名古屋外国語大学論集　第1号　2017年7月

Article

Gauging the Usefulness of Mobile Instant Messaging in Complementing Classroom Communication

Colin S. D. PHILLIPS

Introduction

University students are often seen on campus with their eyes transfixed on their smartphones. Most are interacting via popular social media tools such as Facebook, Twitter, LINE, Instagram, etc. Mobile communication has become an integral part of students' lives. This is happening while they also complain about their lack of opportunity to communicate in English. The few opportunities many students have are in communicative English classrooms with native English teachers.

This study looks at the possibilities of students making use of their enthusiasm for communicating via social media tools to increase their exposure to communication in English. The mobility of smartphones and equivalent devices can enable students to send and receive instant messages (IM) in English while on the bus, during lunch, or after class. While IM should not replace face-to-face communication in the classroom, it could provide the much-desired opportunity to communicate more in English.

Based on Foster and Ohta's (2005) research involving negotiation for meaning (NfM), this study investigates the cognitive and sociocultural elements

present in student communication in the classroom and compares it with student communication via mobile IM. The purpose, therefore, is to gauge the usefulness of out-of-classroom IM communication in supporting face-to-face communication in the classroom. The research question proposed in this study is—does instant messaging out-of-classroom contain the cognitive and sociocultural elements necessary to complement in-classroom communication?

To address the aforementioned research question, I made two quantitative analyses of both modes of communication. The first analysis was from a cognitive approach, borrowed from Foster and Ohta, to determine the frequency of three common ways to negotiate for meaning: *comprehension checks*, *confirmation checks*, and *clarification requests*. The second analysis was from a sociocultural approach, also borrowed from Foster and Ohta, to determine the frequency of supportive language used by students during communication. The four types of supportive language I looked at were: *co-construction*, *recasts*, *self-correction*, and *continuers*.

Literature Review

Interaction Leads to Language Acquisition

Pica (1987: 4) argued that a second language learning environment must include opportunities for students to engage in meaningful social interaction with users of the second language in order for them to discover the linguistic and sociolinguistic structures necessary for language comprehension and production.

Walsh (2012: 2) claims that for effective communication to take place outside the classroom, students must be able to interact with others to reach mutual understandings.

Pica (1996: 245–246) as well as others acknowledge the effectiveness of communicative language classrooms (compared to learning through grammar-translation) but states the difficulty teachers have in providing an environment where the use of the foreign language for communication becomes both the

learner's goal and the learner's process for reaching the goal. Pica suggests a departure from the focus on fluent, continuous interactions, to broken, or near broken communication where there is a lack of comprehensibility. Communication breakdowns engage interlocutors in negotiation, where Pica argues, is necessary for language learning.

Comprehension Through Negotiation for Meaning

According to Krashen (1981, 1982, 1985, cited in Foster and Ohta 2005), a second language is acquired by learners being exposed to comprehensible input, specifically 'i+1', where the level of input is a little above the leaners' current second language ability. Difficult language is likely to be comprehensible if it is embedded in input that is otherwise comprehensible.

Long (1996) makes the claim that learners can negotiate meaning to overcome comprehension difficulties. Learners use strategies to help them bring incomprehensible or partly incomprehensible input within the optimum i+1 level.

Pica (1992, cited in Foster and Ohta 2005) points out that negotiation for meaning (NfM) occurs when a listener signals to the speaker that the speaker's utterance is unclear and both the listener and speaker attempt to resolve the difficulty linguistically. Gass and Selinker (1994, cited in Foster and Ohta 2005) state that NfM occurs in conversation when interlocutors need to interrupt the flow of the conversation in order for both participants to make the conversation comprehensible.

The three types of moves, discussed by Ohta and Foster, that interlocutors use to make utterances more comprehensible are comprehension checks, confirmation checks, and clarification requests. A description of each NfM move is provided below. Examples from the literature and my research are also provided.

