International Academic Institute for Science and Technology

International Academic Journal of Humanities
Vol. 5, No. 1, 2018, pp. 171-186.
ISSN 2454-2245

International Academic Journal of Humanities

www.iaiest.com

Equality, Mutuality in terms of Turn Taking, Joint and dialogical Interaction in Communication and L2 Development of Iranian EFL Learners

Nazanin Forghani [a], Fatemeh Behjat [b]

[a] *PhD Candidate, Department of Foreign Languages, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran*

[b] *Assistant Professor, Department of English, Abadeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran*

Abstract

The current project employs a qualitative design and explores different communication and interaction patterns as well as the various roles learners take in role relationships in dialogical, reciprocal and joint pair communicative and interactive tasks. It also investigates various modes and premises of mutuality and equality in peer communication and interaction. The study conducts on 16 male and female advanced Iranian EFL learners at Shiraz state university. As data collection and analysis procedures, the study gathered data from learners' communication in accomplishing three distinct kinds of communicative and interactive tasks to discover and investigate what rules occur in joint dialogical pair communication and interaction, either collaboratively or non-collaboratively, and its effects on the learning opportunities pairs create for each other which leads to L2 learning, L2 development and appropriate use of target structure. Their voice is recorded and transcribed. It asserts that, it is significant to popularize collaborative joint dialogical peer communication and interaction in the process of L2 learning. To do such this, an in-depth understanding is needed of how learners relate, contribute and cooperate to each other in joint and dialogical paired conversations to do the tasks and build the knowledge jointly. Nevertheless, the belief that learners will always essentially collaborate each other to complete tasks in the communications and interactions is criticized. At the end, according to the findings from the present study, conclusion, significances and solutions for establishing effective collaborative joint dialogical pair communication and interaction in tasks accomplishment are discussed.

Keywords: Mutuality, Equality, Communication and Interaction Pattern, Joint Collaboration, Reciprocal Interaction

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Introduction

In investigation of various aspects of communication, collaborative/ cooperative/ reciprocal/ dyadic and joint interaction between two sides of speaking are important factors leading to L2 acquisition. According to interaction hypothesis proposed by Long (1996), these factors bring together comprehensible input, learners' internal processes such as repair, feedback, negotiation of meaning and uptake, and finally language output or pushed output. Long (1996) within his hypothesis claims that learners can produce and discover more target like language when they interact with teacher or a more competent partner. They receive comprehensible input during interaction which is called 'interactively comprehensible input'. Then, they are provided by feedback, are requested for clarification and are pushed to modify their language during the negotiation of meaning when they attempt to solve communication problems or breakdowns.

Besides, according to sociocultural theory proposed by vygotsky (1978), researchers state that peers, teachers or more competent counterparts scaffolding and assisting allows learners to jointly and collaboratively construct what they cannot achieve individually by their own, which contributes to L2 learning. In other words, a more competent peer should assist the less competent addressee in order to move from other-regulated process toward self-regulated process. (Donato, 1994; Swain, 1997).

Swain (1987), in particular, claims that the collaborative, cooperative and joint conversation which speakers are engaged in during problem solving, meaning negotiation and knowledge or skill building activities mediates and facilitate second language acquisition (SLA). However, not all learners are able to collaborate effectively with each other in peer interaction. They vary and differ in terms of mutuality and equality which would be discussed more in detail in the following parts. This may return to individual's learning style.

Some researches in terms of pair work depict that learners form distinct patterns of interaction tend to maintain the same pattern from task to task (like Aldosari 2008, Storch 2001). In EFL contexts especially Iran, learners are reluctant to speak and make conversation in L2, in both classroom context and out of classroom context in real world. In addition, collaborative, reciprocal, cooperative, supportive and joint dyadic and peer communication are not well developed in EFL contexts including Iran. Although there are a lot of studies conducted regarding interaction, its principle, patterns and the way to develop and conduct that, there are not much pieces of research with respect to investigating collaborative, reciprocal and joint interaction, also patterns of interaction and to explore how all of these lead to L2 development as well, in EFL contexts like Iran and among Iranian EFL learners.

The present study follows a qualitative approach and aims to investigate this issue by analyzing the patterns L2 learners establish during collaborative and joint dyadic peer communication and evaluating how these patterns affect their process of conversation or task performance/achievement and how lead to L2 development. It is accomplished by considering two concepts of mutuality and equality as well. The current study is also an effort to offer some insightful solutions and strategies to students for making effective and natural collaborative and pair communication and to teachers for organizing that effective and natural collaborative pair work. These mentioned tenets are proposed by communicative approaches in ELT as well. Ultimately, it seems that investigation of L2 collaborative pair communication and interaction consist potential capacity for further investigations and seek more improvement and innovation in language learning pedagogy.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Patterns of interaction and related studies

In the world of collaborative interaction, following sociocultural theory (SCT) and the concept of scaffolding asserted by Vygotsky (1974) and the related notions claimed by Lantolf's (2000), the concept of 'collective scaffolding' was proposed by Donato (1994) by which he emphasizes and explains learners' engagement and performance during group interaction and communication. The term 'collective' refers to students' joint collaboration during interaction and is contrasted to the groups in which learners refuse to mediate and assist each other during interaction in order to convey the message and in task completion. Then, Storch (2001) offered a model including patterns of interaction when the students accomplish communicative writing tasks. She presented five categories of communication patterns such as: dominant-dominant, dominant-passive, expert-novice, expert-passive and collaborative pattern.

