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This paper investigates how paraphrase can be taught as a communication strategy (CS) to help learners to cope with problems they encounter in speech production. By critically reviewing the literature on practical and empirical approaches to teaching paraphrase, it reveals that the notion of paraphrase in those studies has been very limited. It then investigates what it means to paraphrase by analyzing paraphrastic expressions used in a monolingual dictionary and a pedagogical grammar book. This analysis results in a list of some patterns of paraphrase both at and beyond the lexical level which learners may profitably exploit to avoid or solve their communication problems. It finally makes a pedagogical proposal that paraphrase exercises should be integrated into English lessons on a regular basis, in which learners are encouraged to paraphrase every single sentence in the textbook they use by selecting the most appropriate pattern of paraphrase from among those identified while making most use of all the linguistic resources at their disposal.

0 Introduction

In communication, speakers often find themselves in situations where they have to 'paraphrase' for psycholinguistic or interactional reasons. They have to use a different word or word combination when they cannot find the desired word in their own speech production. This is a psycholinguistically-motivated paraphrase and has traditionally been called 'paraphrase', 'approximation', or 'circumlocution' (Tarone 1977). They also have to repeat what they have just said, using a different word combination so that it may be easier for their interlocutor to understand. This is an interactionally-motivated paraphrase and is realized as a 'self-re-formulation' (Williams et al. 1997) on the basis of their own assessment of their interlocutor's understanding or as a response to his or her explicit clarification request. They use another interactionally-motivated paraphrase when they have to express what has just been said by their
interlocutor in their own words to confirm their own understanding of his or her utterance. This is realized as what has traditionally been called a 'confirmation check'. It is also called an 'extended paraphrase' (Tarone and Yule 1989) or an 'other-reformulation' (Williams et al. 1997).

All the paraphrastic strategies above are indispensable for successful communication. Second language (L2) learners, however, are not necessarily adept at employing such strategies. For example, when encountering their interlocutor's non-understanding, they have often been observed to insist on repeating what they said, instead of employing more effective strategies such as paraphrase or reformulation (Nelson 1989). That seems partly because the strategies have not been properly taught in the L2 classroom. The situation, described by Dörnyei and Thurrell (1991: 17), that 'the component of communicative competence most neglected by language course books and teachers...is strategic competence' remains unchanged, as expressed by Dörnyei and Scott (1997: 203): '...L2 speakers spend a lot of time and effort struggling with language difficulties, yet L2 courses do not generally prepare students to cope with performance problems'.

This seems to indicate that it is necessary to teach paraphrase as a CS. Teachers should be committed to training learners in problem solving using linguistic resources at their disposal when they face problems. The purpose of this paper, then, is threefold: 1) to critically review some studies, both practical and empirical, on teaching paraphrase, 2) to investigate the process of paraphrase by analyzing paraphrastic expressions in a monolingual dictionary and a pedagogical grammar book, and 3) to make a pedagogical proposal as to how paraphrase should be taught while recognizing the problems involved in the current practice of teaching paraphrase.

1 Teaching paraphrase as a CS: a critical review

In traditional English lessons, some elements of using paraphrase can be seen in two different types of teaching practice. On the one hand, textbook writers paraphrase some sentences in the original text for simplification, teachers paraphrase some sentences in the text for intelligible oral introduction, teachers use some dictionary definitions to introduce the meanings of new vocabulary items, and assistant native-speaking teachers paraphrase difficult sentences in the text. On the other hand, learners use paraphrase by rewriting sentences, substituting some grammatical structures or items with semantically equivalent ones as part of grammar teaching/learning. Both types of practice, however, are very limited and do not address directly the compensatory nature of paraphrase as a CS and therefore should be reconsidered.

The necessity and importance of teaching paraphrase as a CS has been recognized by several researchers. Among them are Tarone (1984), Willems (1987), Dörnyei and Thurrell (1991) and Takatsuka (1996). They made some attempts to teach paraphrase alone or together with other CSs such as using fillers and getting off the point. Most of them gave the learners tasks in which they were required to paraphrase and were taught some linguistic expressions considered as necessary to paraphrase.
There also have been several empirical studies (e.g., Dörnyei, 1995, Kajiwara et al., 1996, Kobayashi et al., 1996, Senda, 1996, Hirose, 1997, Kitajima, 1997, and Cohen, 1998) designed to assess the value and effectiveness of teaching paraphrase as a CS. Most of the studies seem to be motivated and inspired by Dörnyei (1995)'s large-scale and well-organized study.

