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Abstract

In recent years, an increasing number of second language (L2) researchers have employed the concept of task as a unit of analysis (e.g., Crookes & Gass, 1993a, 1993b; Ellis, 2003; Skehan, 1998). However, most studies to date have focused primarily on L2 students doing narrowly defined tasks in classrooms or laboratory settings. How do L2 students work together in and out of class time and over an extended period of time to undertake their in-class academic tasks? How do they benefit from their previous experiences when performing related and similar activities? Informed by sociocultural perspectives (e.g., Duff, 2003; Lantolf, 2000; Ochs, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991), the present multiple-case study examined ESL students’ group project work as a means to their becoming more fully competent knowers and speakers about academic content/culture. More specifically, the study examined ESL students’ academic discourse socialization through their undertaking of oral presentation tasks.

Participants included 80 Japanese undergraduate students enrolled in a two-semester content course at a Canadian university. Data were collected through classroom and non-classroom observations of project work, in-depth, semi-structured interviews, audio-journals kept by key students, and audio- and video-recordings of their interactions. Eleven key students and their partners were observed as they participated in a variety of activities both inside and outside the classroom. Recorded interactions were analyzed using mainly the analytical tools of the ethnography of communication and linked with themes that emerged from the other data.

Data analysis suggested that the instructor, together with her assistant, provided her students with various kinds of help for their undertaking of tasks. In particular, she
organized the course in such a way that earlier tasks and projects would serve as scaffolds for the students’ participation in subsequent ones. The analysis also indicated that students’ task-preparatory activities as well as actual task performances were rich contexts for learning and socialization. Many groups prepared for their presentations by negotiating teacher expectations, task definitions and goals, roles and identities, the language and content of their presentations, and rehearsing their speeches. The analysis suggested that these collaborative sessions, conducted primarily in Japanese, seem to have allowed the students to move their detailed discussion forward with less frustration, maintain group harmony and pursuit of goals, and attend to the form and delivery of their speech. The analysis further suggested that in order to undertake their tasks, students often acted upon their cognitive uptake from previous events, and such continued engagement sometimes took place rather privately as inner dialogues (Volosinov, 1973) or in the absence of the researcher. These findings point to the need to take a behind-the-scenes look at contingency across tasks and contexts by using a variety of methods, including a detailed analysis of discourse, interviews, and journal entries that would together allow for a consideration of both etic and emic perspectives.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The present study examined undergraduate ESL students' language socialization through group project work during their year-long academic studies in a content-based ESL program at a Canadian university. The focus is their oral tasks. The concept of task has recently gained popularity both as a fundamental building block in second language (L2) curriculum and syllabus design (Candlin & Murphy, 1987; Crookes & Gass, 1993b; Long & Crookes, 1992; Mohan, 1990; Nunan, 1989; see also Swales, 1990) and as the unit of analysis in studies of L2 development and interaction (Crookes & Gass, 1993a). This is evident from the growing body of literature on task-based research and pedagogy (Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001; Candlin & Murphy, 1987; Crookes & Gass, 1993a, 1993b; Ellis, 2003; Lee, 2000; Long, 1985, 1989; Nunan, 1989; Prabhu, 1987; Skehan, 1998a; J. Willis, 1996a; Yule, 1997; see also Brown, Anderson, Shillcock, & Yule, 1984). Drawing upon mainstream educational research (e.g., Doyle, 1986; Doyle & Carter, 1984), Crookes and Gass (1993a, 1993b) suggest that the concept is helpful in understanding how teachers and students view the classroom and how teachers plan lessons. To quote Doyle (1983), the school curriculum can be seen as a “collection of academic tasks” (p. 121, cited in Mohan, 1990). Likewise, Scollon and Scollon (1995) propose that tasks are “the most fruitful place to begin an analysis” (p. 281) because they are building blocks through which organizations such as corporations and schools

---

1 I use the term ESL not only to refer to students enrolled in language programs, but also to those who grew up using a language other than English, whether they are international graduate students or immigrants in an English-speaking country. As we will see later, the key teacher in this study, who speaks English as a third language, often referred to herself as an “ESL person.”
organize themselves, and in which their philosophies, values, and institutional cultures all manifest themselves. Hence, task is a practical tool that can be used to plan and study various aspects and processes of organizations.