Storch (2001) focuses on these communicative patterns based on the degrees of equality and mutuality between the both sides of speakers. Equality is referred to learners' contribution of exchanging information, conveying the message and their surveillance or control over communicative task completion and direction. Mutuality also is referred to the degree of reciprocity and contribution during interaction and conversation.

The degree of equality can be identified and measured by production of utterances which each side of communication produces. Dominant speakers contribute, speak and produce more utterances more than passive addressees. Moreover, it can be measured by changing the topic, due to this fact that it elicits feasible dominance by the addressee. As opposed to this, the degree of mutuality typically is measured by some qualitative analysis of the transcripts. With respect to this, Storch (2001) discovered some evidences to demonstrate the degree of mutuality; she stated the frequency of peer repairs and feedback, and analyzed the participants' processes of decision making regarding language issues (it might be accomplished either interactively or non-interactively).

This qualitative analytical framework has been developed and adopted by several researchers interested in investigating collaborative or joint interaction during communication and also interested in communication and interaction patterns. The emerging communication patterns they subsequently discovered will be discussed and introduced in the following parts.

According to the interaction pattern framework and categorization proposed by Storch (2001), in a dominant-dominant communication and interaction pattern, learners are equal concerning task surveillance or control and contribution to exchanging information and conveying meaning; however, they do not repair each other's utterances or do not provide feedback. They also are not capable to engage and deal with each other's utterances thoroughly. Therefore, this pattern enjoys the concept of equality but lacks the concept of mutuality.

A dominant-passive communication and interaction pattern lacks both equality and mutuality. In that, the dominant speaker contributes, speaks and produces more utterances and transfers the majority of messages or information to the task or during the conversation than the passive addressee who plays a subservient role with limited amount of speaking and production. There is no repair, reciprocity and traces of feedback as well.

In the expert-novice communication and interaction pattern or in the relationship between an expert and a novice counterpart, the expert student or the competent teacher mediates, scaffolds and assists the less competent addressee or the less competent student in order to communicate or complete the task. This communication and interaction pattern lacks equality in task surveillance or control and contribution to

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

exchanging information and conveying meaning, but enjoys a high mutuality between the expert side and the novice side. Since during communication or task accomplishment the competent expert provides feedback, repairs the erroneous or misunderstood utterances and contributes to conveying the message and tries to not let breakdown occurs.

In contrast to dominant-dominant communication and interaction pattern, in a collaborative pattern of communication, learners take directions from each other and scaffold, assist and guide each other during communication to control the process of task accomplishment and exchange the information and also convey the message to the addressee. There is a lot of space for repairing and providing feedback .Consequently, this pattern enjoys both high equality and high mutuality.

There is a point that merits to mention, Vygotsky's (1974) sociocultural theory (SCT) focuses on the expert-novice relationship and the pattern of communication and also a two-way assistance in a collaborative manner, however, empirical studies conducted by different researchers in the domain of SLA and exploring the patterns of interaction discovered that the interaction within an expert-novice paradigm and communication pattern was mainly fixed over time and across different task, mostly the communicative ones (Aldosari, 2008; Storch, 2001). Thus, it is difficult to determine whether learners and teachers' relationships in terms of all communication and interaction patterns can or do vary and change across different tasks and from task to task.

Patterns of interaction and L2 learning and conducted studies

Following Storch's (2001) interaction pattern framework and categorization, researchers have kept working to relate, consolidate and unite the connection between patterns of interaction and L2 learning by measuring the language related episodes (LRE) both qualitatively and quantitatively which students elicit during conversation with their addressee. (Aldosari, 2008; Swain and Watanabe, 2007). According to Swain and Lapkin (1998), a language related episode (LRE) is 'any part of a conversation or dialogue where language learners talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others'. (p.326) In addition, Swain and Lapkin (1998) emphasizes that LREs are critical episodes for L2 learning as learners can tune and appropriate each other's language use to make it more target like.

Aldosari's (2008) conducted a piece of research regarding peer interaction. He elicited the patterns and asserted that the communication and interaction patterns learners established in communicative tasks were the main identifier and indicator of the number of LREs produced. In the similar vein, Watanabe and Swain (2007) also discovered more LREs in both sides with a collaborative or expert-novice paradigms or patterns than sides demonstrating dominant-passive and expert-passive relationship in a non-collaborative manner.