Long (1980, cited in Foster and Ohta 2005: 410) defines comprehension checks as "any expression by a native speaker designed to establish whether

that speaker's previous utterance(s) have been understood by the interlocutor". Pica (1987) states a comprehension check as a speaker's check on the listener's understanding of the utterance. Comprehension checks are usually formed by making tag questions, by repeating all or part of the speaker's preceding utterance, and by using a rising question intonation. Examples 1 and 2 below are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 1: Comprehension check from Pica (1987)

NS English: OK, he's dancing with the woman doctor

NNS English: excuse me?

NS English: the young man doctor is dancing with the woman doctor, right?

Example 2: Comprehension check from in-classroom communication

RS4: throw out Andy and Woody separate... finally... but finally and Woody... came to Andy

RS2: haha

RT: Do you understand?

RS5: ya

Long (1980 cited in Foster and Ohta 2005: 410) defines confirmation checks as "any expression by the native speaker immediately following an utterance by the interlocutor which was designed to elicit confirmation the utterance had been correctly understood". Pica (1987) states the confirmation checks are characterized by a rising intonation and a repetition of all or part of the interlocutor's preceding utterance.

Confirmation checks can sometimes be mistaken for moves that learners make to assist one another. Repeating all or part of the interlocutor's utterance may indicate understanding rather than a breakdown in communication. Foster

and Ohta (2005) point out the importance of researchers providing enough data in the example to allow readers to fully understand its function. Examples 3 and 4 below are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 3: Confirmation check from Pica (1987)

NS English: did you get high marks? good grades?

NNS English: high marks?

NS English: good grades A's and B's ___ did you get A in English?

NNS English: uh no in English yes em B

Example 4: Confirmation check from in-classroom communication

AS10: one word is strong impression... un? [thinking]... to me

AT: one word? [rising intonation]

AS10: ce... certain word

AT: OK

Long (1980, cited in Foster and Ohta 2005: 410–411) defines clarification requests as "any expression by a NS designed to elicit clarification of the interlocutor's preceding utterance(s)". Unlike confirmation checks, clarification requests require the speaker to either provide new information or modify the information in the previous utterance(s). Wh-questions or statements like "I don't understand" are frequently used for clarification requests. Examples 5 and 6 below are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 5: Clarification request from Pica (1987)

NS English: so you came here by yourself or did you come with friends?

NNS English: no no I – what? what you say?

Example 6: Clarification request from out-of-classroom IM communication

AT: Good evening. If you were to meet, say hello, and get an autograph from a famous Hollywood actor, who would you want it to be?

AS5: What do you mean?

Collaboration Through Supportive Language

Foster and Ohta (2005) point out that the main benefit of NfM is that it can force learners to confront breakdowns in communication, leading to language acquisition. They caution, however, that NfM can be demotivating for learners because it puts emphasis on failures involved in language learning rather than successes. In addition to the cognitive approach to language learning mentioned above, I also incorporated a sociocultural approach to language learning. I made a quantitative analysis of the data to show how social processes can lead to second language acquisition. The analysis focused on moves that help create a supportive communication environment. The four ways learners collaborate to create discourse in the target language provided by Ohta and Foster are: co-construction, recasts, self-corrections, and continuers.

Foster and Ohta (2005: 420) describe co-construction as "the joint creation of an utterance, whether one person completes what another has begun, or whether various people chime in to create an utterance". This process allows learners to complete a thought that they could not otherwise complete on their own. Examples 7 and 8 below are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 7: Co-construction taken from Foster and Ohta (2005)

G: Watashi no uchi:: no uh chikaku de (.) uhh booringu: [Near my house, bowling:]

Sr: o shimasu? [do?]

G: Hai. [Yes.]

Example 8: Co-construction taken from in-classroom communication

AT: and ahhh... Kiki... like the...

AS11 ah ah... delivery

AT: ... mail...

