APPROPRIATING AND JUSTIFYING CONTROL
OF NS-NNS DISCOURSE[1]

David P. Shea
Keio University SFC

Abstract

In this paper, I present an analysis of NS-NNS interaction that takes place in a group planning
session between Jiro and three American undergraduate classmates. I describe implicit
interactional strategies the native speakers use to appropriate the topic on which Jiro has come
prepared to speak and then justify the appropriation by positioning Jiro as an outsider and
characterizing his talk as disfluent. The interaction illustrates, I argue, how the language
proficiency of the advanced nonnative speaker is not a static construct defined apart from use,
but is instead socially constructed in interaction according to the implicit structuring practices
of the interlocutor. I contrast appropriating strategies with a more positive and supportive
structuring response, characterized by solicitation, clarification, and extension strategies. In
the final section of the paper, I consider the pedagogic implications of the analysis, suggesting
that a focus on generating student response would be of positive benefit to preparing students
for natural interaction and ensuring that communication is more collaborative and successful.

1. INTRODUCTION

Often we consider the physical world around us relatively firm. The table in front
of us, for example, is hard when we knock on it, and we would be immeasurably surprised
if we saw our hand pass through it, as if the table were not solid. Yet we know from what
the physicists tell us that, in a fundamental sense, it is not. The table is not really solid
matter but mostly empty space, full of sparking electrons whizzing around tiny bits of
neutrons. In other words, the world is not as firm as we think, and what is stable from one
perspective can be very fluid and changing from another.

Proficiency in a second language is much like this table, although we often do not
think of it in these terms. What the NNS (nonnative speaker) is able to say in the second
language is not a fixed matter, but something that is dynamically constructed, tugged by the
electronic valances of the native speaker (NS) as contact is made in conversation. NS-
NNS discourse (like all talk) is shaped by the social activity in which it is situated, and the
ability of the second language learner is structured in interaction by the accommodative
response of the native speaker. Constructs of second language acquisition, such as fluency
and appropriateness, are not always as solid as we imagine, as they are dynamically and
interactionally instantiated in the discourse practices of conversation. This paper is an

attempt to illustrate some of these practices and describe their influence on a NS-NNS conversation.

Hymesian perspectives on communicative competence (Hymes, 1974) remind us that language is not simply the structural elements of linguistic form related to *what* a speaker says (as often assumed on Japanese entrance exams). Linguistic competence also includes pragmatic aspects of use, the *how* one says the what *when*, and *why*. Or, perhaps, why one might remain silent without saying anything at all (Becker, 1992). The linguistic text is intricately intertwined with the social context and the discursive practices of use (Kramsch & Mcconnell Ginet, 1992). Thus within communicative approaches to second language (e.g., Scarcella, Anderson & Krashen, 1990), we see a focus on features of discourse related to norms of appropriate interaction, such as politeness, communicative style, negotiation strategies, and speech act realizations.

Vygotskyan perspectives on social activity (e.g., Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989; Cazden, 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Moll, 1991) remind us, however, that interaction is a collaborative affair, and that the NS as the "expert" (or more competent peer) is fundamentally involved in accomplishing linguistic activity of NNS speech acts. In a related manner, Bakhtin (Voloshinov, 1986: 37) points out that utterances and their meanings are mediated by the conditions of social organization in which they are located. What we often think of as linguistic activity is not simply a property of the individual speaker, but of the larger social context of production:

> The organizing center of any utterance, of any experience, is not within but outside--in the social milieu surrounding the individual being. (Voloshinov, 1986: 93).

This social ground of production includes (but is not limited to) the interlocutor with whom one speaks and microsocial world which the interaction implicitly instantiates.

Wertsch (1991) describes how cognitive development originates in the situated communicative processes of social interaction, and even extends this notion to speak of "mental action" collectively, in terms of groups as well as individuals. Accordingly, mental functioning is "shaped or even defined by the mediational means it employs to carry out a task" (Wertsch, 1991: 14). This social conception of development is often described in terms of scaffolded assistance (Wood, Bruner, and Ross, 1976) or guided participation (Rogoff, 1990). Within the supportive framework of a shared orientation to a given task, the teacher (or more competent peer[2]) interacts with the less "competent" learner, and in the

process of interaction, the learner appropriates the more complex mental structures which are collaboratively enacted. Although the term scaffolding (Bruner, 1986; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) did not originate with Vygotsky, it is consistent with a sociocultural approach to learning that recognizes the cooperative character of development. Vygotsky's (1978) famous formulation of the zone of proximal development delineates how interaction with a more competent partner serves to extend and amplify the learner's independent ability to perform, permitting the incorporation of new knowledge as it is used in shared activity. After this stage of assisted performance, the learner gradually becomes able to perform independently.[3] Cazden (1989) uses the image of the child learning to walk while holding the hand of the adult, as the need for adult assistance is gradually reduced.[4]

For the second language learner, particularly the advanced NNS, the collaborative understanding of development serves to shifts attention away from independent and individual acquisition of linguistic form that is set apart from contexts of use, toward a view of language as a resource for acting in the world, to establish relationships, communicate information, and engage in joint activity (Wells, 1986: 22).

Most Vygotskyan discussions of second language development have focused on theoretical discussion of the psycholinguistic function language plays in self- and other-regulated linguistic activity (Lantolf & Frawley, 1984; Frawley & Lantolf, 1986). A few studies building on this theoretical base have looked at the quality of social interaction in the second language and how it mediates discourse. One study in particular is relevant to the present discussion. Building on Rommetveit's (1985, 1987) notion of perspectival intersubjectivity, Lantolf and Ahmed (1989) demonstrate how speakers can orient themselves in divergent ways to the communicative activity at hand, and a very different quality of NNS speech result when this orientation, or "definition of the situation" (Wertsch, 1985), is imposed by one speaker, instead of reciprocally negotiated between both. Lantolf and Ahmed (1989) report how in a test of syntactic form, a NNS was asked to simply respond to questions posed by his American teacher. This imposed task produced a very different kind of speech than did the spontaneous conversation that sprung up following the test situation, where the NNS was able to define the topic under discussion and take a more active, shaping role in the interaction. The significance of the study is its specification of the dyadic patterns of control reflected in the negotiation of a temporarily shared social world. For the NNS, the collaborative interaction provided more potential for second language development.

Thus, the social interaction in which second language discourse is situated affects linguistic production. In the conversational context, dyadic control over the talk and the

kind of intersubjectivity negotiated both serve to mediate the nonnative speaker's discourse. Although the learner is an active initiator within this scaffolded collaboration (Griffin & Cole, 1984), the NS's interactive support of the NNS's discourse and reciprocal endorsement of the NNS's perspective serve to sustain and amplify this self-activated development.

Given the centrality of social activity in shaping second language use, it is important to investigate the patterns of interaction in NS-NNS discourse, delineated in terms of the negotiation of perspective and patterns of control over the discourse. This injunction applies especially to advanced nonnative speakers in the target culture. Investigating the quality of participation in natural conversation will not only allow us to comment on the theoretical applicability of sociocultural formulations of second language acquisition, it will also allow us to look more closely at pedagogical practice for the advanced learner who seeks a more advanced proficiency in the target language.

In this paper, I present a qualitative analysis[5] of a conversation involving an advanced Japanese speaker of English and three NS classmates at an American university. The conversation, because it involves a difference of opinion and an extended discussion of how to resolve the conflict in question, illustrates how the perspectival definition of the situation is negotiated, although to the disadvantage of the NNS. The NNS has to struggle against appropriating and justifying practices of the NS interlocutors.

2. BACKGROUND AND OUTLINE OF THE PLANNING SESSION

The primary informant in the study was Jiro, who the time, was an undergraduate senior majoring in business. Jiro had spent the previous three years as a full-time college student in the US. After high school and a year's study at an English language preparatory school in Japan, Jiro left for the US to enroll in an American community college. He transferred to his present university as a Sophomore. Jiro's English skills were adequate to successfully maintain an overall college GPA of nearly a 3.0. Although his speech was characterized by noticeably nonnative features of pronunciation and syntax, global understanding did not seem to be a problem for those with whom he interacted on a regular basis. In casual conversation, Jiro generally conveyed his feelings and opinions in a friendly, coherent way. In an academic context, however, Jiro admitted that he did not always feel able to fully express his ideas.

The conversation under consideration is a planning session that was held in preparation for Jiro's assigned group presentation in an undergraduate marketing class.