Although those studies vary in the subjects, the period and content of instruction, and the other strategies concurrently taught, they share the same objective, i.e., to assess the value of strategy instruction. As far as a paraphrase strategy is concerned, the results are mixed: while Dörnyei (1995) reported a positive effect in terms of the quality of paraphrase (but not in the quantity of paraphrase) and Kajiwara et al. (1996), Kobayashi et al. (1996), Kitajima (1997) and Cohen (1998) reported positive effects, Senda (1996) and Hirose (1997) reported no significant effects from experimental studies involving consciousness-raising activity about CSs among Japanese learners of English at the high school level.

Though it is not certain whether the inconclusive results can be ascribed to different training situations or to some inherent defects in the studies, most of the studies to date seem to share at least three problems. One is that most seem to have made rather hasty attempts to identify the effect of teaching CSs or paraphrase in particular without paying due attention to the content and method of teaching. Strategy instruction provided learners with opportunities to paraphrase and/or linguistic resources necessary for paraphrase, but not systematic teaching of paraphrase, and was confined to lexical problems and solutions at the lexical level. This is a direct reflection of the present state of CS research, which has tended to concentrate on lexis.

Another problem is that strategy training has not been integrated or incorporated into ordinary English lessons. It was often done as extra activity. In addition, the periods of instruction were rather short: in Kobayashi et al. (1996)'s study, instruction lasted for 6 months but with only 15 lessons on paraphrase. Yet another problem is that appropriate measures were not taken to ensure the reliability and validity of measuring the value of strategy training. In addition, no delayed post-tests were administered: immediate post-tests cannot check whether the effect, if any, is durable over time.

2 Paraphrase at and beyond the lexical level

Paraphrase is conceived as 'the most important relationship for the whole enterprise of linguistic semantics' and as 'the relationship between a word and a combination of other words with the same meaning' (Goddard 1998: 18). It can show the meaning of a word or other linguistic expressions, such as a phrase or a sentence, by means of some other words or expressions which say the same or similar thing.

Most studies have been concerned with paraphrase at the lexical level, i.e., substitution of one word for another word, phrase, or sentence which is semantically equivalent or similar. Paraphrase, however, should not be confined to the lexical level. There have been, in fact, some
attempts (notably Ferch and Kasper, 1983 and Takatsuka, 1998) to investigate how paraphrase can be achieved beyond the lexical level. Takatsuka (1998) calls paraphrase at the lexical level a 'local solution' to a problem in speech production and contrasts it with a 'global solution', i.e., paraphrase beyond the lexical level. Local solutions are ones where problem words are replaced with corresponding paraphrases without any obvious change in position in the original sentence (e.g., 'He is my nephew' is paraphrased as 'He is my brother/sister's son' when the problem word is 'nephew') while global solutions are those in which problems are solved by 'restructuring' (Ferch and Kasper, 1983: 50) the original proposition or reorganizing the original sentence (e.g., 'He is my nephew' is paraphrased as 'I am his uncle/aunt'). Global solutions involve planning the original message all over again at the level of conceptualization (Levelt 1989) in speech production. In the example above, the problem is solved globally by changing the grammatical subject of the original sentence.

3 Patterns of paraphrase

In order to investigate how problems can be solved locally and/or globally and how local and global solutions can be achieved linguistically, i.e., to identify some patterns of paraphrase, a total of 843 pairs of original expressions and their paraphrastic counterparts are analyzed: they include the pairs combined with the symbol 'i.e.' (N=24) and the symbol ' = ' under headwords starting with a through i (N = 582) in The Electronic Oxford Wordpower Dictionary (EOWD) (1995) and the symbol ' = ' or some equivalent notations (N = 237) in Murphy (1994)'s English Grammar in Use (EGU).

Although such paraphrastic expressions are designed to help learners understand the meanings of the original expressions, which are considered to be more difficult, it is assumed that linguistic devices for making understanding easier can also serve to solve problems in speech production. This assumption seems to be justifiable especially when we consider that L2 learners, when encountering difficult ideas, tend to encode them first in their L1 and then translate them into the L2.

The paraphrastic expressions have been analyzed from two different, though interrelated, perspectives: manipulation of meaning and manipulation of form which operate on the original expressions.