Concepts of Equality/Mutuality in detail and investigated studies

Beside the patterns of interaction submitted and introduced up to now, Swain and Watanabe (2007) discovered an emerging pattern in their collaborative pair talk data. They found an expert-passive communication and interaction pattern in which teacher, more competent side or the expert provides much amount of mediation, assistance and encouragement to speak and complete the task, however, the passive and less competent student and side seems reluctant to participate in the conversation. They obtained such results that, learners in this pattern scored lower than the collaborative and expert-novice

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

pattern in the individual writing post test. However, generally and based on the results of their investigation, the only difference between the expert/novice and expert-passive paradigm settles in the level of mutuality. In that, the novice in the expert-novice paradigm deals with the assistance and guidance provided by the expert, teacher or more competent peer reciprocally and also engages in the expert scaffolding through communication and task completion. He/she repairs and provides feedback during conversation as well. The passive speaker in the expert-passive pattern indicates less engagement in the process during communication and task completion over time.

Consequently, it sounds mutuality plays a predominant role in determining the learning opportunities in collaboration and joint peer interaction. As a matter of fact, the degree of mutuality between dyadic addressees plays more significant and important role than equality. For instance, according to Storch (2001), it is true that equality is high in the dominant/dominant pattern, but there is also a high possibility and high level of argument, disputation and frequent rejection of each other's suggestions without due consideration. Such conflicts in communication lead to breakdown during conversation and does not let the meaning to be conveyed and also prevent learners from pooling their knowledge to achieve greater performance.

Likewise, Storch, Tan, Wigglesworth (2010) investigated a piece of research and discovered a cooperative and collaborative pattern of peer interaction. They compared the cooperative and collaborative pattern in production and writing tasks. They inferred that learners in a cooperative and collaborative relationship were equal in terms of production as they took turns to contribute and engage but contributed different elements to a writing task and did not contribute and engage with each other's writing during task achievement. Thus, these two studies seem to imply and emphasize that mutuality is more significant, crucial and important to knowledge co-construction than equality collaborative and joint peer interaction.

As far as we know, Swain's (2000) output hypothesis asserts that production and pushed output is a necessary condition for learning to occur. In that, learners need to be pushed to produce output for their L2 to develop. Therefore, due to and with respect to the Swain's claim, despite the apparently higher value of mutuality in comparison to equality, the question rises whether a pattern with high mutuality but very low equality in contributing information may facilitate L2 learning. Nevertheless, even silent participants can benefit from peer interaction by just carefully listening to their partners and addresses' utterances.

Dobao (2016) observed learner conversation and discussion in groups of four. She determined and classified learners' roles in or in terms of LRE such as: 1.the trigger, who initiates a language concept; 2.the solver, who solves the issue; 3. the collaborator or contributor, who collaborate or contributes to the solution; and 4. the silent side, who contributes nothing to the LRE. She inferred that the silent side could learn from the lexical LREs negotiated and discussed between other group members just by listening and observing carefully. Consequently, she argues that instead of focusing on learners' equality of spoken interaction, our main focus and concern should be on the actual learning chances different members and sides can create for individuals, and how individuals can exploit and benefit from these learning opportunities.

In the aggregate, mutuality is a dominant factor during conversation for contribution and control over conversation and communicative tasks. It is also a crucial notion for exchanging information, conveying the message appropriately and as a result, the quantity and quality of learning opportunities learners can

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

create for each other in a joint and dyadic interaction, based on the empirical studies discussed above, are closely bound to the level of mutuality between the interlocutors.

Research questions

The study employs a qualitative approach to answer the following questions:

1. Which communication and interaction patterns do benefit students' L2 learning development and lead to efficient task completion or effective communication?
2. How do different levels and modes of mutuality and equality contribute to L2 learning development and lead to efficient task completion or effective communication?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the project included 16 advanced Iranian EFL learners at Shiraz state university including male and female, their age ranged from 24 to 26, and they took part voluntarily in the project. The study conducted during about six week study and the students' voice was audio recorded.

Instrument

The learners were asked to accomplish some communicative and interactive tasks dialogically and in pairs. The tasks consisted of a dictogloss, a jigsaw information exchange and an interview. Students accomplished one task each week. A warm-up and preparation section was held prior to each task to familiarize them with the task and topic. However, there was no instruction or intervention by teacher when the learners started doing their tasks. In the aggregate and at the end, dialogical and pair talk data were collected and then transcribed word by word and verbatim.

