takes 6 turns: initiated by speaker A and terminated by speaker B by greeting. One important thing to note is that as the turns continue interlocutors engage in more active chatting conversation most of which are concerned with greetings, phatic communion, apology, thanking, query, reply to the query, identifying oneself, and explanation. However, the beginning and termination of openings always ended with greeting "hi," "Hello," and reply to the statement or greeting given to the interlocutor. There are neither pre-utterances nor post-utterances in the opening of chatting conversation.

As to closing chatting conversation our data show the following sequences:

- (1) Pre-utterances for closing chatting
 - giving advice
 - thanking
- (2) apology + explanation
 - direct/indirect signal to closings + leave taking/direct signal
 - query + reason
- (3) reply + thanking + leave taking
 - query + statement
 - leave taking
 - direct/indirect signal
- (4) greeting/lexical filler or discourse marker + leave taking
 - wish/desire to talk more + discourse marker + indirect signal
 - direct signal + discourse marker
- (5) direct/indirect signal + discourse marker + leave-taking
 - agreement
- (6) leave taking
- (7) post-utterances
 - thanking
 - asking for information(e-mail address)
 - explanation

Unlike openings of chatting conversation, closings involve both pre-utterances and post-utterances. Pre-utterances and post-utterances are necessary because in order to close a chatting conversation smoothly one needs to add some type of statement. Both Japanese and Korean culture, under the influence of Confucianism, tend to pay respect to their elders and trust their peers or equals. Thus, hasty termination of conversation is not recommended as this would cause the interlocutor to feel embarrassed, mistreated or even inferior. Sufficient exchanges of opinions and giving of signals whether indirect or direct should happen in advance so interlocutors are aware that you are going to terminate the conversation soon. This enables them to be prepared for the end of the conversation.

The following pattern of closing chatting conversation can be observed from our data:

Pre-utterances:

talking about relevant matters

1st turn Speaker A:

- (1) indirect/ apology + direct signal
- (2) query

2nd turn Speaker B:

- (1) reply + thanking + leave taking
- (2) query + leave-taking
- (3) indirectly express her/his desire to continue

3rd turn Speaker A:

- (1) discourse marker + leave taking
- (2) direct/indirect signal + discourse marker + leave taking
- (3) desire to talk more or continue

4th turn Speaker B:

- (1) desire to meet again + leave talking
- (2) discourse maker + explanation
- (3) salutation + desire to meet again + leave taking

5th turn Speaker A:

- (1) direct signal + leave taking + leave taking

6th turn Speaker B:

- (1) leave taking

Post-utterances

- (1) explanation or reasons for closing
- (2) asking for more information(e.g. e-mail address)
- (3) making arrangement for another meeting
- (4) thanking for the advice in general

Like openings of chatting conversation, termination of conversation is very important because it affects the social relationship between the parties involved. Appropriately terminating conversation has an affective effect in that it makes your interlocutors feel good, relaxed or even well-treated which is the basis of social relationships.

In this light, pre-utterances and post-utterances are very important because rather than abruptly terminating a conversation one can talk about mutual interests or give advice followed by a hint so the interlocutors can anticipate the end of the conversation. Some kind of explanation concerned with why the conversation has

to be terminated soon can also be very helpful to the interlocutors so that misunderstandings do not arise.

VI. Conclusion

It is very important for non-native speakers of English from different cultural backgrounds to engage in interaction via English because mutual learning can take place. They can learn from each other and enhance their English proficiency through a large amount of real life practice. There have been some negative views on interaction among non-native speakers because they may build up and end up with traces of fossilization in their interlanguage so that misunderstandings will continuously occur. However, as we have seen from our data on opening and closing chatting conversations, interaction between non-native speakers of English can be a good starting point in terms of lowering the affective filter and enhancing English proficiency. Since the subjects are university students they are not beginners and have reached a certain degree of English competence. Their passive knowledge of English outpaces their active knowledge of English so they have the ability to self-correct to some degree and the ability to correct their interlocutors. They are also capable of discerning what a grammatical and ungrammatical utterance is in English. On the basis of what we have collected from the Japanese and Korean students participating in the CCDL project we reach the conclusion of what to teach and what to pay attention to in classroom contexts. Therefore, in English classrooms more emphasis should be given to how to open and close conversations smoothly and appropriately.

Acknowledgments

This paper is supported by Korea University Special Research Grant (March, 2001.- March, 2002).

I would like to extend my special gratitude to Prof. Michiko Nakano of Waseda University for her support of KWCCDLP as a director of CCDL Center at Waseda University, and to Prof. Lee Hikyoung of Mississippi State University for her final polishing up in English.

My special thanks also go to Mr. Ha Seung-Wan and Miss Lee Nari, the TAs

of Multi-Media Education Lab. at Korea University, who have devoted most of their time and energy to KWCCDLP for years. Without their help this paper would not have been brought into being.

REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (1996). *Conversational Routines in English*. Longman.
- Brown, A. (1993). The role of test taker feedback in the test development process: test takers' Reactions to a tape-mediated test of proficiency in spoken Japanese. *Language Testing* 10(3): 277-303.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brumfit, C.(1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Long, M. et al. (1976). Doing things with words verbal interaction in lockstep and small group Classroom situations. In J. Fanselow & R. Crymes (eds.). *On TESOL 76*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL. 137-153
- Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & Madden (eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*(pp. 377-393). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W. & Bhatia T.(eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* pp. 413-468. Academic Press.
- Kasper, G. & E. Kellerman(eds.). (1997). *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Newbury House.
- Pica, T. (1991). Do second language learners need negotiation? *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 7 (2), 1-35.
- _____. (1993). Communication with second language learners: What does it reveal about the social and linguistic processes of second language learning? In J. Alatis (ed.), *Language, Communication, and Social Meaning* (pp. 434-464). Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- _____. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second

- language acquisition? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Poulisse, N. (1997). Compensatory strategies and the principles of clarity and economy. In Kasper G. & E. Kellerman (eds.) *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 49- 64). London: Longman.
- _____. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Poulisse, N. (1987). Problems and solutions in the classification of compensatory strategies, *Second Language Research*, 3, 141-53.
- Ringbom, H. (1987). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon, UK.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of applied Linguistics and Language Teaching (IRAL)* 10, 209-30.
- Trappes-Lomax, H. (2000). *Cyber lectures* from September to November.

박 경 자
고려대학교 문과대학 영어영문학과
136-701 서울시 성북구 안암동
Tel: (02) 3290-1984/1432
Email: kukjpark@korea.ac.kr

Revised version received in January, 2002