(1) Manipulation of meaning

An analysis of the original expressions and their paraphrastic counterparts reveals that, although there are some cases in which the original meaning is not manipulated ('no manipulation') in the paraphrase, in most of the cases paraphrastic expressions are made possible by manipulating the meanings of original expressions. In the paraphrases, the meanings of the
original expressions are conveyed in more specific/general, elaborated/reduced, absolute/relative, holistic/analytic, or direct/indirect ways, though each adjectival pair must be considered as representing not a dichotomous meaning relationship but a continuum from one extreme to the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) no manipulation</td>
<td>→ general</td>
<td>3) general</td>
<td>→ specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) specific</td>
<td>→ reduced</td>
<td>4) reduced</td>
<td>→ elaborated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) relative</td>
<td>→ absolute</td>
<td>6) absolute</td>
<td>→ relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) analytic</td>
<td>→ holistic</td>
<td>8) holistic</td>
<td>→ analytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) indirect</td>
<td>→ direct</td>
<td>10) direct</td>
<td>→ indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Manipulation of form

The various types of meaning manipulation identified are realized linguistically by considerable changes in form. Various meaning relations between words, phrases and sentences are exploited. Traditionally, meaning relations have been confined to individual words but the same relations can hold between single words, phrases and sentences, and even between phrases or sentences. There should be synonyms not only at the lexical level but also at the phrasal or sentential level.

Types of form manipulation identified in the data include the use of synonyms, hypernyms (superordinate terms), hyponyms (subordinate terms), co-hyponyms (coordinate terms), antonyms (gradable and ungradable), numbers, related words, and deictic expressions, the change of grammatical subject, structure (word/phrase/clause/sentence), word class, voice, and sentence type, and the addition or deletion of a word or words.

(3) Relationship between manipulation of meaning and manipulation of form

There is no one-to-one relationship between the two categories of manipulation because one type of meaning manipulation can be realized by more than one type of form manipulation, and vice versa. 'Analytic' manipulation of meaning, for example, often accompanies such form manipulation as the change of word class and structure. Some classified examples of the manipulations of meaning and form are listed in the appendix.
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(4) Problems

It should be acknowledged that the taxonomies of meaning and form manipulation discussed above have three problems. One is that it is not clear to what extent individual types of meaning manipulation are distinct ones. There seem to be some overlap between the types. For example, 'general' manipulation and, in many cases, 'separate' manipulation involve the deletion of some meaning elements and thus can be taken as 'simple' manipulation.

Another problem is that one type of meaning manipulation is often realized by more than one type of form manipulation: 'relative' manipulation, for example, is often realized by the change of 'grammatical subject' and 'word class'. It is therefore necessary to figure out possible relationships or a hierarchy among the types of form manipulation. Yet another problem, which is more serious than the other two, is that although the fact that there is no one-to-one correspondence between meaning manipulation and the form manipulation which realizes it clearly shows that the two are different categories of manipulation, it is not clear at all whether the two can always be separated.

These problems, however, should not be taken as indicating that it is not necessary to categorize paraphrases in terms of meaning manipulation and form manipulation. The proposed taxonomies of both types of manipulation, tentative as they are, have helped to clarify the process or patterns of paraphrase and may be used as a basis on which strategy training can be built.

4 Content and method of teaching paraphrase: a proposal

Chamot and Rubin (1994) list factors which have been found to influence the effectiveness of learning strategy training: the length of training, the degree of integration of the training into the regular curriculum and ongoing classroom activities, and the development of expertise among teachers in how to conduct learning strategies instruction. It seems necessary to take these factors into consideration in communication strategy training and make it systematic, integrated, and continuous.

Paraphrase training comprises three parts. In the first part, learners are made aware of how they can paraphrase by manipulating meaning and form, i.e., efficiently activating interconnected semantic and lexical features. In the second part, they paraphrase orally, keeping the variety of paraphrase patterns in mind, each of the sentences in the textbook with their available linguistic resources. They also think and express what they would say in the same situation. In the final part, they paraphrase, using the newly learned lexical and/or grammatical items, the sentences in the preceding lessons, which they find it difficult to paraphrase with the previously learned linguistic items.

The necessity and value of returning to the textbook materials covered in the previous lessons and having learners paraphrase sentences by using the newly learned items can be readily seen
from the following example.

Original: You can go up to the top of the rock in an hour.
Paraphrase 1: You can get to the top of the rock.
(reduced/synonym, word deletion)
Paraphrase 2: You can climb the rock. You need one hour.
(after climb and need are learned) (analytic/synonym, word class change)
Paraphrase 3: You can go up to the top of the rock. It takes one hour.
(after take is learned) (analytic/synonym, word class change)

In Paraphrase 1, the meaning of the original sentence is reduced because of lack of available linguistic resources at that stage of learning, while the delayed Paraphrases 2 and 3, which are made possible by the new linguistic items, retain and convey the original meaning to a far larger extent.