Data collection

As mentioned earlier in the introduction and literature review, the study's objective was to investigate the concepts of equality, mutuality, interaction and communication patterns and the contributions to learners' achievement of the task goal as well as improvement in their using L2 and improvement in their accuracy in using the appropriate target language. The number of LREs and learners' accurate production of target like structures were identified and counted quantitatively and characteristics of equality, mutuality and particular interaction and communication patterns were discovered and analyzed qualitatively. Mutuality was operationalized by analyzing and considering learners' turn-taking whose characteristics, premises and the elements which the degree of the mutuality in tasks accomplishment was to be considered and analyzed based on, are stated as follows:

- **Adjacency dyads:** turn-takings in conversations, communications and interactions consisted of two joint related utterances by both sides or by two speakers, closely one after the other.
- **Topic change or theme shift:** either disjunctive (a transition between two topics) or stepwise (a break between two topics).
- Other procedures like interruption and pause frequency, problem-solving and decision-making processes; either individualized or collaborative and joint.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Before starting to explain and present the process of the study in detail, to mention an overall findings of the study briefly for getting the mind ready, the current study discovered that participants in their communications and interactions with high mutuality and equality in task accomplishment created more opportunities for the both sides to seek assistance, negotiate, collaborate, cooperate, interact, communicate and correct each other's errors, whereas both sides lacking mutuality and equality in their communications and interactions tended to overlook each other's requests and seemed reluctant to seek assistance, negotiate, collaborate, cooperate, interact, communicate, offer assistance and correct each other's errors, consequently missing substantial chances to create LREs.
The study goes on based on two main parts depending on various degrees of mutuality and equality:

a) Illustrating, discussing and analyzing data which endorse missed opportunities for seeking peer scaffolding, negotiation, collaboration, cooperation, interaction, communication and correcting each other's errors in non-collaborative communication and interactions which leads to ineffective communication and interaction.
b) Illustrating, discussing and analyzing data which endorse opportunities to seek assistance, negotiate, collaborate, cooperate, interact, communicate and correct each other's errors in collaborative communication and interactions which successfully resolved and led to LREs and leads to effective communication and interaction.

Data analysis

Ineffective communication and interaction: case of low mutuality/ high equality

In the first task and transcribed extract from the collected data, the two students were asked to accomplish a *dictogloss task*, where they had to listen to a short text or story verbalized by a tape recorder and then they reconstructed that short text after listening to the story or text and jot down some key words by each individuals at first; then, these notes, key words and short reconstructions constructed by individuals were used as the basis for the dialogic and joint reconstruction of the text or story verbalized by the tape. As the first extract shows, the two participants are trying to reconstruct the text or story according to their notes but debating the word choices.
Therefore, this task accomplishment enjoys high equality, in that, learners are equal concerning task surveillance or control and contribution to exchanging information and conveying meaning however, low mutuality, in that, , they do not repair each other's utterances, do not provide feedback and do not correct each other's errors in collaborative communication and interaction They also are not capable to engage and deal with each other's utterances thoroughly. Nicknames are used to keep the participants' identity and anonymity.

Task and extract 1 (S: Star, M: Moon)

1) **S**: The queen enters.
2) **M:** Told the invitation letter?
3) **S:** No! no! no!, I don't guess I heard something about invitation letter.
4) **M:** Yeah, it's invitation but I'm not sure where to fit it. Someone find him and...
5) **S:** The queen enters.
6) **M:** Invitation…

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

7) **S:** instead**,** just use another words. It's not important for the story. So let's do it…
8) Um…choose some simple words instead of things we're not sure.
9) **M:** Aha … OKay, imagine a word, such as…
10) **S:** We just should retell the story reason… reasonable.
11) **M:** OK. Someone found him and …
12) **S:** The queen enters.
13) **M:** I mean the word, told the queen???! It's told the invitation...
14) **S:** Oh… come on… Forget about invitation…

In this task, extract and LRE, Moon is attempting to fit the word 'invitation' into the story or text, however, he then asserts that he is not sure where he should put that (row 4). Star rejects him directly and simply since he believes he did not hear this word (row 3). Actually, the word 'invitation' exists in the text or story they are discussing. Moon emphasizes this word several times in this short task, extract, and LRE, however, Star rejects all his insists, either by direct ignorance (rows 3 and 7–8) or by overlooking them (row 14). As it is evident, although they both enjoy an equal opportunity to contribute, exchange information and express themselves, both enjoy low mutuality. In other words, both Tong's individualized decision-making and the low mutuality between Moon and Star leads them not to engage and deal with each other's utterances in collaborative communication and interaction and as a result led to miss a key word in their text or story reconstruction.

Ineffective communication and interaction: case of low mutuality/ low equality

In the second task and transcribed extract from the collected data, the learners were asked to accomplish a *role play interview task* where they were depicted some job announcements and each leaner chose one job. They were assigned the interviewer and interviewee roles and played, and finally decided if the candidate was qualified for the job. Before task accomplishment, learners were given time to prepare, compose and design their resume as interviewee and to prepare, compose and design their questions for asking as an interviewer.

This task accomplishment enjoys not only low mutuality but also low equality, in that, in terms of mutuality, both sides do not repair each other's utterances, do not provide feedback and do not correct each other's errors in collaborative communication and interaction. They also are not capable to engage and deal with each other's utterances thoroughly. Thus, this task, extract and LRE is an example of pair's communication and interaction in a role play interview task that there is no engaged contribution from sides and aims to indicate and emphasize the significant role of mutuality in dialogic, dyadic, collaborative, cooperative interaction and communication and also in peer interaction to convey the message. In terms of equality, learners are equal concerning task surveillance or control and contribution to exchanging information and conveying meaning.