AS12: Majo No Takyubin [Japanese title of *Kiki's Delivery Service*]

The second use of supportive language used in the sociocultural approach is recasts, described in Foster and Ohta (2005: 420) as a type of co-coordination where an interlocutor corrects the utterance of his or her partner. Examples 9 and 10 are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 9: Recast taken from Foster and Ohta (2005)

W: Tanoshi-te? (.) Tanoshi (.) te [Fun (.) Fun (.)?

C: Tano:shi-katta desu. [was fun]

W: Tanoshi-katta desu [It was fun]

Example 10: Recast taken from in-classroom communication

RS4: *eh?* [hesitation] Well... *un* [thinking] so... Andy... Andy grow up because ... and toy... toy... don't ... don'(t need because Woody and Buzz and so on... and so throw up.

RT: Throw out?

RS4: Throw out and Andy and Woody separate... finally... but finally and Woody... came to Andy.

The third use of supportive language is self-corrections. Foster and Ohta (2005: 420) describe it as a move where a speaker recognizes his/her own mistake and initiates a repair without being prompted by his/her partner(s). Examples 11 and 12 are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 11: Self-correction taken from Foster and Ohta (2005)

S: Kirei no hi- kirei na hito I think. [Beautiful–Beautiful person, I think.]

Example 12: Self-correction taken from in-classroom communication

RS5: But taking the... reading the book is... ummm so, it takes so long, many time, much time.

The fourth use of supportive language is continuers. Foster and Ohta (2005: 421) state that continuers are sometimes mistaken for confirmation checks, because in form, they look similar as an NfM move. In function, however, continuers assist learners in the communication process by showing that the interlocutor is interested in what the speaker is saying and to encourage the speaker to continue. Examples 13 and 14 below are taken from the literature and my research respectively.

Example 13: Continuers taken from Foster and Ohta (2005)

M1: I wasn't so fat before I came to England

V2: fat?

M3: yeah, but now I eat a lot of bread.

Example 14: Continuers taken from in-classroom communication

RS2: And she is nine *a ja* [self-correcting] forty-nine.. forty-nine

RS5: Forty-nine [no rising intonation]

RS2: Forty-nine years old, but he looks very young

RS5: Oh, he looks like young

Electronic Synchronous Communication

The growth of the Internet and its broad application with computer and mobile

devices has transformed the way people are interacting. Numerous platforms and applications enable real-time communication between people who are geographically separated. People are able to communicate using synchronous tools on a wide range of mobile devices, such as smartphones, tablets, and laptops. Some examples of synchronous tools include web-conferencing (Google Hangouts and Skype) and instant messaging (LINE and WhatsApp).

Ortega (1997) looked at computer-assisted classroom discussions (CACD) and came up with three distinct arguments in support of electronic synchronous communication: it has an equalizing effect on participants, increases learner productivity, and produces language that is more complex.

A study conducted by Chun (1994, cited in Ortega 1997) found that CACD provided opportunity for interactional adjustments such as: clarification checks, comprehension checks, and clarification requests. Chun concluded that a variety of interactional adjustments would be realized when learners engage in electronic synchronous communication.

Averianova (2012) cautions that there are certain risks involved with foreign language classrooms adopting electronic synchronous communication. Averianova points out that inappropriate use may lead to communication problems such as exclusion, flaming, and incomprehensibility.

Methodology

Research Participants

My research took place with first year students in the School of Contemporary International Studies (SCIS) at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies (NUFS). All students across three departments—English and Contemporary Society, Global Business, and Liberal Arts and Global Studies—are enrolled in the Power-Up! Tutorial (PUT), an oral communication tutorial. One class, each having the same upper intermediate English proficiency, was chosen from all three departments to take part in the study.

There are typically fifteen students in a class that meets once a week for ninety minutes. Three students sit at a table with one native English tutor, giving the course a unique student to tutor ratio of 3:1.

Each week, in-class conversations focus on a topic with an accompanying conversation strategy, designed to provide tips on how to improve oral communication ability. Example topics include technology, movies, music, etc. Additionally, conversation strategies include shadowing (a continuer), asking for examples (a clarification request), asking for meaning (clarification request) etc.