The four members of the group, Jiro, Peter, Mike and Bruce,[6] met after class on Tuesday afternoon to plan for their presentation, which was scheduled for the following Thursday. The assignment was to select a news article from *The Wall Street Journal* and make a formal presentation to the class, summarizing the report and outlining marketing implications. Students were required to conduct background research using supplementary information sources. Each member of the group was to speak approximately two to three minutes about one aspect of the topic, and the group was to field questions at the end. Grades were to be assigned collectively, so that each student received the same grade, regardless of individual performance.[7]

Jiro's group chose an article[8] that described recent economic development in Indonesia, outlining the growing regional integration of the Indonesian economy based on capital investment from Japan and other "newly industrializing economies" of the region, such as Taiwan, Singapore, and Korea.

Prior to the session, the amount of the group's organizational preparation was minimal. The members had only met informally a couple of times after class to agree on an article (which Bruce chose), but all four members had not met together before the planning session (although Mike and Jiro met one afternoon, and Mike and Bruce also talked in general terms). Jiro and Bruce had done outside reading and collected information on the topic, but Mike and Peter came to the session having done little preparation beyond reading the article.

I was present for the entire session, except for ten minutes when I left the room (on purpose) to go to the restroom. After asking permission to tape record the interaction, I sat quietly in the back of the room with a pad and pen and took notes "unobtrusively."

The critical point around which the discussion revolves is the fact that Peter, Mike, and Jiro have all come to the planning session expecting to talk about the same topic. Peter asserts his claim over the contested topic and Mike relents, but Jiro insists on maintaining the topic which he has prepared to speak. Eventually -- after lengthy discussion -- a compromise of sorts is reached. Peter declares the topic of regional economic investment out of bounds and essentially claims the topic Japanese investment but allows Jiro to present the background "numbers" he has prepared.

What is significant is that Peter, who admits he "needs information," ends up using some of the material Jiro has prepared. Peter justifies his appropriation of the contexted topic and Jiro's information in part by characterizing Jiro's speech as disfluent. By "reducing" Jiro's speakership, and framing him as an incompetent nonnative speaker, Peter

defines the group's activity and authenticates his discursive authority.

The conversation is a hour-long stream of talk that, for the sake of summary purposes, can be divided into four sections, although there are a number of side currents and eddies (related to such topics as the performance of other groups and the professor's evaluation) that deviate from the main stream of talk. The first section lasts approximately twenty minutes and is generally concerned with resolving who will speak on the contested topic. It begins with Peter's proposed outline of what he will talk about and includes attempts to convince Jiro to switch to a new topic. The second section, which lasts about ten minutes, begins with another sketch by Peter (similar to the first) of the topic he now claims and the hesitant and tentative musings about what to say (there are long 10 to 15 second pauses and Mike and Peter declare that they "don't have any ideas"). Peter intimates that he needs some of Jiro's information. Jiro actually offers to let him use some OHP transparencies he has prepared. The third section, which begins immediately after I leave the room on the pretense of going to the restroom, is very active and a decision is quickly reached about the topic and order of presentation. In the fourth section, the talk shifts to a discussion of last minute preparations.

This analysis is concerned principally with the first section of the planning session and the struggle over the topic as the group members organize their activity and define their discursive positions within it. I delineate the strategies of reduction which are used to appropriate the topic and deny Jiro's claim, reflected in Peter's (and to a lesser extent, Mike's) talk, and I argue that this discursive response is related to an underlying ethnocentric bias that serves as a critical mediating function in justifying the appropriation. To highlight the character of the native speaker's response, I describe Bruce's more supportive and collaborative response to Jiro's talk.

3. CONTESTING THE TOPIC

The session begins with Peter immediately taking the conversational floor to present a sketch of the topic he's "gonna" talk about (Japan's investment in Indonesia). At the same time, Peter admits that he's "lacking information" on the subject:

1   P   I'm lacking information right now, uh, I'm gonna, gonna be able to, what I'm gonna do, is I'm
          gonna give the reasons why Japan is in Indonesia, I'm gonna give comparisons between Japan
          and Indonesia according to their GNP, per person,
          <...>
2   P   Okay, what I'm really concerned about is, is, Mike how your-, your -, your outline and my
          outline are gonna overlap

3	M	<...> I'm gonna talk about the textiles and how they've grown there, and uh, I was gonna talk a li:ttle bit about uh, the wages and stuff like that, one of the reasons they moved in, but um, hmm let's see, , we'll see how that goes, um, [okay
4	P	[Why don't you just-, why don't you just say, uh why don't you just generalize and let me get into the numbers <...> talk about uh, made in Indonesia with help from Japan, talk about the two companies, the Teijin limited and Fujitex, uh [what they're doing,
5	M	[Adding in there, I'm gonna talk some about Ja, the Indonesians are worried about uh, getting American upset
6	P	Does that come under, okay that's gonna come under you? Cause this, this is what I just wrote down some stuff during the thing, y'all let me know if this is economic or not, the reasons why Japan is interested in Indonesia
7	J	Actually, I already hhh had this, that information here hhh e:h
8	B	Cheap labor and [mass resources
9	J	[Ye:ah I got, I listed all of those, here, you know, Indonesian/ cheap labor, abundant, easy to train, young, good work ethic, skillful, hardworking, political study recommends that, what is the location, and appreciation in, [hhh ???
10	P	[Seems like we're doing-, seems like we're doing the same thing

After outlining the details of what he will talk about (turn 1), Peter expresses his concern about overlapping Mike who, after a brief effort to explain, relinquishes his claim on the topic, signalling his deference with the past tense: he "*was* gonna" talk about it but, upon reflection, he decides to "see how it goes" (turn 3). At this point, Jiro interjects (turn 7), pointing out he has already prepared to speak on the topic, and he begins to list details of the information he has collected (turn 9).

Unlike Mike, Jiro refuses to defer to Peter's assertion of ownership over the topic. Jiro has come to the session thinking that Peter will talk about background information on the role of the regional economies in developing the Indonesian economy, not on the trade relationship with Japan. Jiro is also worried that, if he has to switch topics at the last minute, he will not have enough time to adequately prepare given only one day remaining before the scheduled presentation. Although Jiro's position is strengthened because he has so much data in hand, he faces the native speaker's persuasive attempts to get him to change his mind.

4. PERSUADING JIRO

When it becomes clear that there is a conflict, Mike initiates the first attempt to convince Jiro to change topics, suggesting that Jiro lead off as the first speaker and builds on his Japaneseness to spark class interest in the issue:

5   M   if you would start off the group, if you would come in, and uh talk about, if uh/ say you're a manufacturer and um, you could hire somebody for twenty five dollars a month, would you do it? <...> just kind of talk to the class like that and try to get some response out of them/ {J unhun} and then, well, this group's gonna tell you how to do it,

<...>

7   M   Japan is, they've seen the future and America's still stuck behind, I don't know, try to get the class upset,

Mike is asking Jiro to get the class "upset" by talking about the unfair practices of Japanese businesses in Indonesia, implicitly building upon assumptions about economic competition between Japan and the US.[9] Jiro declines the proposal. Although he solicits clarification of a few details, he resists the pressure to change his topic, arguing that he needs to follow the outline he has already prepared:

9   J   You know, but these are you know, I got these overhead/, if I show these you know to them/ {M unhun} they can understand hhh more you know what I'm talking about, {M unhun} these all figures, so they can understand easily

Jiro goes on to explain, in a manner similar to Peter's opening sketch of what he will talk about, some of the details of what he had planned to talk about:

> <...> cheap, labor cheap, right, so cheap for your factory workers, if they just uh one hundred dollars per month, and or minority based 760 dollars, then I guess give example of these you know, ??? labor, and you know the location/ why Indonesia is good location, we don't put-, they can import chill [steel] from China/ and uh, food from Australia/ and it's not so far from Japan, it's, and the communication transportation is good-,

There are certainly aspects of Jiro's speech which are problematic, but I would like to postpone discussion of his ability for a few minutes in order to concentrate on the issue of persuasion.

It is interesting to note that a few minutes later in the conversation, Jiro is asked a second time to switch topics. Peter tries to persuade Jiro to talk about the case of a shoe manufacturer (noted in the article) that relocated its production to Indonesia. Maintaining his position, Jiro resists the suggestion and Peter quickly gives up the idea. Peter's request has more of an impromptu quality than Mike's, but it shares a similar function serving to persuade Jiro to relinquish the contested topic.