Such paraphrase exercises should be conceived not on an ad hoc basis but as an essential activity in the L2 classroom. They can be embedded in the pairwork activities in which learners have to reformulate what they said and what their interlocutor said in order to facilitate their interlocutor’s understanding and to confirm their own understanding respectively. The exercises can be placed after the activities in which learners listen to and read the text and the grammatical points are introduced and practiced.

5 Conclusion

It should be clear by now that a definitive study on the value of communication strategy training in general and paraphrase exercises in particular cannot be designed without paying due attention to the process of strategy use. It is essential that any attempt to teach communication strategies be designed and implemented around a sound theoretical basis. This study has managed to build such a basis by showing the patterns of paraphrase in terms of meaning and form manipulation. However, more work is needed to test the plausibility of the approach proposed here to teaching paraphrase in the classroom.

Note

1 This study was supported by a grant from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture (No. 09680271) to S. Takatsuka, K. Matsuhata, K. Konishi, and T. Kawamura.
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Appendix

Classified examples of manipulation of meaning/manipulation of form

1) no manipulation/synonym: wide awake → completely awake (EOWD: awake)
no manipulation/word class, phrase structure: at birth → when it was born (EOWD: birth)
no manipulation/voice: Mr. X hates being kept waiting. → Mr. X hates people keeping him waiting. (EGU: 86)

2) specific → general/hypernym: a herd of cattle → a group of cattle (EOWD: herd)

3) general → specific/hyponym: citrus fruits → oranges, lemons, grapefruit, etc (EOWD: fruit);
in alphabetical order → from A to Z (EOWD: encyclopedia)
general → specific/related words: go out for a meal → go to a restaurant (EOWD: go)
general → specific/number: a right angle → an angle of 90° (EOWD: angle); in the 20th century → in the period between the years 1901 and 2000 (EOWD: century)

4) elaborated → reduced/word deletion: She must have traveled a lot. → She has traveled a lot;
You can have first choice of all the cakes. → You can choose first. (EOWD: choice)

5) reduced → elaborated/word addition: at Sue’s → at Sue’s house (EOWD: at); She goes to confession twice a year. → She goes to confession with a priest twice a year. (EOWD: confession)

6) absolute → relative/antonym: (in) broad daylight → not at night (EOWD: daylight); I’ve forgotten his name. → I can’t remember his name now. (EGU: 14); Fred will be away until Monday. → Fred will be back on Monday. (EGU: 238)
absolute → relative/antonym, subject: X is Y’s nephew. → Y is X’s uncle/aunt.; X resulted from Y. → Y caused X.
absolute → relative/deixis: in the 20th century → in this century
absolute → relative/voice: I was completely satisfied with the quality of her work. → The quality of her work satisfied me completely.
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7) **relative** → **absolute/number**: Patrick left ten minutes ago. → (If it is twelve o'clock now,) he left at ten to twelve. (EOWD: ago); in an hour → at xx:xx (a specific time)

8) **holistic** → **analytic/word class, structure: popular belief** → what many people think (believe) (EOWD: contrary to)
   holistic → analytic/structure: The questions are arranged in ascending order of difficulty. → (The easiest questions are at the beginning and the most difficult ones are at the end. (EOWD: ascending); He works alternative weeks. → He works the first week, he doesn't work the second week, he works again the third week. (EOWD: alternative); I can't help being nervous. → I'm so nervous. I can't help it (EGU: 112)

9) **analytic** → **holistic/structure**: My nose got sunburnt and now the skin (of the nose) is coming off. → My nose got sunburnt and now it is peeling. (EOWD: peel); I don't know Paul's phone number and I regret this. → I wish I knew Paul's phone number. (EGU: 76); They went to the cinema and have not yet come back. → They've gone to the cinema. (EOWD: been)

10) **direct** → **indirect (presupposition)/related words**: You decided to come after all. → I thought you weren't going to come. (EOWD: after all); Do you know where my bag is? → Have you seen my bag? (EGU: 14); There is no need to hurry. → We've got plenty of time. (EGU: 166)
   direct → indirect (entailment)/related words: become addicted to X → can't stop using X (EOWD: heroin)
   direct → indirect (metaphor)/related words: manage to overcome difficulties → land like a cat

11) indirect → direct/related words: an iron will → a very strong will (EOWD: iron)
    indirect → direct/word deletion: the first house but one on the right → the second house on the right (EOWD: first but one)
    indirect → direct/sentence type: I wish you could come earlier. → Couldn't you come earlier? (EOWD: could)