In-classroom Interactions

The topic for the in-classroom interactions was predetermined and most students had prepared vocabulary and a conversation card for the class. During class, students typically have three interactions at a table comprising of three students and one native English tutor. Each conversation was with a different group of students and tutor. The recursive nature of the interactions helps develop communicative competency and improves students' confidence.

The third interaction at the table was recorded with a digital audio recorder. Students are typically allotted twenty minutes for the interaction. The first few minutes of the interaction for this study, however, were taken up by being briefed on my research objectives and signing consent forms.

Instant Messaging Interactions

Similar to the in-classroom interactions, the role of the tutor (represented as AT, KT, and RT in the data) during the IM interactions was to facilitate and encourage students (represented as AS1, KS2, RS3, etc. in the data) to communicate, not dominate or monopolize communication. The instant messaging interactions for each class were initiated by the tutor three days prior to their Power-Up! Tutorial class. The purpose of the IM interactions prior to class was to introduce the in-classroom topic by exploring some vocabulary and phrases.

The IM interactions continued for three days after the in-classroom interaction with intention to extend the conversation by providing students more opportunity to communicate. Some students who were not able to speak as much as they had hoped during class would have opportunity through IM out-of-classroom.

Students were not instructed to avoid common language unique to IM, such as abbreviations, symbols, and emoticons. Additionally, students were not instructed to mimic face-to-face communication.

Data Gathering

Data was gathered for this study in three ways. First was through a questionnaire aimed at understanding students' exposure to interactions in English and use of mobile instant messaging. Second was audio recording and transcribing in-classroom interactions. Third was downloading IM text of out-of-classroom interactions through LINE (an IM application).

The first objective of the questionnaire was to better understand the students' level of exposure to interactions in English by comparing expectations upon entering with the current reality. Second was to gather information about the type of IM platform they often used along with who they interacted with. Third was to understand the main purpose of their IM interactions. The questionnaire was conducted in English during the last ten minutes of class. A tutor was available at the table to offer help to the students. Translation into Japanese of some key words was provided on the questionnaire.

The next task used a cognitive approach to language learning to better understand how the use of negotiation for meaning (NfM) compared between the two types of interactions—in-classroom and out-of-classroom IM. The in-classroom interactions were recorded during class using a digital audio recorder. The conversations were manually transcribed for analysis. The out-of-classroom IM interactions were exported as a text file for analysis. I made a quantitative analysis of the interactions counting the number of moves made to negotiate for

meaning (NfM).

The final task used a sociocultural approach to language learning to better understand the frequency of supportive language students used during the two types of interactions. The number of moves that helped create a positive learning environment were counted and analyzed.

Results

Results obtained from the data pertaining to the questionnaire, the cognitive approach, and the sociocultural approach are introduced below.

Questionnaire

Data was gathered from the seven questions in the questionnaire. Results are displayed in a table and summarized below.

Table 1: Results from Question 1.1

What is the average number of face-to-face interactions in English you have on campus per week?	< 5	6–10	> 10
Number of participants: 40	36 (90%)	4 (10%)	0 (0%)

The results from Question 1.1 show a significant majority (90%) of students receive less than five face-to-face interactions in English per week. The remaining 10% of students were exposed to between six and ten interactions. No students claimed to have over ten face-to-face interactions in English per week.

Table 2: Results from Question 1.2

How many interactions in English did you expect to have on campus per week upon entering this university?	less than Q1.1	equal to Q1.1	more than Q1.1
Number of participants: 40	13 (32%)	7 (18%)	20 (50%)

Question 1.2 focused on the students' expectations for the number of interactions in English. Fifty percent of the students thought they would be interacting more. Thirty-two percent stated they expected to have fewer interactions than they were currently having. Finally, 18% of the students stated they expected to have the same number of interactions in English.