Neither attempt to convince Jiro to accept another topic is successful, but there is no explicit reason offered why Jiro should make the requested change, especially in light of

the preparation he mentions he has done. Both Mike and Peter's suggestions are presented as attractive possibilities that would be good for the group, but no arguments are made beyond simply stating the suggestions. Indirectly, however, Peter offers two reasons[10] for the need to change. The first is related to the hypothetical danger of a negative evaluation from the professor, and the second to Jiro's lack of fluency as a nonnative speaker. Both forms of reasoning fundamentally shape the response to Jiro's talk.

4-1. Hypothetical threat

When Mike's direct request fails to persuade Jiro to change topics, Peter argues his case to the group, arguing that it would be a mistake to adopt Jiro's position. Peter paints a hypothetical picture of a low grade if the presentation is "too scattered" and poorly organized.

When Jiro asserts that he is responsible for talking about background information (the Four Tigers), for example, Peter responds by declaring the subject out of bounds, and he supports his position by posing the hypothetical danger of following such a course:

1	J	Uh, but I- you, gonna talk about the four tiger, right? {B basically} Korea, South Korea, Singapore, and uh hhh
2	M	Taiwan, [Korea
3	B	[Taiwan
4	J	[Taiwan
5	M	Korea, south Korea,
6	P	How do the four tigers relate to this article? <...>
7	M	The growth of Asia, I mean it's a dominant force just like the EC is becoming, and we're gradually shrinking in the world picture
8	P	But in ten minutes can we really explain, the growth of Asia, or should we just stick to Indonesia, and talk about it for ten minutes, , Can we talk about all of Asia in ten minutes?
9	M	No, no, there's no possible way, [but uh, you
10	P	[I, I--
11	M	You're gonna have to mention something about that, {P right} uh, mention something about uh,, three, the growth of almost three spheres of influence, um, , ,
12	P	See if we start getting into, into and hypothetical situations, that's the kind of questions the class's gonna ask us, they're gonna ask us what we think is gonna happen in fifty years, what countries are gonna do then, we don't know, we don't have that information, <...> we're gonna get drilled in questions, she's gonna, she's gonna have a field day with us, if we start, assuming there's gonna be an Asian community and stuff like that

Jiro's assertion that Peter will speak about the four tigers seems to elicit potential agreement from Mike and Bruce, reflected in their synchronous production of the term (turns 2-5), as they complete Jiro's sentence and thus implicitly participate in its assertion. Peter challenges the relevance of Jiro's definition (turn 6), however, and when Mike argues (turn 7) for the need to discuss regional developments, Peter points out the hazards of "getting

drilled" (turn 12)for making such assumptions about hypothetical situations about which they have no knowledge.

Peter's reasoning is convincing, and it serves to construct a consensus that supports his point of view and not Jiro's. Particularly noteworthy is the pattern of rhythmic integration which is produced among the three NS, and which serves to exclude Jiro. Scollon (1982) has discussed the importance of the synchronic rhythm of interaction, similar to the coordinated tempo of a musical ensemble. Building on Scollon's analysis, Tannen (1989) shows how repetition can create positive rapport, reinforcing the feeling of shared identification and agreement. The synchronous repetition that the group members demonstrate, though, is not an a priori reflection of given agreement, but is instead the accomplished product of shared reasoning that Peter initiates and carries out. Peter, for example, is holding a transparency on joint ventures that Jiro has prepared, and he asks about its usefulness:

```
1    P    Okay so, what can we use this for, what does this show?
2    B    Well it shows the US is behind {M yeah} in joint ventures, [way behind!
3    M                                                [Yeah, Japan is number one, Hong
          Kong
4    J    Yeah, this three billion is, you know, [uh pattern, different
5    M                                          [Ten times, ten times what the US is investing there,
6    P    Okay, so are, so are we getting into a new topic now/ of how Japan is beating the US? or are we
          sticking with how Japan is there, ,
7    M    Grow-, making the region grow
8    P    Making the region grow
9    M    Unhun [through investment
10   J          [I'm getting
11   P    Through investment
12   M    Unhun
```

Although Peter is questioning the appropriateness of the transparency, Mike and Bruce at first demonstrate a positive evaluation of its usefulness, restating the figures and commenting on their impressive size. In fact (in turn 5) Mike completes Jiro's utterance in a synchronous overlap that implicitly affirms Jiro's point of view and suggests a positive evaluation of the transparency's usefulness. Peter's response (in turn 6) is negative, however. Given the context of the professor's evaluation and the agreed-upon need to streamline the presentation, Peter's threat of an extraneous "new topic" is persuasive and elicits Mike's agreement (turn 7), reflected in his completion of Peter's utterance. In turns 7 to 12, Peter and Mike demonstrate a highly synchronous consonance, with their rhythmic exchange accentuating the explicit agreement and lexical repetition. Jiro's comment (turn

10) is noticeably out of sync.

But the point is not yet resolved, and as the discussion continues, Jiro offers more details in support of his explanation:

13   J   This textile company/ is trying to you know, uh export to America, not Japan {M unhun} it's that way you know [hhh
14   M   [But Japan is, Japan is also using Indonesia for cheap labor
15   J   Unhun they just use cheap labor, and produce more you know {M unhun} then, produce high quality textile in Japan, {M unhun} because in Indonesia, they don't have much uh technol-, high technology/ right now so
16   P   Okay [so we're gonna--
17   B   [They just have the resources and the cheap labor?
18   J   Unhun so, just hire more people and produce more textiles

Mike interrupts Jiro to point out (turn 14), critically, that Japan is exploiting the Indonesian situation. But Jiro's response (turn 15) makes it clear that he has recognized the situation Mike describes, that in fact cheap labor is one of the central strategic considerations in the Japanese manufacturing investment strategy. This prompts a clarification request from Bruce (turn 17) which, in rephrasing the central thrust of Jiro's explanation, reflects a positive appraisal of Jiro's assessment. Bruce begins a response and although he is interrupted (turn 16), at this point it is Peter's abbreviated comment, inserted between Jiro's explanation and Bruce's clarification, that is asynchronous and out of place.

Peter's subsequent response, however, asserts a different rhythm that presents a contrasting perspective as well as his negative evaluation of Jiro's explanation. The assertion carries this rhythm and, as Mike is swayed by the counter argument and finally comes to a full agreement, his utterances change their cadence to match the "beat" of Peter's reasoning:

19   P   So we are gonna, we're bringing the US into the comparison`, that's-, that's-, that's fine with me, that's fine with me, I just need to know so I can gets some figures on the US to put in there too. Are we gonna be prepared to answer questions about, why the US isn't there and how can the US go about getting there, more effectively?
20   M   More effectively
21   P   I'm saying--
22   M   [We're covered some, some uh of the things they can do, when they go in there
23   P   Right, we don't have to know anything about government regulations or, if there's any, or anything like that, {M hmm} or if there's, or, or, or if the US is really trying, and not having much luck or,
24   M   Unhun, no we don't have any idea on that,
25   P   See I'm-, I'm a little paranoid about the questions
26   B   [Yeah, it's uh, ten minutes

27   M   [Yeah, cause, cause she's tough

Both rhetorical strategies of complaint and hypothetical threat are evident in Peter's comment, as he states his dissatisfaction with the cynical and ironically disinterested, "that's fine with me," and then poses the prospect of wild and dangerous questions from the teacher related to the extraneous topic of US involvement.[11] Mike's restored agreement is represented in his repetition (turn 20) of "more effectively," uttered synchronously on the beat following Peter's statement. His resistance disappears in his restatement. When Peter brings up the common threat of the professor's potentially deadly questions (turn 25), he makes a point upon which all three members can agree. At this juncture, Mike and Bruce's overlapping responses (turns 26 & 27) affirm the validity of the argument in chorus, and the three NS are in agreement. Peter extends his argument (in turn 28), asserting the dominant chord of the interaction, implicitly excluding the dissenting tone of Jiro's point of view. In this way, the group focus is constructed and, out of the disagreement over the topic, one position is affirmed while the other rejected. Peter's reasoning is socially validated by the group members as he establishes his claim to the contested topic.

4-2. Stigmatizing Jiro's fluency

The second discourse strategy central to the interaction concerns Jiro's linguistic proficiency as a nonnative speaker. Jiro's nonnative speech is one of the underlying aspects that inform the reasoning of the native speakers as they carry out their interaction. In much the same way that the rhythm of the group is constructed, nonnative "speakership" is also fashioned and made relevant through the interaction. All of the members are aware that Jiro is not an American native speaker (including Jiro himself) but this "fact" is brought to bear in the negotiation and used as a instrumental means of justifying certain courses of action. Through the interaction, Jiro is discursively *positioned* as a nonnative speaker, someone who is inexperienced and uncomfortable speaking English and thus, in an important way, less forceful a speaker.