1.2 The Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The present study examined the academic discourse socialization of Japanese university students during their year-long studies in a sheltered content course on intercultural communication and research methodologies in social science and education. The study focused on the oral presentation component of their project work as a major unit of analysis. Throughout the year, students were required to work in pairs or groups in and out of the classroom to accomplish their in-class tasks, including final presentations of their projects. In other words, the purpose of the study was to examine the group work which L2 students who shared the same first language (L1) engaged in, in the presence and absence of their teachers, and to uncover the learning opportunities that such work made available for them in formal and informal socio-educational contexts. Informed by sociocultural theories of learning (e.g., Lantolf, 2000b; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Ochs, 1988; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978; Wells, 1999a; Wertsch, 1991b), the present study sought to address the following questions:

(1) What is the nature of the institutional and classroom culture in which undergraduate ESL students perform their oral academic presentations? How is this task environment organized?

(2) What are some of the features of a valued (or “good”) academic oral presentation as perceived by the teachers and students?

(3) How do students exercise their agency to undertake their presentation tasks? What are the consequences of these agentive acts?

(4) How do students, through their participation in an academic oral presentation, become prepared for their subsequent participation in similar or related activities?
1.3 The Statement of the Problem

Many task-based studies to date have focused primarily on L2 students doing narrowly defined tasks in classrooms or laboratory settings. What about students’ learning outside the classroom? How do L2 students work together out of class time to undertake their in-class tasks? What learning opportunities are available? Mohan (2001) argues that the challenge for teachers is “to help students take more control over their own learning, and have access to resources and a sense of direction, not simply at the micro-level of the brief task, but at the macro-level of the longer cycles of academic work” (p. 125). Likewise, van Lier (1996) argues that students must gradually “learn to make choices about how to plan and conduct tasks (including field work, investigations, reports, presentations, etc.), since only then will they develop the sense of self-determination that fosters intrinsic motivation” (p. 213). To better understand these teaching-learning processes, researchers need to take a broader view of task. Additionally, as some researchers point out (Beckett, 1999, 2002; Eyring, 1989), there have been only a few formal studies on L2 students’ learning through project work. Given the importance of students’ learning to make decisions about their own tasks (van Lier, 1996), project work seems to provide a crucial context for this learning as it gives students a wider choice about and more responsibilities for the planning of their activities. It then follows that studies on L2 project work would yield valuable insights about students’ development of autonomy (Macaro, 1997; van Lier, 1996) as well as linguistic, sociocultural, and content-area knowledge (Beckett, 1999).

Moreover, only a few studies have examined L2 students’ learning about and learning from academic oral tasks (e.g., Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002b; Lynch & Maclean,
2001; Morita, 2000, 2002; Varela, 1997). As we will see in later chapters, one of the major tasks student-participants in the present study were required to do was presenting orally on research findings. Ferris and Tagg’s (1996b) review of the literature suggests that “ESL college/university students are often intimidated by academic speaking tasks, including both formal presentations and participation in large- or small-group class discussions” (p. 300). Previous research suggests that in content area courses, such oral tasks, along with literacy tasks, are an important means to L2 students becoming participants in and members of their target discourse communities, thus providing a vital context for academic discourse socialization (Duff, 1995, 1996; Morita, 1996, 2000; Zappa-Hollman, 2002; for research on writing tasks, see, for example, Prior, 1995, 1998; Spack, 1998). Yet, this is a relatively unexplored area of task-based L2 research.

Moreover, as Mohan (1990) points out, some of the tasks examined in SLA studies are “isolated from and unconnected with earlier and later tasks” (p. 120). Because of their major goal to psycholinguistically inform syllabus design, many studies have isolated different demands of tasks in order to examine the L2 use and cognitive processing in which individuals engaged as they performed different tasks under different conditions. These psycholinguistic studies have contributed greatly to our knowledge about microprocesses of students’ L2 discourse within tasks (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992). But we know relatively little about the macroprocesses weaving together those tasks (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992). Mohan (1990) asserts that tasks selected in an academic content course like the one being reported in the present study should “form a coherent progression within the context of the subject area, constituting a complex ‘ecology’ of tasks” (p. 138). Likewise, van Lier, (1996) argues, “a progression of tasks

\footnote{Here, I am using Cole’s (1996) notion of “context as that which weaves together” (p. 135).}
without some continuity or systematicity in terms of content progression (or coherence) would lead to a very disjointed, ‘scattergun’ syllabus” (p. 205; see also van Lier, 2004). Therefore it is vital that more research attention be paid to the ecology of tasks.