Table 3: Results from Question 1.4

What is your level of satisfaction with the number of face-to-face interactions in English you are getting on campus per week?	not satisfied	satisfied	very satisfied
Number of participants: 38	22 (58%)	16 (42%)	0 (0%)

Question 1.4 attempted to gauge the students' level of satisfaction with the interactions in English they were having on campus. Fifty-eight percent responded that they were not satisfied, while 42% responded they were satisfied. No students responded that they were very satisfied.

Table 4: Results of Question 2.1

Do you send and receive mobile instant messages?	Yes	no
Number of participants: 40	40 (100%)	0 (0%)

The focus shifted in Questions 2.1–2.3 from in-classroom face-to-face interactions in English to use of out-of-classroom mobile instant messaging. All students (100%) responded that they use mobile instant messaging to communicate.

Table 5: Results from Question 2.2

Which instant message client do you use for the majority of your interactions?	LINE	Facebook	Twitter	Skype	other
Number of participants: 23	22 (96%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Although many of the students responded that they use multiple IM hosts, the majority (96%) responded that they use LINE. Only one student responded that he/she used Twitter for the majority of his/her IM interactions.

Table 6: Results from Question 2.3

What is the purpose of the majority of your mobile instant messaging interactions?	classes/ homework/ assignments	discussing plans	chatting	other
Number of participants: 29	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	29 (100%)	0 (0%)

Many of the students had multiple reasons for using IM, but for Question 2.3, they could only choose one answer. All of the students (100%) chose chatting as the reason for the majority of their IM interactions. No students (0%) responded that they use IM for other purposes such as classes, discussing plans or other.

Table 7: Results from Question 3.2

Why did you choose this university?					
Number of participants: 40	Study English/ Study Abroad	Airline course	Study business	Near my house	Experience a new department
	35 (87.5%)	2 (5%)	1 (2.5%)	1 (2.5%)	1 (2.5%)

The final question from the questionnaire asked students why they chose to attend NUFS. This question was not multiple choice. They could write their answer in English or Japanese. Some students wrote more than one reason. The majority (87.5%) answered that they decided to attend NUFS to study English and/or study abroad.

Cognitive Approach to Discourse Analysis

This section uses a cognitive approach to language learning to quantitatively

analyze both modes of communication. Data are presented Table 8 below with a brief summary.

Table 8: Frequency of NfM in IM and In-classroom Interactions

Mode	Turns	Negotiation for Meaning (NfM)			
		Total	Comprehension checks	Confirmation checks	Clarification requests
Instant Messaging	145	7 (5%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)
In-classroom	728	59 (8%)	14 (2%)	33 (4%)	12 (2%)

The results from Table 8 reveal that the total number of moves made to negotiate for meaning was far greater during the in-class interaction than it was during the IM interaction. Fourteen comprehension checks, 33 confirmation checks, and 12 clarification requests were made during the in-class interaction. During the IM interactions, only three comprehension checks were made, and no confirmation checks or clarification requests were made.

Sociocultural Approach to Language Learning

This section looks at the quantitative analysis of data in the sociocultural approach to language learning. Data are presented in Table 9 below with a brief summary.

Table 9: Frequency of Modified Output in IM and In-class Interactions

Mode	Turns	Supportive Language				
		Total	Co-construction	Recast	Self-correction	Continuers
Instant Messaging	145	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
In-classroom	728	84 (12%)	16 (2%)	4 (1%)	39 (5%)	25 (4%)

Results from Table 9 show that students used supportive language 84 times

during the in-classroom interaction. Of the four kinds of supportive language being examined in this study, co-construction was used 16 times, recasts were used four times, self-correction was used 39 times, and continuers were made 25 times. No supportive language (zero moves) was used in the IM interactions.

Discussion

This section will look at some of the positive outcomes and challenges in the questionnaire, instant messaging interaction, and in-classroom interaction. Recommendations for further research will be introduced in the conclusion.

Questionnaire

Students were enthusiastic to fill out the questionnaire. They were able to communicate with tutors at their tables using the target language. The ten questions on the questionnaire did not seem overly burdensome. The questionnaire contained some key words translated into Japanese for their reference.