This point is illustrated in Peter's rhetorical questions about Jiro's ability to talk in front of the class. At the beginning of the session, when Bruce is trying to convince Jiro to talk as the lead-off speaker, Peter interrupts to ask if Jiro is comfortable speaking before the group:

1   B   <...> questions maybe that you could ask along those lines [and then ???--
2   P   [Do you feel comfortable talking in

```
                front of people?
3    J          er hhh, no uh,
```

Peter essentially the same phrase at three critical points during the first fifteen minutes of the session. He asks if Jiro is comfortable when he tries to persuade Jiro to speak about the shoe manufacturer:

```
1    J    maybe if I talk two minutes hhh that's enough hhh, <...>
2    P    Jiro, the less you speak, the more confident you'll be? the more comfortable you'll be?
3    J    I think so hhh,
```

Peter makes reference to Jiro's lack of comprehension when, sketching an outline of Japanese investment in Indonesia, he comments that the group needs to "organize" themselves and thus decide Jiro's topic:

```
1    P    we need to figure out what all Jiro's gonna talk about,
2    B    Maybe most the stuff that you just said, like he's got this on reasons for investing in Indonesia,
          um, ,
3    J    I have one more, you know, transparency, you know how Indonesia workers feel about Japanese
          company, employment, <...> hhh, but I thought that's not necessary so, I didn't bring that with
          me,
4    P    Okay`, are you gonna feel comfortable talking about all this?
```

Each of Peter's questions follows Jiro's statement of intention to talk about the contested topic. Through these public rhetorical questions signalling scepticism and disagreement, Peter is announcing Jiro's identity as a nonnative speaker and declaring it relevant to the discussion. Questioning Jiro's competency to speak thus challenges the legitimacy of his claim to the topic. Raising such doubt also serves to entail the agreement of the other members. The explicit reference to whether Jiro is "comfortable" speaking implies, of course, that he is in fact not capable. Jiro agrees with the interpretation, but the thrust of the statement is not to engage Jiro's agreement, but the other members' of the group. In response to Peter's third question, Jiro attempts to another outline what he plans to say, but his explanation (for the first and only time in the session) breaks down completely:

```
1    J    I just-uh-, I just say you know, I don't-, I do::n, I don't talk much about um, the reason for
          Indonesia` Indonesia is li-,  maybe cheap labor, for example, for hakuvesen, avible, just you-,
          they have this you, about that and they have beedogu/[12] They   [u:h,
2    P                                                                     [hhh
3    J    the industrial beesdu,
4    P    [hhh
```

```
5    B    [hhh
6    J    we just [redo,
7    B           [okay,
8    J    I just [follow this-
9    P           [Do you think the class'll be able to understand you? Do y'all think the class'll be able to
          understand him?
```

Indeed, Jiro's speech does not seem fluent enough to speak in front of the class. In
addition to the reduction (e.g., *beedogu* for "been doing good") and indistinct articulatory
features of pronunciation (e.g., *hakuvesen* for "manufacturing"), a significant feature of
Jiro's speech in this exchange is its low volume. Jiro is almost mumbling, which only
accentuates the misunderstanding. As Jiro continues, his explanation elicits a humorous
reaction, first from Peter (turn 2) and then from both Peter and Bruce as they laugh (turns 4
& 5). Jiro attempts to restate his intention to follow the outline he has prepared (turn 8),
but Peter interrupts to ask, this time explicitly addressing the group ("Do y'all think"),
whether he will be understood. They can of course only say no.

The strategy of calling attention to Jiro's fluency serves to altercast Jiro and
stigmatize his speech, branding it inappropriate and ineffectual. It also seems to resolve the
struggle over the contested topic, solidifying Peter's control.

In the larger picture, though, Jiro's speech is not inappropriate, for a numbers of
reasons. First, the three native speakers, including Peter, are dependent on Jiro's ability to
speak clearly during the presentation since the grade is assigned collectively for the group's
performance. Second, Jiro's speech is, on the whole, understandable throughout the
planning session. His other explanations, such as when he outlines the details of the topic
and Japan's investment in Indonesia (noted above), are generally lucid and even insightful,
as the reactions of both Bruce and Mike attest. Third, the members' suggestions designed
to persuade Jiro to shift topics (speaking as the introductory speaker or talking about the
shoe manufacturer) presume a linguistic fluency that is even more advanced than is required
to speak on the topic on which Jiro has come prepared. Designating Jiro's speech as
incomprehensible is thus not a neutral description of objective linguistic ability, but a
motivated evaluation situated within the interested agenda of gaining control of the
contested topic.

Jiro's speech is certainly not always clear. In his explanations, Jiro's thesis is not
always clearly articulated, and it is questionable whether he will be able to successfully
present the large amount of data effectively in the two to three minutes allotted to each
speaker. These are central considerations which bear a direct relation to the group, and

deserve the group's consideration. But they remain an unaddressed, secondary concern, as Peter is able to successfully associate Jiro's inability to speak clearly with the need to divide the topic. In this respect, calling attention to Jiro's fluency pragmatically serves to stigmatize his speech and facilitate Peter's appropriation of the topic.

Explicit reference to Jiro's fluency is used later in the session to justify appropriation of the topic. Peter has already set up a distinction between numbers and words in the second section of the session when he suggest a division of the topic in these terms:

P   I want one of us to deal with numbers and one of us to deal with words,

Obviously, the comparison favors of the NS, and it serves to frame Jiro in terms of his linguistic ability, so that the appropriate course of action is obvious, in light of the implied conclusion that the NS should be the one dealing with the words. The logical connection between the characterization of Jiro's fluency and the organization of the topic becomes even more clear-cut when the discussion splits into two separate streams of talk, after I leave the room, and Peter and Mike quickly decide on an appropriate division of the topic:

1   P   Jiro should talk about numbers, and I should talk about the, ,
2   M   You should do the talking and leave all the overhead numbers for him
3   P   You want to do that? We'll do that then, I'll talk about
4   M   That, that just, this way you're more, , [eloquent
5   P   [I'll talk about, the reasons for investing in Indonesia/

Peter again poses the distinction between words and numbers, and Mike concurs with his proposal, pointing out Peter's "eloquence" in comparison with Jiro's inability. In this way, the native speakers enact the denial of Jiro's point of view, usurping his discursive authority and justifying the appropriation of his information.

5. THE NOTION OF THE OTHER

Underlying the appropriating discourse in the planning session are implicit assumptions about nonnative speakers which inform how the native speakers interact with Jiro. These unstated, taken-for-granted attitudes frame the interaction with Jiro and shape how his discourse is interpreted as top-down processing strategies (Brown & Yule, 1983; Kleifgen & Saville-Troike, 1992). When the nonnative speaker is defined as someone who is different, the definition constrains the interaction, reducing Jiro's discursive authority

and making it easier to assume that his opinion about the group's activity does not count as much as the native speakers. It also makes it easier to think that Jiro does not realize what is going on when the native speakers attempt to talk him into speaking on a different topic. This attitude allows Peter to position Jiro as a passive participant, whose opinion is not heard and whose agreement is presumed.

In this section, I describe how the attitude toward the foreign other may be triggered by Jiro's discourse but is founded on ethnocentrism and racial prejudice. This ideological orientation allows the feelings and perspectives of the nonnative speaker to be denigrated and ignored so that the native speakers are able to tell Jiro what to do, appropriate his work, and then consider the outcome as natural and ordinary. The virulence of this ethnocentric attitude ranges from Bruce's mild insensitivity to the NNS experience to Peter's racial prejudice, but what is shared among all three native speakers is the notion of Jiro as fundamentally different from themselves.

Mike, for example, is blissfully unaware of the demeaning assumptions which underlay his suggestion that Jiro lead off the group's presentation with the "Japanese" point of view, when he tells Jiro to "get the class upset" about unfair Japanese trade practices and suggests that Jiro play on American fears of Japanese economic power to excite the class. One of the practices which Mike offers in illustration of his point is the employment of Indonesian maids at low wages. In fact, at other points during the session, the three native speakers joke about how they and their college roommates would like to employ maids for fifteen dollars a month, but the "Japanese have beaten us to it." Mike fails to realize the contradiction inherent in his criticism of the Japanese for unfair practices which, given the opportunity, he himself would like to engage in. According to this logic, what is wrong about the situation is that the maids' employers are Japanese and not American.