Furthermore, as Skehan (1998b) points out, most of the task-based L2 studies have been cross-sectional and do not have much to say about student learning that can be accomplished through particular tasks over an extended period of time. Given that language learning is a long process, it is necessary for L2 researchers to conduct longitudinal studies that explore how task performance at a given time relates to longer-term change (Skehan, 1998b). Skehan further suggests that teacher-led action research would complement this effort since teachers possess extended knowledge about their students. Similarly, qualitative, longitudinal studies that require researchers to spend considerable amount of time with their participants provide valuable insights about students’ learning about and learning from tasks over time.

1.4 The Significance of the Study

The present study makes several important contributions to the field, especially in the areas of task-based L2 research and academic discourse socialization. For one thing, while focusing on the oral presentation component of project work, the study examines the ecology of tasks (Mohan, 1990). As Mohan (2001) points out, this is a relatively unexplored area in task-based L2 research; however, from a language socialization perspective, it is vital to consider “how tasks fit into a larger whole” (p. 125). As part of its effort to examine the classroom context of the presentation task, this study therefore examines the ecology of the tasks and sheds light on the important role of the teacher as organizer of the learning environment.
Another unique contribution is that it offers a behind-the-scenes view at L2 students' task preparation. As we will see in Chapter 3, key students and their partners were observed and audio- and video-recorded as they prepared for their oral presentations out of class time. This means that I was “there” most of the time to see this happen (Keyton, 1999). Sometimes two groups met at the same time, and I had to miss one of these meetings. Even in such situations, I still had access to the inner workings of both groups, thanks to the students’ willingness to record their activities. To the best of my knowledge, no previous study has examined L2 students’ out-of-class task-preparatory activities more directly and intensively than the present study.³ By using an ethnographic case study approach, the study highlights the role of personal agency and interpersonal collaboration in students’ learning through group tasks. Also, as a study conducted with a group of Japanese students, this investigation provides insights about the role of L1 in L2 students’ accomplishment of academic tasks.

A third contribution is that unlike most L2 research, the present study examined students’ task-related strategies and performance as they evolved over time. As mentioned earlier, the study observed key students and their partners’ task-preparatory activities in and out of class time. As such, it reveals the cumulative effects of their participation in the development of knowledge and skills required to accomplish their academic presentation tasks. Furthermore, as it followed the key students for more than one cycle of project work over the year, the study provides insights about their personal transformation through repeated involvement in oral presentation tasks.

³ However, Heath (1998, 1999, 2000b) conducted a series of ethnographic studies to examine L1 English-speaking adolescents’ preparation for and performance of a variety of tasks in non-school settings.
1.5 Previous Approaches to Task-Based Research

Many L2 researchers take a psycholinguistic\(^4\) approach to task-based research, which falls into several major strands (see Ellis, 2000, 2003; Skehan, 1998b). One strand draws upon the input/interaction model of second language acquisition (SLA). Inspired by the work of such scholars as Hatch (1978), Krashen (e.g., 1982), and Long (e.g., 1980, 1983), researchers in this tradition argue that in order for SLA to take place, learners need to receive abundant comprehensible input, and one effective way of making input comprehensible and manageable is to negotiate for meaning (Gass, 1997; Pica, Kanagy & Falodun, 1993). Negotiation of meaning is defined by Pica (1992) as “interactions in which learners and their interlocutors adjust their speech phonologically, lexically, and morphosyntactically to resolve difficulties in mutual understanding that impede the course of their communication” (p. 200). Thus, the goal of this research is to uncover which task types and conditions are apt to generate most interactional modifications (Ellis, 1994; Skehan, 1998b). For example, Futaba’s (1994) quasi-experimental study showed that his Japanese participants produced significantly more negotiation of meaning and negative feedback when paired with another Japanese participant than when paired with a native speaker of English and that there was no significant difference in input modification between those students in NS-NNS dyads and NNS dyads, suggesting that sharing a first language may contribute positively to SLA by yielding more negotiation.