The questionnaire provided interesting insight about mobile communication amongst students. First, many students use mobile devices to communicate with friends and family. Second, students maintain a casual discourse with their IM interactions. The subject of their interactions was chatting, which may indicate that IM is still seen as a tool for communication in the private sphere and not widely adopted for academic and professional purposes. Third, LINE is a very popular IM application used by the majority of students at the university

A challenge with the questionnaire may have been some of the ambiguous language used in the questions. Firstly, the meaning of *interaction* may not have been clear. Some students may have interpreted it as meaning a simple greeting in English while others may have understood it as a more complex discourse such as a discussion or debate. Clarity on the terminology within second language acquisition is necessary.

Another challenge may be surrounding students' expectations (Question

1.2 of the questionnaire) of interactions in English at the university. There may have been multiple factors that influence students' expectations, such as, how the university is marketed, the reputation of the tutors, the varied experience students have abroad, and therefore, information gathered from this question may not be reliable.

Instant Messaging Interaction

In this section I will look at some of the benefits and challenges of mobile instant messaging. First, the results suggest that instant messaging has reduced some of the sociocultural barriers associated with face-to-face communication. LINE enabled some students to communicate more freely and often, without the pressure of following social norms. The necessity to capture and maintain speaking turns can be an inhibitive task for some language learners. Instant messaging allowed students who are intimidated by face-to-face communication more opportunity for output.

Second, students had unrestricted access to output through mobile communication. Many students were submitting instant messages during their free periods on campus or off campus late in the evening. The ability for students to interact on the go, whenever they had free time resulted in greater output. Some students had the opportunity to use LINE to reformulate their in-class utterances, increasing opportunity for interaction in English.

Third, IM interactions seemed to offer students opportunity for more casual language than they would normally use in the classroom. The instant messages resembled more accurately how they would naturally interact in their native language. Supportive phrases such as "That's good, (name)" and "Good afternoon XD[emoticon)". Mobile instant messaging could provide a means for students to communicate more comfortably than in the classroom.

Although there were some clear benefits of using instant messaging to increase output, there were some challenges as well. I will introduce three main

challenges of IM in the cognitive approach to language learning.

First, self-correction, like in most forms of written discourse, is uncommon. Grammar mistakes are often corrected before the instant message is sent. Typos sometimes occur, but usually go undetected by the sender until after the message has been sent. The relatively few typos in the data may indicate that students were extra careful typing their messages. Examples 15 and 16 below show typos that were not self-corrected nor pointed out by the receiver.

Example 15: Typo made by a student that was ignored

AS1: I want to watch Monsters Univercity [emoticon: heart]

AS2: Me too!!! I will watch it!

Example 16: Typos made by a tutor that were ignored

RT: Ya, I've never seen it either. I kind if want to take my kids ti see Monsters University. looks fun

RS2: I want to see it !!!!!!!!! It looks fun. Will you go theater with your kid's?

The second challenge encountered by the IM interaction was the variable frequency of posts from the start of the week to the end. Near the end of the week, some classes were sending only one instant message per day. Perhaps the excitement of using a novel communication tool explained the high frequency at the start, but without the social pressure to respond like in face-to-face communication, students may have opted not to respond as time passed.

The third challenge relates to the synchronous nature of instant messaging. Being able to send and receive messages in real time was one of the main features that drew me to this mode of communication. However, instant messaging in its entirety is not synchronous as evident in this study. When students provided output in the form of an instant message through LINE, all recipients

can receive the message as input synchronously. When replies are made, they become asynchronous. There is often a time delay of a few minutes, even a few hours, or no reply at all. This delay in response is unique to IM and provided an additional challenge not present in in-classroom interactions.

In-classroom Interaction

In this section, I will introduce some of the benefits and challenges observed in the classroom conversations.