Other statements by the members index an Anglo-centric ethnocentrism. At the end of the session during the wind-down discussion about last minute preparations, Peter is telling Jiro what further information he needs to collect and makes reference to the Japanese book Jiro has brought with him. With hyperbolic looseness, Peter remarks that if Jiro cannot find the exact figures, he should improvise: "When it comes down to it, just make up an answer or something." He suggests that Jiro say the figures came from the Japanese book. "Who's gonna be able to read this?" he jokes. Jiro protests against the ploy, arguing that, indeed, there are other Japanese students in the class who can read it and might even recognize the deception. But the native speakers, concerned only about the teacher's evaluation, brush aside Jiro's reservations.

What is striking about the reasoning is the denigration of another language. Monolingualism is the assumed norm which serves to excuse the academic bluffing, revealing an Anglo-centric perspective that makes it difficult if not impossible to understand Jiro's bilingual point of view. Arguably, this ethnocentric attitude is not always harmful, particularly if based on a willingness to solicit the perspective of the nonnative speaker, but that is exactly what does not happen in the interaction. Jiro's knowledge of a second language is seen not as a resource but as a tool of deception to fool the teacher. The ethnocentric attitude precludes full recognition of Jiro and what he has to say.

Peter's discourse evinces a more racist attitude. During his second sketch of what he will talk about, Peter is describing how he will present the information on Japanese investment in Indonesia. He is running down a list of reasons when he says, "What are the Japs doing in, what are the Japanese doing in Indonesia." Peter quickly corrects himself, supplying "Japanese" for the derogatory term Japs. The quick correction suggests a sensitivity to propriety, but his use of the epithet demonstrates an underlying racial bias.

It is not necessarily the case that Peter's prejudicial attitudes toward the Japanese directly affects what he says to Jiro, and in follow-up interviews, Jiro commented that he thought Peter did not like Japanese in general, but that he seemed to like Jiro as an individual. Nonetheless, given the pattern that all three Americans display over the course of the interaction, and given the illogical rationalizations and justifications for the denigration and mistreatment of Jiro, it is clear that a fundamental notion of difference informs the exclusion of Jiro's voice from the group. Jiro's speech is the lightening rod for this attitude, the justification which Peter uses to portray his appropriation in terms of concern and beneficence, but it is not the cause of the attitude, and neither is it the cause of the "miscommunication" which occurs in the encounter.

6. STRUCTURING NNS DISCOURSE

The planning session demonstrates that the character of NNS discourse is situated in the social interaction with the other speakers. Jiro is perceived in a particular way according to the motivation of the speakers, and his talk is structured by the NS's interactive response. He is positioned by the constructive response he receives, as his ability is both extended and restricted according to the character of that interactive engagement.

Discursive structuring is most noticeable in access to the floor and the opportunity to express one's ideas. As Tannen (1992) notes, asymmetrical patterns of exchange reflect

an unequal domination of the conversation. Structuring, however, extends farther than the calculation of floor time or even the consideration of patterns of overlap (while recognizing that these are critical). A reciprocally supportive response includes other features of interaction which facilitate (or impede) NNS discourse. In this section, I illustrate the discourse strategies used in the planning session by the native speakers that reduce Jiro's talk and position him as a disfluent nonnative speaker. Five strategies are evident in Peter and Mike's response: neglect, interruption, exclusion, intimidation, and explicit control.

6-1. Reductive usurpation

Throughout the session, Jiro receives little substantial recognition for what he says. Although his ideas are for the most part relevant and understandable, they are largely ignored. In the first few minutes of the conversation, for example, when Peter realizes that there is an overlap between them, he asks Jiro what topic he will speak on:

1	P	Jiro what-, what is your topic, what are you doing?
2	J	I'm doing background of this something, Indonesia. Then uh, then you know, I found out that Japane-, Japan invested most you know, largest in this countries, Indonesia. And uh, trade also. The Japan is the major trading partner, so-,
3	P	Here let me see, let me see yours a minute
4	J	So I concentrate on that, how Japanese, why Japanese company invest in Indonesia, and then, how they invest.
5	M	Yeah, um we were talking last night about, you know, how people aren't getting the class very involved/ and we were thinking maybe, if uh, you'd come up with maybe three questions, if you would start off the group

Jiro's explanation (in turns 2 and 4), although not native by any measure, presents no problem for the group members to understand (a taken-for-granted point demonstrated by Peter's recognition of what Jiro is saying and that he is claiming the same topic). In the exchange, however, there is no uptake of Jiro's opinion, of the content of what he says: no feedback, no clarification, no evaluation. His explanation is neglected as Mike launches into the attempt to persuade him to speak first. In other words, no accommodation takes place, and Jiro's statement echoes against a vacuum of disregard, unsupported by any supportive response.

Throughout the session, patterns of floor maintenance are unbalanced, with Peter interrupting Jiro (and Mike) but not the reverse. In an excerpt taken from the third section after Peter and Mike have decided between themselves the topic division and order of presentation, Mike begins to explain this to Jiro but he is quickly interrupted by Peter who announces the decision:

1	M	I'm gonna go, and fill in, then Jiro's gonna go with the numbers, and go on with him
		[???
2	P	[Okay Jiro, are you ready for your part?
3	J	Okay
4	P	Okay Mike is gonna go first, and give a pretty broad summary of the article, and say a little
		something about the companies that the article deals with right?
5	M	Right, yeah things like that
6	J	Yeah if uh, Mike try to get involved in class/[and hhh
7	M	[Yeah, I'm going-, I'm gonna ask the questions
		and things like that too, then you're [gonna-,
8	P	[Okay, then I'm gonna go second, <...>

The selection delineates the hierarchy of interactional rights not only to interrupt another speaker but also to explicitly define the discourse situation. Echoing Peter's prior statement, Mike explains (turn 1) that he will go first and Jiro, in charge of the "numbers," will go second. Peter interrupts, however, to say the same thing to Jiro, only with more authority. He makes it explicit that Jiro is being assigned a part, which Mike simply echoes, "yeah, things like that" (turn 5). When Jiro (turn 6) begins to restate the information and clarify his understanding of what was said, Mike interrupts before he can finish, demonstrating that, although he cannot interrupt Peter, he can indeed interrupt Jiro. Then once again, Peter interrupts Mike and, more importantly, contradicts what he has just said. Mike has explained (turn 7) that Jiro will go second ("I'm gonna ask the questions ... then you're gonna-"), which is exactly what he and Peter have just agreed upon. But Peter, obviously having changed his mind, interrupts to announce that in fact *he* will go second. The hierarchy is defined in its enactment: Peter has more authority than Mike to define the group's activity, but Mike has more than Jiro, who is positioned with the least authority.

Peter dominates the floor through exclusion strategies as well. Even though, for example, he is asking the group about one of the graphs Jiro has prepared as he holds it in his hands, Peter monopolizes the floor, preventing Jiro from inserting a comment:

1	J	[Um this is from uh, encyclopedia,
2	P	[Bruce does this come under-, , , Mike, does this come under what you're gonna be doing? are
		you gonna, is this-, who's gonna talk about this, Japan is interested because of blank, the cheap
		labor, bla bla bla the stuff that {J yeah maybe-} the stuff that you have written down {J maybe
		you know} is that a marketing im-, is that marketing? or is that economic?

In the exchange, Peter precludes Jiro from gaining access to the floor, overlapping his first statement and talking over his attempts to speak. Jiro tries twice to gain the floor, but

Peter's orientation toward Mike and away from Jiro, coupled with his continuing speech, excludes Jiro from being heard. Through the exclusionary strategy, Peter is also making public information that Jiro himself has brought to the meeting, which serves in turn to allow its appropriation.

Peter's discourse strategies reflect subtle intimidation, as he confidently outlines his plans and asserts his position. Although his tone of voice remains subdued through the session, his response to Jiro indicates his frustration with Jiro's persistence:

```
1    P    I think we're having a little bit of a problem understanding, what each of us {M unhun} is gonna
          talk about {M yeah}, it seems like we're gonna talk about this, all we're gonna do is repeat the
          same things to the class, - - -
2    M    [Over and over again
3    P    - - - it's just in four different ways, and that's not gonna accomplish anything, {M unhun}
4    J    [But-,
5    P    [U:h, , What`
```

Peter is complaining (turn 1) about the overlap with Jiro. Mike is in tune with Peter's rhythm, rephrasing part of Peter's statement from the same referential perspective ("Over and over again"). Jiro, however, tries to insert a comment (turn 4) and overlaps Peter who, holding the floor with "u::h," is about to continue. Peter then stops abruptly to respond to Jiro with sharp, downturned intonation. The brusqueness conveys a reluctance to incorporate his different perspective on the matter.