Task and extract 2 (S: Sun, E: Earth)

1) **S:** Which job do you choose?
2) **E:** I wanna work as a school teacher ...

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

3) **S:** Job 3.
4) **E:** Yes. m Um … I wanna choose a job as the teachers which involves in
5) teaching …Um … students… Um … in high or primary schools to … to teach them and expand their knowledge to know more
6) about… Um…different subjects, basic information and different topics. At first I tend to say
7) some points about my university. .. Um … when I'm in the university, I'm always
8) participating actively in different activities and societies, and I want to have a
9) good relationship with my peers and mates…with friends. And this… Um… and this
10) experience made me able to … makes me able to Um … to be, especially good at
11) communicating and dealing with the relationship with others. And additionally, personally and frankly
12) speaking, I love students a lot, so I enjoy the time when I'm working… Um ... I enjoy
13) when I'm teaching to the students and children …Um… and while teach them the various
14) knowledge. And, and, …Um… the, the next part I wanna say is about …Um … I want to
15) know, I want to conduct a research on the teaching and education of students because I want to …
16) um … I want to find out how the students learn and…Um… and what is the best way to teach them. and what the world of education and school
17) is like in the students' eyes, I want to discover this through my …um … my
18) teaching experiences and through this …Um … doing this research. And after…, Um … Um …
19) I think …Um … I'm completely good at, you know, just …Um … shifting my … education
20) strategies according to the different students' learning styles, tastes and personalities or characteristics.
21) As you know…Um … we cannot always use one single method to educate all the
22) students. Different students have various styles and personalities… Um…and… so… we should shift
23) our teaching strategies when necessary based on the different styles and personalities or
24) characteristics. And that is one of my strong …Um … that's my … one of my
25) strength because I can do thoroughly well on it. And here is my resume. Do you have any
26) questions?
27) S well…Um … may I ask … may I ask how long can you work for … er … per month,
28) per … per week…., per week?
29) **E** Um … I…I think, as you stated in…, in this…, in this announcement, you need a teacher
30) which have a flexible time, flexible hours to teach students in school, so I think as a
31) university student I have a lot of free time, so … so I can …Um… about a week I think…I can
32) spend … Um … about… 5 or 6 days to teach the students at school. And when the children
33) have … questions or needs help or extra program to present … they…they can call me, so I can …Um … I can be available at any
34) time.
35) **S:** Okay … Um … I think, I think …
36) **E:** Is there any additional or further questions?
37) **S:** That's enough…,you are employed… I think..., I think you can start working tomorrow.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

In this task, extract and LRE, Earth starts the interview in a monologue manner, very long like an inaugural speaking and begins his self-introduction without any direction and initiation from the interviewer, Sun. In his lengthy speaking and turn, he explains his strengths (rows 7–13), his priorities at the job (rows 14–18), and some aims if he would be employed for the offer (rows 19–24). Earth as the interviewee even asks Sun as the interviewer if there are any questions that he may wish to ask (rows 25–6 and row 36). Sun seems stressed-out unprepared for this question. He shocks, pauses and reformulates the repeated first question for his peer (rows 27–8), as if he overlooks the passing of the time and he may not have expected the interview to go so quickly. As an L2 speaker, Earth shows off his fluent English. However, as a talented speaker in an interactive and communicative situation, he makes no effort to invite his partner to engage in this communication and interaction and only put space for Sun to raise questions when he finishes his utterance (row 26).

This task, extract and LRE follow a dominant/passive communicative and interaction patterns, in the sense that, it lacks not only mutuality but also equality. The dominant speaker contributes the majority of information to the task, while the passive speaker plays a subservient role with limited production. Consequently here, Sun as the interviewer is passive while Earth as the interviewee surveillances and controls the direction of the conversation.

In this way that the two students accomplish their role play interview task does not fulfill the task's communicative purpose. Since there is no actual role play on the part of both sides rather than just one side, and also there is no authentic situation and context for both students to use the target language to construct a meaningful and effective communication and interaction to convey the message as the characteristics of communicative aspect of language emphasizes on.

Effective communication and interaction: the significance of contribution, collaboration, equality and Mutuality

In the third task and transcribed extract from the collected data, the following two extracts are selected and compared to demonstrate the differences between the performance in a collaborative, cooperative, interactive, communicative dialogical interaction of two sides and performance in a non-collaborative, non-cooperative, non-interactive, non-communicative dialogical interaction of two sides to indicate how collaboration and contribution in joint dialogical communication and interaction help and play significant roles and offer the students more chances for learning.