One main benefit of the in-classroom interaction drawn from this study was the number of moves made to negotiate for meaning. The cognitive approach to language learning could successfully determine that the frequency of NfM as a result of breakdowns in communication was greater during the in-classroom interactions. Results also revealed that very few negotiations occurred during the IM interactions. Perhaps students during the in-classroom interactions were forced to be accountable for their output, which led to more NfM. LINE separated students in space and time, eliminating the need to be socially accountable for communication breakdowns.

One main challenge students faced during the in-classroom interactions was the length of time they had to communicate. Although the students in the classroom were allotted the same twenty minutes for their interaction, inevitably, there was some lost time. I introduced my research objectives and had students sign consent forms. This process meant that on average, 30% of their interaction time was spent taking care of administrative tasks.

Conclusion

The results have shown that the conditions under which the IM interactions took place did not provide the necessary cognitive elements salient in face-to-face interactions to sufficiently support classroom interactions in the Power-Up! Tutorial. Errors in communication were left unchecked. It was not clear whether

IM output was understood by all interlocutors. Lack of NfM was the major failure of the IM interactions.

Although there is no data to support that students used the four types of supportive language in the IM interactions, they seemed to communicate more naturally and in a manner they felt comfortable with. From a sociocultural perspective, IM had some clear benefits. That being said, IM lacked some social accountability that is present in face-to-face interactions.

Clear explanations of student and tutor roles in the IM interaction may have resulted in an interaction more similar to the in-class interaction. Students were often waiting for prompts from other students or the tutor using LINE, when normally in the classroom they would not. Logging instant message submissions may be one way of inserting accountability into the IM interactions.

Although IM and in-classroom interactions differ significantly from a cognitive and sociocultural perspective, there are some clear benefits—providing students more opportunity in space and time to create output and use supportive language that creates a comfortable language learning atmosphere.

With a few additions, such as social accountability and a clear understanding of interlocutor roles, IM interactions can be more similar to in-classroom interactions and be a suitable complement to the Power-Up! Tutorial.

Appendix A – Sample of Instant Messaging Interaction

Tue

18:51 RS4: When I went to USJ, I saw 4D movies. It's so exciting.

18:52 RS5: 迫力がある [Have a tremendous impact]

18:52 RS5: Sorry

18:52 30 RS2: what?

18:53 RS2: haha

18:53 RS6: what?

18:53 RS4: haha

18:53 RS7: hahaha

18:53 35 RS6: haha

18:53 RS7: I want to see it!

18:53 RS8: Me too!!!

18:54 RT: What are you saying RS5???

18:56 RS5: Sorry! It was wrong.

19:02 40 RS5: Please continue talking about the movie!!

19:03 RS4: 4D movies are very dynamism!!

19:04 RS9: When I went to USJ,I watched 4D movies too. It's about sesami street.

19:05 RS5: What is the difference between 4D and 3D?

19:06 RS7: It moves the seat!

19:08 45 RS9: And it rain and billow bubble.

19:09 RS7: We can sense a smell there.

19:10 RS5: It seems very interesting! I want to try it!

19:20 RT: What movie do you think would be best in 4D? If you were to watch any movie in 4D, which one would you choose?

Wed

15:58 50 RT: I think Charlie and the Chocolate Factory would be cool. We could smell and taste the delicious chocolate in the theatre!

23:36 RS5: I want to look at the biohazard in 4D!! I think that fear increases more.

23:37 RS4: That's good! I like it. the movie will be better that chocolate's smell in the theater. Also, moving seats make me so excited!

Appendix B – Sample of In-classroom Interaction

2:00 AS12: Ahh, I didn't watch recently. (5)

AS11: Hmm.

AS12: *Un.*

AT: Do you... Do you like fantasy movies? Like... AS11's movie she saw recently is a fantasy movie, right? Do you like fantasy?

AS12: Yes.

AT: Uh huh. (8) What kind... What movies do you like? What's a movie that you... that you like?

2:30 AS12: I like non-fiction movie.

AT: Hmm.

AS12: And love story.