In sum, Peter and Mike's discursive response to Jiro's talk serves to position Jiro as an outsider with little interactional authority, denying his interactional point of view and definition of the situation, as well as reducing his participation. Jiro has less chance to speak, in terms of access to the floor. He also has less supportive and sustaining engagement with what he says. The orientation of Peter to the interaction is reductive, as he seeks to discredit Jiro for the larger goal of gaining an advantageous access to the topic.[13]

6-2. Amplifying response

The reductive response of Peter and Mike becomes more pronounced when set in comparison with salient features of Bruce's discourse, which are significantly more supportive and which structure a more collaborative definition of the discursive situation. Peter, for example, never solicits Jiro's opinion. He never says, "What do you think, Jiro?" Only in certain, limited situations does Peter even solicit information from Jiro, such

as when he asks, "What is your topic, what are you doing?" at the beginning of the session. In contrast, Bruce grants Jiro shared access to the floor through such strategies as solicitation, wait time, and encouraging backchannel and agreement cues. More significantly, Bruce works to incorporate what Jiro says into his own discourse through extension, clarification, and other strategies of an engaged, amplifying response. Although this engagement is not a major element of the conversation (occurring when the conversation has broken into a separate, simultaneous discussion that does not include Peter and Mike), it illustrates how NS response can facilitate the NNS's authentic participation and develop a more textured and developmentally important discourse.

Bruce's solicitation gradually increases as the session proceeds. He begins to include specific requests for factual information as well as opinion. At one point, he asks Jiro, "So you think our topic is too broad? Is that what you're thinking?" Finally, in the third section of the meeting, Bruce enters into what is the only example in the entire session of a shared, collaborative construction of ideas with Jiro, when they discuss the characteristics of Japanese investment in Indonesia, the topic which Jiro has come prepared to talk about. The exchange is not part of the full group's attention. Bruce and Jiro are talking between themselves, while Peter and Mike are deciding the division of the topic:

1	J	And I think you know, uh Japanese joint venture/ and joint venture between Japan and Indonesia don't have much technology, so,
2	B	Maybe the US technology could-,
3	J	Yeah, invest technology, because, that way they can build [beat] Japanese companies, they're producing products which Japan want to buy hhh ???
4	B	They're producing products that/
5	J	Products which Japan/ they want to buy
6	B	Right, so the Americans need to ??? [technology/
7	J	[Produce something better hhh yeah, so Indonesia has to invest more for technology,
8	B	In Indonesia?
9	J	Yeah, ,
10	B	So they should [become
11	J	[To be understood, to beat Japan, Japanese companies
12	B	I know, but how can we relate that to Indonesia? So if the US, could the US, um, use technology, use more technology than the Japanese industries and the Taiwanese, and um, set up companies, companies go over there, and use more technology, and that way they'd be more advanced and have a better competitive edge?
13	J	That's right, , Japan textile policy is just try to get cheaper labor, produce cheap stuff you know, cheap stuff with cheap labor, {B right} more, they have to produce a lot
14	B	Right, instead of,
15	J	Instead of [producing - - -
16	B	[quality
17	J	- - -quality yeah

18	B	yeah
19	J	We produce quality stuff in Japan,
20	B	But just not in Indonesia
21	J	Not in Indonesia
22	B	Oh okay,
23	J	So, they didn't, they didn't invest pretty much, in terms of technology, they didn't, Japan didn't invest, much in terms of technology

In the first turn, Jiro presents an assessment (or description) of the situation concerning the economic relationship between Japan and Indonesia. Bruce's response reflects an implicit adoption of Jiro's perspective, evident in his application of the point to the related situation concerning US technology. Bruce also extends Jiro's idea by soliciting further clarification based on the implications of the idea. This response elicits a more developed elaboration from Jiro, to which Bruce again responds to positively, asking for clarification (turn 4) through the upturned intonation ("that/").

In turn 12, Bruce attempts to extend Jiro's ideas, relating the information to the US involvement in Indonesia by speculating on the possibilities of more competitive US investment. Jiro concurs, restating the basic information. At this point, the two speakers are collaboratively developing a shared interpretation within a symmetric pattern of participation. Bruce's questions elicit Jiro's explanation, which are in turn extended when he considers its implications, to which Jiro develops in further, more detailed explanation.

This collaboration is reflected in the synchrony developed over the next few turns (14-22), evident in the affirmation cues ("yeah" and "okay"), lexical repetition, and rhythmic cadence of the utterances.

Through the exchange, Bruce recognizes Jiro's ideas as valid and affirms his perspective, as a shared referential orientation (Rommetveit, 1987) and a dyadic pattern of control (Lantolf & Ahmed, 1989). The discourse is collaboratively constructed. In contrast to Peter's response that excludes Jiro's talk and stigmatizes it as unclear, Bruce solicits clarification of Jiro's ideas, considers their implications, and articulates their significance.[14] Bruce is motivated to hear what Jiro says (where Peter is not) and this motivated receptivity positions Jiro as a speaking subject with discursive authority. This kind of "contingent responsiveness" (Wells, 1985) sustains the self-activated learning of the NNS. The dialogic engagement builds a more developed discourse than Jiro could accomplish on his own, and it is the mediational bridge for the further development of Jiro's fluency.

Bruce's response highlights the critical mediating role that the NS response plays in

shaping NNS speech. When, like Bruce, the NS works to support the talk of the NNS, "proficiency" is amplified even within the local parameters of the conversation. A more extended discourse is built and, at the same time, a different speaker is constructed, one who is more persuasive, more authoritative, and even more appropriate. At whatever "level" of proficiency the speaker brings to the interaction, it is only a potential that is actualized in the social dynamic of interaction. Over time, too, the kind of scaffolded response demonstrated by Bruce then serves as the means by which the NNS ability develops toward more "independent," higher levels.

7. PEDAGOGIC IMPLICATIONS[15]

In the above analysis of Jiro's planning session, I have tried to show the dynamics of appropriation in a naturally occurring NS-NNS conversation and the way that the discursive reduction of the NNS is justified. I have illustrated some of the implicit interactional strategies that limit Jiro's opportunities to speak, shaping not only the direction of the interaction but also the quality of the NNS discourse. Through their talk, Peter and Mike position Jiro as a disfluent outsider without social authority or support. I have also discussed the common-sense assumptions related to ethnocentric ideological beliefs about foreigners that inform this appropriation, justifying it as natural and right. There is little awareness, even on the part of Bruce, of the way that Jiro's nonnative speech is stigmatized and used as a tool to accomplish the organization of the group's activity. Further, the contrasting styes of interaction illustrate how the language proficiency of the advanced speaker is not a static construct that can be defined apart from the context of use, but is instead reciprocally constructed in interaction according to the structuring response or practice of the interlocutors. I contrast Peter's negative reduction with Bruce's more positive and supportive response, characterized by discourse strategies of engagement, including solicitation, clarification, and extension.

What does the analysis suggest to us as classroom teachers, though, in terms of second language pedagogy? How can the description of native speaker appropriation in discourse inform instruction in the second language classroom in Japan? Certainly, Peter does not present a model to imitate, except perhaps as an example of how *not* to interact with a NNS. Are we left with just another example of racism in the USA, a picture of subtle ethnocentrism on the interactional level that parallels analogous examples of large scale racism, which Japanese speakers should avoid with as much care and circumspection? I do not think so. I think the analysis tells us more than simply some Americans are crude, insensitive louts (although certainly many are). The analysis of the

planning session offers us insight into the interactional dynamics that are fundamental to cross cultural discourse, and which can inform practice in the language classroom. At the same time, it provides a necessary corrective to individualistic and rather static claims about second language acquisition (especially for the advanced speaker) and cross cultural differences.

First, the analysis of the planning session illustrates the critical role of the *native speaker* in intercultural conversation. The result is a shift away from a narrow concern for the individual "ability" of the language learner in terms of linguistic and pragmatic knowledge, toward a more dynamic social conception of NNS proficiency that is enacted in interactive activity according to the structuring of the NS interlocutor.

Even interactionist accounts of second language acquisition (Long, 1983; Gass & Varonis, 1989, 1991; Pica, 1988, 1992; Varonis & Gass, 1985) that stress the role of modified interaction in facilitating the development of new vocabulary and syntax, tend to present a view of acquisition as an individual process of mastering structural forms. This theoretical position seems to promote social interaction, represented in the negotiation of meaning between interactants. In practice, task-based group activities are often adopted where one speaker has information that the other speaker does not (Long & Porter, 1986).[16] Certainly this information gap can stimulate not only the quantity of negotiation but also the authenticity of communicative activities.