Therefore, this task accomplishment, in terms of the first extract, enjoys both high equality and high mutuality, in that, learners are equal concerning task surveillance or control and contribution to exchanging information and conveying meaning, and they repair each other's utterances, provide feedback and correct each other's errors in collaborative communication and interaction .They also are capable to engage and deal with each other's utterances thoroughly.

In this task and extract, the students were asked to accomplish a *jigsaw information exchange task* in which they had to exchange idea and information to perform and solve a picture puzzle. They were also required to report the process of picture puzzle solving and picture order and tell their reconstructed story to the teacher. The 'simple past tense' was selected as target structure and the task was designed in the way that encourages learners to use and practice *the English simple past tense*, as their report started with 'one day'. The target structure *simple past tense structures* are underlined.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Extracts 3 and 4 depict how the pairs performed the jigsaw information exchange picture puzzle task and reported the stories to their teachers in a collaborative, cooperative, interactive, communicative dialogical interaction and in a non-collaborative, non-cooperative, non-interactive, non-communicative dialogical interaction respectively.

Task and extract 3 (S: Sky, W: Wind, T: teacher)

1) **S:** I got the third. He was … er … maybe one day he discovered his … sharp teeth
2) was dirty and ugly, thus he is call…, he call…, he called…, called the nurse and dentist for assistance. And the fourth … that the
3) dentist do…, is do…, was do, was working on his teeth and extracted his teeth.
4) **W:** And I got the next and the last because I can …, I can…, I can see that the Dracula is … Um …
5) the Dracula don't have the … the sharp teeth and …Perhaps…Um … in the end
6) process of the treatment, he, he, he, … mm … fell in love with this nurse because
7) he … he is taking her hands and…Um … invited the nurse to his home.
8) **T:** OK, however, it's not thoroughly correct and complete.
9) **W** yes…, yes…, he…, he maybe…, brush…, is brushing…, he brushed her teeth at first and then
10) go out? Because he …
11) **S:** wait…, yes…, he went out and found some problem with his teeth, he
12) used … a cotton cloth or towel.

This task, extract and LRE, shows an illustration of a collaborative, cooperative, interactive, communicative joint dialogical interaction accomplishing the picture puzzle task and reporting their jigsaw
story. The both sides follow turn-taking rules and take turns to repot and narrate their stories and pictures (rows 1–7). They also highly assist, collaborate and contribute each other and highly engage with each other's utterances and production. They do such these through listening to each other's reports, narrations and questions, providing each other feedback, repairing each other's utterances, correcting each other's errors in a collaborative communication and interaction, showing support, confirmation and agreement with each other, and complementing, adding and extending each other's ideas. They jointly contributed to convey the message while they focused on the using target structure 'simple past tense'.
Wind makes errors and self-corrects his non-target-like structure in use of 'brush' (row 9). When Sky makes errors, he both self-corrects his own errors (non-target-like structure in use of 'call' in row 2) and provides corrective feedback to his peer and side (non-target-like structure in use of 'go out' in rows 9–11).
Therefore, in this task both students benefited from a high mutuality and equality which enabled the them to share their ideas, misunderstandings and cognitive load and also enabled them tune their each other's appropriate use of target structure while conveying the message and focusing on meaning. As mentioned earlier, extract 4 below contrasts with extract 3 in that the pairs performed the jigsaw information exchange picture puzzle task and reported the stories to their teachers in a non-collaborative, non-cooperative, non-interactive, non-communicative dialogical interaction and did not create a high level of equality and mutuality as well.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Task 3 and extract 4 (F: Flower; B: Butterfly; T : teacher)

1) **F:** You start telling the story from the beginning.
2) **B:** at first…, oh…, no…, one day…, the time *was* 10 A.m. He is in … The Dracula was in his own
3) home.
4) **T:** yes, it is true.
5) **B:** And, and a few moments later, he…, he write…, he is writing to his momy and dady. And went…
6) out away … walk with his pets. The pictures demonstrates his everyday life…
7) **F:** no…Let me resay the story. One day…., Dracula *is* at his home Eating meal.
8) Um … he want to have rest…, so… he's writing to his parents… mom and dad…and then *go* out with
9) his pet. then, he found problem with his tooth. And he wish to find a dentist. And
10) after he finally find a … a dentist for … for the help. .Um… and …he … and he alter
11) his teeth with human teeth. And a pretty lady firstly was surprised
12) when see his teeth. And finally he come house gladly with his
13) tooth problem ... his tooth problem recovery and he is … use his brush to wash his teeth.

In this task, extract and LRE, the two sides, Flower and Butterfly, are reporting the process of picture puzzle solving and their jigsaw information exchange story to the teacher in a non-collaborative, non-cooperative, non-interactive, non-communicative dialogical interaction.

Flower surveillance and controls the report by giving direction to his peer to say the report and the story. He calls and prompts Butterfly to say the report and narrate the story (row 1), however, after a while, he cease him and tell the report and the story on his own (rows 7–13). When butterfly tells the report and story, he uses three intended target structure *simple past tenses*. As opposed, Flower uses the target structure *simple pas tense* just one time during his report and story telling (row 9) and does not keep Butterfly's appropriate use of target structure in his own utterance (italics in rows 7 and 8).