AS11: Hmm.

AS12: And so on.

AS11: Hmm.

AS10: What's movie do you like the best?

AS12: Ahh *eh*? I don't have favorite movies but I'd like to watch Devil Wears Prada.

AS11: Wha...

3:00 AS12: Ah *shiranai ka* [Oh, You don't know it?]

AS11: I don't know about that movie. Ahh let me introduce some information about that movie.

AS12: *Eh? Maji ka.*[Do I have to?]

AS10/AS11: Haha

AS12: *Eh?* Uh. This movie is famous...uh...*komata ...un*. [darn-it!]

AS11: Ah is it a Japanese movie or Western movie?

AS12: Western movie.

AS11: Ah.

3:30 AT: Yup. It's a Hollywood... Hollywood movie. What's the story about? Basically. Very simple. What's simple story. Do you know? Can you describe what the story is about? (3)

AS12: I don't know detail. (7)

4:00 AT: Can you say why you like it? Why... Why do you like that movie? (3)

AS12: *Kochi?* [Pointing to the movie title written on her conversation card]

Appendix A – Questionnaire

Interactions in English - Questionnaire

From: Colin Phillips, Power Up! Tutorial program leader; MA TEFL/SL student at University of Birmingham, U.K.	To: 1st year students, School of Contemporary International Studies, NUFS, Japan.

Part One: Face to face interactions in English

1.1 What is the average number of face to face interactions in English you have on campus per week?	< 5 ☐	6 - 10 ☐	> 10 ☐
1.2 How many interactions in English did you expect to have on campus per week upon entering this university?	less than Q1.1 ☐	equal to Q1.1 ☐	more than Q1.1 ☐
1.3 Who do you currently have face to face interactions in English with on campus?	☐ out of class with teacher ☐ out of class with classmates ☐ international / exchange students ☐ other _____		
1.4 What is your level of satisfaction with the number of face to face interactions in English you are getting on campus per week?	not satisfied ☐	satisfied ☐	very satisfied ☐

Part Two: Mobile instant messaging

2.1 Do you send and receive mobile instant messages?	yes ☐		no ☐	
2.2 Which instant messaging client do you use for the majority of your interactions?	LINE ☐	Facebook ☐	Twitter ☐	Skype ☐
	other ☐ _____			
2.3 What is the relationship with the majority of people you have mobile instant messaging interactions with?	friends ☐	family ☐	co-workers ☐	
	other ☐ _____			
2.4 What is the purpose of the majority of your mobile instant messaging interactions?	☐ classes/homework/assignments ☐ discussing plans ☐ chatting ☐ other _____			

Part Three: About you

3.1 What department are you in?	English and Contemporary Society ☐	Global Business ☐	Liberal Arts and Global Studies ☐
3.2 Why did you choose this university?	_____ _____ _____ _____		

interaction - 対話　level of satisfaction - 満足度　relationship - 関係　majority - 大部分

References

Averianova, I. (2012) 'The language of electronic communication and its implications for TEFL'. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 34: 14–19.

Foster, P. and Ohta, A. (2005) 'Negotiation for Meaning and Peer Assistance in Second Language Classrooms'. *Applied Linguistics* 26/3: 402–430.

Long, M. (1996) 'The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition'. In Ortega, L. (2011) *Second Language Acquisition: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*. Routledge: London.

Ortega, L. (1997) 'Processes and Outcomes in Networked Classroom Interaction: Defining the research agenda for L2 computer-assisted classroom discussions'. *Language Learning & Technology* 1/1: 82–93.

Pica, T. (1987) 'Second-Language Acquisition, Social Interaction, and the Classroom.' *Applied Linguistics* 8/1: 3–21.

Pica, T. (1996) 'The Essential Role of Negotiation in the Communicative Classroom.' *JALT Journal* 18/2: 241–268.

Walsh, S. (2012) 'Conceptualising Classroom Interactional Competence'. *Novitas Royal* 6/1: 1–14.