But the theoretical lens of this understanding is ultimately focused on the individual learner's comprehension of new linguistic structures that, once learned, are assumed to be safely stored inside, the property of the learner. According to this interactionist framework, though, when there is no breakdown in communication, there is little need for negotiation. Pica (1992: 200), for example, defines negotiation in terms of "activity that occurs when a [NS] listener signals to a [NNS] speaker that the speaker's message is not clear, and listener and speaker work linguistically to resolve this impasse." The collaborative scaffolding of the native speaker to support and amplify (or to restrict and impede) performance receives little attention, especially in cases of advanced speakers where the NNS may understand every word that the NS says, and even use interactional strategies to negotiate unclear reference, but still be denied the opportunity to articulate his or her ideas in an authentic and developmentally important way. As the interaction between Jiro and the native speakers of his group demonstrates, negotiation is a constant process that shapes meaning even when referential meaning is clear. Jiro may understand most of the syntactic and lexical structures that Peter uses and, in two instances (not discussed in

63

this analysis), he even solicits Peter's clarification about unfamiliar words. But Jiro is still unable to gain active control over the discourse and a shared definition of the situation is not attained, he is still some distance from an authentic involvement with the conversation. The native speaker's facilitative role in the construction of the nonnative speaker's discourse is not sufficiently calculated in the typical interactionist equation.

A second implication of the analysis presented here relates to often cited contrasts in culturally specific discourse styles that are said to generate cross cultural communicative friction and inadvertent misunderstanding. For instance, Gass & Varonis (1991: 122) assert that when speakers do not share the same sociolinguistic norms of interaction, the possibilities of miscommunication are "profound." This position is adopted in mismatch models of culturally specific communicative styles as well speech act analyses of cross cultural pragmatic failure. Beebe and Takahashi (1989) contend that Japanese nonnative speakers demonstrate a "great deal of transfer" of social values which are not easily given up in their second language, an assertion with which Ellis (1991: 121) concurs, stating that "Japanese speakers of English experience difficulty in performing speech acts in socially appropriate ways."[17]

The interaction between Jiro and his NS colleagues illustrates, however, that what is considered appropriate to interaction is also a matter of contested values and beliefs, often informed by NS ethnocentric attitudes that are taken for granted as common sense and thus difficult to recognize. The conversational data involving Jiro and his classmates make clear that it is not simply cultural differences per se that generate miscommunication, but the way differences are interpreted and interactively structured in the discourse. Jiro's speech and its appropriacy changes dramatically according to the interactional partner and the responsive support (or reduction) which it receives from the native speaker. Appropriacy can be as much the *justification* of cross cultural miscommunication as its cause. Given the motivation, speakers utilizing structuring strategies that instantiate a collaboratively defined, perspectival intersubjectivity can bridge even wide cultural differences in communicative style. Pedagogy should recognize that learners when they interact in a foreign culture do not simply follow social norms of appropriateness, but are also involved in actually *constructing* these norms within the dynamic context of social activity. As Fairclough (1992) points out, culturally situated norms are not simply static constructs of external rules which guide communication, but are contested and interactively brought to bear in conversation.

Perhaps the most obvious pedagogic implication for EFL instruction to be drawn

from the analysis relates to the interactional dynamics of classroom discussion. The contrast between the structuring practice of Peter and Mike on the one hand, and Bruce on the other illustrates the critical role of the listener's responsive engagement in drawing out and building the speaker's ideas. Often in EFL class discussion (actually in any class discussion), student participation has the flavor of display, a demonstration of linguistic skill that is oriented to the teacher's evaluation based on formal notions of correctness. Such an arrangement borders on reproducing the kind of discursive reduction of the student that Peter and Mike demonstrate in the planning session. The asymmetric pattern of control that is assumed in the specification of practice (Lave, 1989) subverts real engagement of students and the potential contained in the provision *for* practice. If we recognize that learning is integrally tied to the character of engagement, a far more reciprocal pattern of interaction is called for, in which the teacher works (much like Bruce) to engage the student's ideas and opinion and, with the supportive and amplifying strategies of response, collaboratively structure the student's speech and facilitate the self-engagement of the learner. This is the goal in both in student -teacher as well as student-student interaction to which the teacher is the outside observer and possibly commentator.

Even when the teacher-fronted classroom is decentered, and the teacher steps down from the podium to facilitate small group activity, it is important to recognize that in talking about interaction, the quality of participation takes precedence over the structure of the arrangement. Donato (1989) points out that a discussion group can not be defined simply as an aggregate of individuals, but depends on the collaborative engagement and collective definition of the activity. A further concern relates to the control over the group interaction. Sometimes one or two students tend to dominate the discussion while more reticent members of the group listen passively without the chance to express their own ideas (as if the imbalance were a natural arrangement). Often (but not always) it is the male students who dominate access to the floor and fail to notice that their talk limits the participation of the women, who in turn find it difficult to assert themselves in face of social attitudes which privilege the male voice and male experience.[18] It is not only pedagogically sound but also ethically important to make students explicitly aware of the structuring strategies of solicitation and extension, as part of the attempt to facilitate more collaborative participation. As a critical dimension of language pedagogy, Edelsky (1992) points out that constructing meaning is integrally tied to issues of equity and cooperation.

While the call for more balanced talk affirms the goal of introducing the notion of equality into classroom activity, it does not actually prepare students to contend with the appropriating strategies (whether intentional or inadvertent) of native speakers like Peter.

In other words, it does not directly address the issue of empowering student voice. In this respect, if the dynamics of structuring are reciprocally enacted, the advanced NNS is obliged not only to listen attentively to the talk of the NS, but also to articulate his or her ideas in the extending uptake of a creative response.

The interaction between Jiro and his NS interlocutors suggests that for the advanced speaker, classroom practice should be not only communicative, focused on authentic tasks that have meaning and relevance to the learner, but also what I would call "response centered." This response does not imply passive receptivity, but rather an active, creative articulation of opinion that is generated in response to spoken and written texts. The response is part of the larger dialogue in which one voice interacts and builds on another. The classroom can be the construction site where the advanced speaker works to organize and articulate ideas, building persuasive interpretations of the world. Students need to engage in the rhetorical practices of extended argument and compelling narrative, developing convincing, persuasive reasoning in support of opinion. And this in turn needs to be set within the reciprocally supportive engagement of scaffolded response. Useful pedagogy needs to go beyond bits of language to allow students to synthesize their own ideas in writing and speaking activities that extend beyond short turns and that are addressed to real audiences in real contexts.

In order to do this, of course, the responsive engagement of the teacher and fellow students is essential in supporting and extending opinion, but in the context of shared enquiry, students can develop argumentative and narrative skills that will allow them to respond in convincing ways in conversational contexts in the target language. Further, such practice will empower students, giving them a stronger voice as they struggle to articulate persuasive ideas and interpretations that, situated within the awareness of the collaborative development of conversational meaning, will not prevent reduction by native speakers like Peter, but will at least offer a constructive means with which to respond with confidence and direction and to contest the discriminatory appropriation of the NS whose response serves to unfairly control conversation. The English classroom can strive to be the site of engagement, as students, particularly advanced speakers, become active participants in conversations where they struggle to articulate their own place in the linguistic world around them.

NOTES

1   I would like to express my appreciation to Jiro, without whose generous assistance and cooperation this study could not have been conducted. I am also grateful to Genelle Morain, JoBeth Allen, Joel Taxel, Alan McCornick, and Christine Pearson Casanave for critical feedback on an earlier draft of this paper. However, they are not in any way responsible for the limitations of the analysis which remain, in spite of their assistance.

2   Griffin & Cole (1984) have criticized the implicit teleological stress of this construction. Such a "stepwise progression" based on expert knowledge serves to devalue the learner's initiative. They argue for more active conceptualization of the learner's activity.

3   This formulation is consistent with interactionist accounts of SLA (Ellis, 1985; Gass & Varonis, 1989) which see syntactic development as generated in the collaborative interaction of conversation. There are significant differences with sociocultural approaches, however, which will be discussed later.

4   This formulation of scaffolded development implies, as the metaphor suggests, that collaborative construction is limited to a developmental stage and that, once competence is attained, assistance is no longer needed. This view, however, slights the collaborative character of all performance, even that between "independent" adults (Shea, 1993b). This point is captured more clearly in the Bakhtinian notion of the social ground of linguistic production.