In comparison to Sky and Wind's use of appropriate target structure *simple past tense*, contribution and equal sharing of responsibility, the Flower and Butterfly's dialogical communication and interaction reveal only three target structures *simple past forms*.

This task, extract and LRE follows a dominant/passive communicative and interaction patterns, in the sense that, it lacks not only mutuality but also equality. The dominant speaker contributes the majority of information to the task, while the passive speaker plays a subservient role with limited production.

The dominant speaker Flower, capture the full responsibility for telling the report and story. We can state a justification that since he bears the whole burden of the report and story telling, he might be too cognitively overloaded to use the appropriate target structure *simple past tense* in the right place and time and just focuses on conveying the message in such a lengthy turn.

Therefore, the comparison between extracts 3 and 4 extracted from task 3suggests that joint collaboration, negotiation, cooperation, interaction, communication prompts learners to jointly and dialogically contribute to task accomplishment and help, assist and scaffold each other to achieve more accurate performances and producing target-like structures which leads to L2 learning and development.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Discussion

All the three tasks, the four extracts and LREs above, were accomplished and were gathered the data in different mode of communicative, collaborative, cooperative, interactive and communicative situation and task activities. These tasks and extracts reflect previous investigation in terms of various communication and interaction patterns which discovered that not all learners are able to negotiate, collaborate, cooperate, interact, and communicate effectively and successfully in communicative and interactive tasks.

As proved, illustrated and demonstrated, the present study asserts that mutuality seems more significant than equality in using accurate target structure, effective communication and interaction, conveying the message, L2 learning and development and determining learning opportunities. In that, a high and remarkable degree of mutuality allows learners to assist their partners , negotiate, collaborate, cooperate, interact, communicate and correct each other's errors, repair each other's utterances, provide feedback and in collaborative communication and interaction. They also are capable to engage and deal with each other's utterances thoroughly, listen to each other's questions, share the responsibility for task accomplishment, contribute and collaborate each other to focus on both meaning and form simultaneously. All of these lead the students to engage in appropriate use of the target structure and make use of communication strategies which benefit L2 learning and development.

With respect to this, Macdonald and Yule (1990) claim, a more collaborative, cooperative, interactive and communicate mode of communication and interaction between partners increase learning chances for the less proficient speakers in a joint and dialogical interaction and communication; in that, he/ she is able to receive more comprehensible input and produce more pushed or modified output. They also assert that a more collaborative, cooperative, interactive and communicative mode of communication and interaction between partners increase learning chances and force the more proficient peer to first listen and then speak to provide input for the addressee and to take his/her addressee's attitude into consideration rather than ignores it, and to tune each other's collaboration and contributions, to fit a particular interactive partner's knowledge and equalize the amount of knowledge sharing in an equal manner to follow the premises of equality and mutuality instead of displaying just one side's knowledge' (p. 553). Macdonald and Yule's assertion imply that the both sides should contribute in a way that they follow the premises of both mutuality and equality and try to negotiate, collaborate, contribute, communicate and interact for conveying the message and an effective conversation and communication.

This statement is in line with the findings and analysis of the present project that emphasizes the significance of mutual mental alertness and attentive, meaningful and constant listening for learners and the collaboration and sense of responsibility of the sides. This argument also highlights the fact that both more competent peers and less competent ones can learn and benefit from such joint dialogical collaborations, cooperations, contributions, communications and interactions. In the sense that, stronger and more proficient students provide and create equal, mutual and sociolinguistically appropriate interaction, communication and conversation with the students who are weaker and less proficient than them and by scaffolding, meaning negotiations, error corrections and providing feedback to them and also by uniting their existing knowledge when explaining to weaker students.

Thus, an ideal joint dialogical interaction and communication in task accomplishment, using appropriate target structure, L2 learning and L2 development should involve two responsible students irrespective of their proficiency levels who are both constantly active participants in

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

task accomplishment and communication in terms of L2 learning, and also mentally alert, attentive and active listeners contributing and responding to each other's ideas and questions so that they negotiate for the message, convey the meaning, focus on the accurate target structures and forms, and can offer each other valuable feedback.

Conclusions and significance of the study

As seen in illustrations, data collections, analyses and discussions on different tasks and extracts with different mode of mutuality and equality as well as various communication and interaction patterns, teachers should be aware of this fact that learners may always not essentially be active and assist each other, scaffold, collaborate, negotiate, contribute, cooperate and interact with each other in a joint dialogical communication, interaction and pair work and this phenomenon thus may not assist, help and lead them to L2 development, appropriate use of target structure and intended goal achievement for the tasks.