Having reviewed various task-based L2 studies, Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993) identified several task features that play a critical role in promoting negotiated interactions. One of these features concerns information exchange. Research findings

\(^4\) Like Ellis (2000), I use the term “psycholinguistic” to refer to a computational model of second language acquisition, while acknowledging that Vygotsky’s theory can also be considered as psycholinguistic (see, for example, Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Lantolf & Ahmed, 1989; Wertsch, 1978).
suggest that two-way communication tasks generate significantly more negotiation work than one-way communication tasks (Long, 1980, 1989). This is because in a two-way task, all participants have fragments of relevant information which must be shared for successful completion of the task. Thus, tasks that require two-way information exchange are claimed to be more conducive to SLA than tasks that require one-way information exchange (Long, 1989; Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993).

Another influential strand of task-based L2 research is the cognitive approach proposed and developed by Skehan and his colleagues (e.g., Bygate, 1996, 2001; Foster & Skehan, 1996, 1999; Mehnert, 1998; Robinson, 2001a, 2001b; Skehan, 1996, 1998a; Skehan & Foster, 1997). Researchers in this psycholinguistic tradition argue that since humans are limited in their attentional capacities, they choose “to attend to some things at the expense of others, and the choice of attentional direction, as well as the use of attentional resources themselves, have costs as far as the processing of potential foregone material is concerned” (Skehan, 1996, p. 45). In other words, because of their limited information-processing abilities, it is difficult for individuals to attend to and process both form and meaning simultaneously (Skehan, 1998a; cf. Robinson, 2001a).

One major goal of this line of research is to contribute to L2 syllabus design by researching the relative complexity of various types of tasks, which provides a sound basis for pedagogical decisions for task sequencing (Robinson, 2001a; Skehan, 1998a, 1998b). Skehan (1996) discusses three aspects of task performance—accuracy, fluency and complexity—which are in competition for attentional resources. In other words, there are “trade-off effects” among these variables (Skehan, 1996, 1998a). Skehan suggests

---

5 Van Lier (1996) likewise states that “focal attention is a limited resource which cannot be directed toward several targets at once” (p. 75).
that task-based pedagogy should aim to help students achieve balanced L2 development and that good task choice will result in a sound balance between accuracy and fluency as well as in opportunities for previous restructuring to be integrated into ongoing L2 use.

Similarly, Bygate (1994) discusses the psycholinguistic and pedagogical rationale of the information-processing approach. He claims that psycholinguistically, the manipulation of tasks allows teachers to vary the amount and focus of pressure students are placed under in performing the task, and this provides them with the basis for evaluation of student performance and of task effects. Pedagogically, as Bygate claims, by manipulating different aspects of tasks, teachers can raise students’ awareness of the major purpose(s) of a given task. This ensures that students carry out current and future versions of the task with that purpose in mind (Bygate, 1994).

In both input-interaction and cognitive perspectives, task is thus viewed as a construct that determines the type of language use and information processing that learners will engage in and, it is claimed, the learning outcomes to be expected (see Ellis, Robinson, 2001a; Skehan, 1998a). However, as Coughlan and Duff’s (1994) study indicated, individuals’ perception of and orientation to the same task may differ and may also change over time, thus yielding potentially different activities each time (see also Lantolf & Ahmed, 1989; Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 2004; Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992; Roebuck, 2000). Likewise, Mercer (1992) argues that “any task or activity does not exist independently of the ways in which participants (experimenters and subjects, teachers and learners) contextualize it” (p. 33; see also Guberman, 1999; Peters, 1996 for similar arguments). Moreover, van Lier (1992), while acknowledging its contribution to the field, argues that by focusing on a certain form of negotiation of meaning (i.e.,
repair), much task-based L2 research “sidesteps the issue of contingency, or the quality of social interaction and its potential learning value, and blocks it from view” (p. 100; see also Nakahama, Tyler, & van Lier, 2001; Ondarra, 1997; van Lier & Matsuo, 2000).