5   By qualitative analysis, I mean an approach to research design, data collection, and analysis that seeks to generate a "grounded" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) interpretation of interactional processes by generating core categories that emerge from intensive analysis of data (Patton, 1990; Strauss, 1989). See Shea (1993a) for a detailed description of methodological principles and procedures.

6   All names in this study are fictitious, designed to disguise informant identity.

7   Special consideration for Jiro's language skills was not discussed by the professor and, since there were a number of international students in the class, every group had at least one nonnative speaker.

8   The article suggests that the current Indonesian economy is looking away from its traditional dependence on oil exports, seeking technological and capital investments from industrial countries. Indonesia's economy, from Japan's perspective, offers a source of low-wage labor, essential to develop a manufacturing base that will allow it to remain competitive with regional Asian economies.

9   Mike fails to appreciate the ironic ethnocentrism of his suggestion, a point to which the discussion will return.

10   A third strategy, to directly express displeasure, is evident (such as when Peter complains that he doesn't "have anything to do"), but will not be discussed in this analysis.

11   Peter may be right, in that it might be a better strategy for the group to avoid the issue. Even if he is, though, accuracy is not the main thrust of the analysis, which relates to how Peter elicits the agreement of the group and altercasts Jiro's perspective.

12   I think Jiro is saying, manufacturing, agriculture, and doing good, respectively. It is indeed difficult to tell.

13   I should perhaps stress that Peter may be acting with good intentions. He may certainly believe that his interactional position is just and fair. Further, he probably feels little ethical qualms about using information Jiro has prepared. But intentionality doesn't constrain principle, and even if he is not aware of it, Peter is taking advantage of Jiro, at least from the perspective of equality.

14   This does not necessarily equal agreement, though. I should stress that the issue is not whether the speakers like Jiro or not. There are nice guys in the US, and there a lot of muggers who will steal your clothes. The point is that structuring is a discursive response that facilitates the language

development of the learner. In class and in conversation, we should aspire to the kind of responsive, engaged interaction demonstrated in the interaction.

15 It is difficult (if not impossible) to speak in general terms about classroom practice, given the external structural constraints that shape what goes on in the classroom with as much force and determination as the behavior and attitudes of both students and teachers. It must be asked, for example, why students are in class in the first place. Is English compulsory credit, required for graduation? Is the overall academic load so heavy that students have little time to study English outside of class? What kind of social economic background do the students bring to school that inform their expectations about the value of study? These questions are not often asked in pedagogic discussions about English education (likely because little can be done about them by the individual), but they are nevertheless of central importance in shaping the success or failure of academic study. For a critical discussion of such structural issues in education, see Apple (1990; Giroux, 1988). In the Japanese context, see Rohlene (1979) and Goodman (1991).

16 Donato (1989) presents an extended critique of mainstream notions of group activity as ultimately individual and formal conceptions of what is in fact socially negotiated activity.

17 Many of these studies are based on data generated in written discourse completion questionaires. For critiques of the limitations of a methodology that relies on written self-report data, see *inter alia* Holmes (1991) and Wolfson (1989).

18 One recent example from my own Sophomore advanced English class comes to mind. I noticed that in one group, the one woman student was sitting quietly as the four guys discussed the novel we had just read. When I asked why they hadn't included the woman (whose name was indeed Shizuka!), one guy responded, "I'm embarrassed to talk to women." I think he was telling the truth, but regardless of his intention, the result still served to privilege the male speakers and deny Shizuka opportunity to develop her own ideas within the social activity. I suggested that if he were to think about solicitation strategies, in terms of equal access to participation as a matter of responsibility and fairness to all members of the group, it might be easier and perhaps less embarrassing to solicit from Shizuka her ideas and include her opinion in the discussion.

TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

, ,	pause of *approximately* one-half second per comma
[	simultaneous, overlapping speech
{ }	overlapping speech inserted as backchannels: e.g. "unhun" "right"
-	speech is clipped short or cut off
::	elongation of a sound
`	distinctly falling intonation
/	rising, upturned intonation
.	sentence-like concluding tone
???	speech not understood in transcription
!	excited, enthusiastic intonation
( )	analyst's inserted comment or description
<...>	ellipsis: conversation not included in selection
Under	emphasis of a word by the speaker
hhh	laughter
" "	verbal quotation: speaker adopts a distinctly different voice
- - -	continuous or latched talk

REFERENCES

Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum (2nd edition)*. New York: Routledge.

Becker, A. (1992). Silence across languages: An essay. In C. Kramsch & McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 115-123). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Beebe, L. and Takahashi, T. (1989). Do you have a bag? Social status and patterned variation in second language acquisition. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics* (pp. 103-125). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher, 18*(1), 32-42.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cazden, C. (1989). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Donato, R. (1988). *Beyond group: A psycholinguistic rationale for collective activity in second-language learning*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Delaware.

Edelsky, C. (1992). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education*. London: Falmer Press.

Ellis, R. (1991). Communicative competence and the Japanese learner. *JALT Journal, 13* (2), 103-130.

Fairclough, N. (1992). The appropriacy of 'appropriateness.' In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical language awareness* (pp. 33-56). London: Longman.

Frawley, W. and Lantolf, J. (1985). Second language discourse: A Vygotskyan perspective. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 143-159.

Gass, S. and Varonis, E. (1985). Miscommunication in native/nonnative conversation. *Language in Society, 14*, 327-343.

Gass, S. and Varonis, E. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage* (pp. 71-86). New York: Plenum.

Gass, S. and Varonis, E. (1991). Miscommunication in nonnative speaker discourse. In N. Copland, H. Giles, & J. Wiemann (Eds.), *Miscommunication and problematic talk* (pp. 121-145). Newbury Park: Sage.

Giroux, H. (1988). Literacy and the pedagogy of voice and political empowerment. *Educational Theory 38* (1): 61-75.

Glaser, B and Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Goodman, R. *Japan's international youth: The emergence of a new class of schoolchildren*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Griffin, P. and Cole, M. (1984). Current activity for the future: The zo-ped. In B. Rogoff & J. Wertsch (Eds.), *Children's learning in the zone of proximal development* (pp. 45-63). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Holmes, J. (1991). Review of Blum-Kulka, House & Kaspar (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Language in Society, 20*, 119-126.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kleifgen, J. and Saville-Troike, M. (1992). Achieving coherence in multilingual interaction. *Discourse processes, 15*, 183-206.

Kramsch, C. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). (Con)textual knowledge in language education. In C. Kramsch & S. Mcconnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 3-25). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Lantolf, J. and Ahmed, M. (1989). Psycholinguistic perspectives on interlanguage variation: A Vygotskyan analysis. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Psycholinguistic issues* (pp. 93-108). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lantolf, J. and Frawley, W. (1988). Proficiency: Understanding the construct. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 10*, 181-195.

Lave, J. (1989). The culture of acquisition and the practice of understanding. In J. Stigler, R. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), The Chicago symposia on human development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition* pp. 259-278). Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.

Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5*, 175-193.

Long, M. and Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 207-228.

Moll, L. 1991. Introduction. In L. Moll (Ed.),*Vygotsky and education* (pp. 1-17). New York: Cambridge University Press

Pica, T. (1988). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning, 38*, 45-73.

Pica, T. (1992). The textual outcomes of native speaker--non-native speaker negotiation: What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 198-237). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Pratt, M. (1987). Linguistic utopias. In N. Fabb, D. Attridge, A. Durant, & C. MacCabe (Eds.), *The linguistics of writing* (pp. 48-66). New York: Methuen.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rommetveit, R. (1985). Language acquisition as increasing linguistic structuring of experience and symbolic behavior control. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 183-204). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rommetveit, R. (1987). Meaning, context, and control. *Inquiry, 30*, 77-99.

Scarcella, R., Anderson, E. and Krashen, S. (1990). Introduction. In R. Scarcella, E. Anderson, & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury.

Scollon, R. (1982). The rhythmic integration of ordinary talk. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 335-349). Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Shea, D. (1993a). *Structuring discourse: A qualitative study of the pragmatics of Japanese and American cross cultural conversation.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, The University of Georgia.

Shea, D. (1993b). Ex-scaffolding: The double edged sword of cross cultural discourse.

Paper presented at the TESOL conference, Atlanta, GA.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1992). Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 135-147). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Voloshinov, V. (1986). *Marxism and the philosophy of language.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1985). Language and learning: An international perspective. In G. Wells & J. Nicholls (Eds.), *Language and learning: An interactional perspective.* London: Falmer Press.

Wertsch, J. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition.* Rowley. MA: Newbury House.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. and Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 17,* 89-100.