Nevertheless, existence and proposing a well-established and well-developed model
which demonstrate collaborative, contributive, cooperative and interactive joint dialogical communication and interaction of the pairs in accomplishing the tasks assists the learners to understand the task objective and goal and identify for them modes and premises of mutuality, modes and premises of equality and communication and interaction patterns of interaction that will facilitate task completion, L2 learning, L2 developments and appropriate use of target structure, and will serve as criteria for students and teachers as well.

Kim and McDonough (2011) proposed a creative way of the mentioned model and students-preparation activity for task accomplishment. They provided videos demonstrating sample pairs who accomplish the tasks, provide feedback, respond to the questions jointly, assist and scaffold each other, correct each other's errors, negotiate for both form and meaning and prompt each other for establishing joint and collaborative relationship in collaborative, contributive, cooperative and interactive joint dialogical communication and interaction as a kind of pre-task modeling. They inferred that the this kind of pre-task modeling was an influential pedagogical and educational strategy and technique to assist the teachers to provide a collaborative environment for the students and also for the students to establish collaborative, contributive, cooperative and interactive joint dialogical potentials in communication and interaction to convey the message and create effective conversation which leads to L2 development.

Foot (1999) and Norton (2005) proposed another technique and model which help the student to accomplish the tasks and leads to L2 development. They did it by conducting researches in terms of paired tests and Pairing pairs or students who are familiar with each other to promote and identify modes and premises of mutuality, modes and premises of equality, communication and interaction patterns.

These studies indicated that the students and test takers showed tendency to join and match with their close peers as they felt more comfortable and relaxed communicating and interacting with people who are familiar with them. Additionally and more significantly, the results depicted that the students and test takers who did the test and interact with the familiar people outperformed, achieved higher test scores and completed the tasks more successfully than those students and test takers who did the test and interact with the unfamiliar people that did not know them beforehand. Thus, as a solution or suggestion, we may consider giving our students the right to choose their desired addressee, rather than assigning them to a pre-determined peer and pair. Since this will affect the test and task outcome.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Finally, the present project was qualitative in nature and as mentioned before, its aim was to investigate and understand the potentials, dynamics and various shapes of peer collaboration, negotiation, cooperation, contribution, assistance, scaffolding, communication, interaction and also exploring the communicative and interactive patterns and its effects on L2 learning and development. These were done by reviewing the previous related studies mentioned in the literature and the various data collected from various types of tasks, extracts and LREs. As an important point which merits mentioning again, we can see that in some tasks, there may be non-collaborative, non- cooperative and non-contributive joint dialogical communication and interaction between pairs which missed opportunities for task accomplishment, conveying the message, effective communication, appropriate use of target structure and L2 development.

Therefore, it is important for teachers to create a collaborative, cooperative and communicative situation for the students to communicate and interact jointly and dialogically. They may also motivate students to contribute and collaborate with their peers by designing and manipulating task activities that demand and prompt communicative aspects of language and encourage peer collaboration, peer assistance and peer negotiation.

References

Aldosari, A. (2008). The effect of proficiency levels, task types, and social relationships on peer communications: an EFL context. (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Melbourne, Australia.

Dobao, A. F. (2016). Peer communication and learning: a focus on the quiet learners in M. Sato and S. Ballinger (eds.). Pair interaction and second language learning: pedagogical genuine and authenticity and research program. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective assistanece in L2 learning in J. P. Lantolf and G. Appel (eds.). Vygotskian approaches to second sanguage research. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Foot, M. C. (1999). Relaxing in peers. ELT Journal 53(1), 36–41.

Kim, Y. and K. McDonough. (2011). Using pretask modelling to prompt cooperative learning chances. Language Teaching Research 15(2), 183–199.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic context in second language learning in

W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia (eds.). Guideline of second language acquisition. New York, NY: Academic.

Norton, J. (2005). The paired design in the Cambridge Speaking Tests. ELT Journal 59(4), 287–297.

Storch, N. (2001). An exploration into the nature of dialogic work in an ESL classroom and its influence on grammatical development. (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Melbourne, Australia.

Swain, M. (1997). cooperative conversation: its contribution to second language learning. Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 34, 115–132.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and related issues: mediating acquisition through cooperative and dialogical communication in J. P. Lantolf (ed.). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018

Swain, M. and S. Lapkin. (1998). communication and second language learning: the case of two adolescent French immersion students working in pairs. The Modern Language Journal 82(3), 320–337.

Tan, L. L., G. Wigglesworth, and N. Storch. (2010). Peer interactions and mode of communication: comparing face-to-face and computer assisted communication'. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics 33(3), 21–27.

Watanabe, Y. and M. Swain. (2007). Influences of proficiency differences and patterns of peer interaction on second language learning: cooperative conversation between adult ESL learners. Language Teaching Research, 11(2), 121–142.

Yule, G. and D. Macdonald. (1990). Resolving referential controversies in L2 communications: the influence of proficiency and communicative role. Language Learning, 40(4), 539–556.

Received:9 February 2018/Accepted:10 May 2018/Published:1 June 2018