Along these lines, increasing numbers of L2 researchers have recently turned to more context-sensitive approaches such as Vygotskian sociocultural, activity theory (e.g., Lantolf, 2000b; Ohta, 1995, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; van Lier, 1996, 2004), and language socialization (e.g., Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002b; Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992; Morita, 2000; Poole, 1992), perspectives that attribute greater agency to individuals (Duff, 2003; Hatano, 1993). Central to these sociocultural perspectives is the assumption that newcomers to a community develop their linguistic and sociocultural knowledge through observation of and participation in language-mediated interactions with the assistance of more experienced members of that community (Gutierrez, 1995; Heath, 1983; Ochs, 1988; Rogoff, 1990, 1995; Schieffelin, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978; Watson-Gegeo, 1992; Wertsch, 1991b; see also Lave & Wenger, 1991).

In such a perspective, human beings are viewed as active agents who can make choices about their own learning and socialization (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 1995, 2001; Wells, 1998a; see also Linell, 1998; Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996), both enabled and constrained by the environment (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Norton & Toohey, 2001; van Lier, 1996, 2000, 2002). Informed by these perspectives, some L2 researchers have recently examined the role of peer support in L2 classrooms beyond negotiation alone, reporting on students’ use of effective scaffolds (Donato, 1994) and the co-construction of linguistic knowledge and meaning through collaborative dialogues (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2000, 2001; see also Ohta, 1995, 2001). Other sociocultural studies, like earlier
computational ones (e.g., the aforementioned Futaba, 1994, study), have examined both the quality and quantity of ESL students' discourse as they performed different tasks with native speakers (NS) of English (Nakahama et al., 2001) and as they performed the same task with different nonnative interlocutors (van Lier & Matsuo, 2000).

1.6 Defining Key Terms

In this section, I will explain some of the key terms task, activity, task preparation, performance, project work, and academic task as they are used in this dissertation.

1.6.1 Task and Activity

The present study adopts Coughlan and Duff’s (1994) distinction between task and activity, which draws upon the perspective of activity theory (see Chapter 2) developed by Vygotsky’s colleagues and followers (e.g., A. N. Leont’ev, 1981; Wertsch, 1991b). Coughlan and Duff report that given the same picture-description task under the same conditions, different participants produced different types of discourse (see also Duff, 1993b). Moreover, their analysis showed that the same participant produced different types of discourse at different times, indicating that individuals as active agents can interpret tasks and perform them in ways that are different from those expected by the researcher. These findings lend support to several other studies that identified a great gap between teachers’ perceptions of tasks and those of students (Barkhuizen, 1998; Block, 1994, 1996; Kumaravadivelu, 1991; Nelson, 1990; see also Beckett, 1999). Based upon their findings, Coughlan and Duff (1994) argue that a task is “a blueprint” assigned to research participants for the purpose of eliciting linguistic data whereas an activity is participants’ construction and operationalization of the blueprint. In other words, a task is
something which researchers/teachers expect their participants/students to do whereas an activity is something which participants/students who have different motives, goals, and histories actually do. To use Breen’s (1987, 1989) words, task is a “workplan” developed by task designers including teachers, researchers, textbook writers, and learners themselves whereas activity is a “process” constructed by task participants.

More recently, Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) argue that even if individuals are engaged in the same overt behaviors, “cognitively, they are not all engaged in the same activity” (p. 148). This is because it is the activity that individuals engage in and the significance that L2 study has for them in their lives that shape their orientation to learn or not (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; see also Holliday, 1994 for a similar argument). All of these arguments “encourage us to study the process, not just the outcomes, of learning” (Mercer, 1992, p. 34, emphasis original). Examining more macro-level processes related to the task (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992, p. 88), including students’ task preparation, as well as their actual task performance, would help us gain more insights not only into the learning opportunities made available through group work (Ochs, 1988; van Lier, 2000), but also into their orientation to and contextualization of the task.

1.6.2 Task Preparation

In the L2 research literature, task preparation has often been conceived as pre-task planning. For example, several studies (e.g., Crookes, 1989; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Mehnert, 1998; Wendel, 1997) defined planning as providing participants with a limited amount of planning time (e.g., ten minutes) prior to doing researcher-developed tasks such as information gap tasks, narrative tasks, and decision-making tasks under different

---

6 As Tough’s (1971) study on adult learning projects suggests, individuals can set up tasks for their own learning. As such, a task is anything that individuals are assigned to do or choose to do for the purpose of furthering their learning (Williams & Burden, 1997).
conditions (see Skehan & Foster, 2001, for other definitions of planning). A central concern of these psycholinguistic studies is to find out what type of planning predisposes individuals to attend to which aspect(s) of L2 oral production--accuracy, fluency, or syntactic complexity (Skehan, 1996, 1998a)--while performing different tasks. For example, based on their findings, Foster and Skehan (1996) suggest that task performers seem to produce relatively accurate language when they are given planning time but no guidance as to how to use that time. However, as they report mainly on the outcomes of the tasks performed under different planning conditions,7 we do not know much about the types of activities participants actually engaged in during the planning stage. To examine students’ agency, the present study uses the term task preparation to refer to all activities that students choose to do in and out of class time in order to prepare for their ultimate task, which, in this case, is the oral presentation. As Legutke and Thomas (1991) say, “the presentation itself is an event of short duration, but it is preceded by a preparatory process of collective decision making, data reorganization and skill acquisition” (p. 179). However, although they may be given suggestions or guidelines by their teacher, the length and type of planning is for students to decide.

1.6.3. Performance

In this dissertation, the term performance is used in two senses. Firstly, this term is used to simply refer to the execution of tasks as it is commonly used in the literature on task-based learning and teaching (Brown et al., 1984; Bygate et al., 2001; Ellis, 2003; Foster & Skehan, 1999; Skehan, 1998a; Yule & Powers, 1994). Thus, performance in this

7 As Foster and Skehan (1999) point out, this seems to relate to the fact that most studies to date have focused on individual planning as opposed to group planning (cf., Donato, 1994) because “it is difficult to know exactly what has happened when subjects engage in solitary planning” (p. 222). One exception is Wendel’s (1997) study in which post-task retrospective interviews with participants were conducted in order to examine their activities during the individual “strategic planning” stage.
sense constitutes the major part of the activity that people construct based on the task as a blueprint (Coughlan & Duff, 1994), contrasting with the term preparation defined above.

Secondly, the term is used in a theatrical sense. Goffman (1981 cited in Jacoby, 1998) states that performers or those who present themselves before an audience implicitly “claim those platform skills for lack of which an ordinary person thrust upon the stage would flounder hopelessly” (p. 165). Moreover, Bauman (1977) defines performance as “a mode of spoken verbal communication [that] consists in the assumption of responsibility to an audience for a display of communicative competence” (p. 11). He goes on to say:

This competence rests on the knowledge and ability to speak in socially appropriate ways. Performance involves on the part of the performer an assumption of accountability to an audience for the way in which communication is carried out, above and beyond its referential content. From the point of view of the audience, the act of expression on the part of the performer is thus marked as subject to evaluation for the way it is done, for the relative skill and effectiveness of the performer’s display of competence. Additionally, it is marked as available for the enhancement of experience, through the present enjoyment of the intrinsic qualities of the act of expression itself. Performance thus calls forth special attention to and heightened awareness of the act of expression and gives license to the audience to regard the act of expression and the performer with special intensity. (p. 11)

What is commonly stressed by these definitions is that performers submit themselves to their audience’s evaluation for the form and content of their communication (Bauman, 1986; see also D. Willis, 2003). In other words, the performer’s job is to satisfy the audience by displaying their knowledge and skills effectively. As we will see later, some of the student participants in the present study saw their oral presentation tasks in this light. For the sake of clarity, I will use the term performance in combination with the term task as in task performance to denote the first sense.
1.6.4. Project Work

Since the present study focuses on L2 students’ oral presentations in the context of their project work, the notion of project will be introduced here. As several L2 researchers suggest (Beckett, 1999, 2002; Eyring, 2001; Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Wrigley, 1998; see also Kohonen, 2001), project work has deep roots in the work of educational philosophers such as Dewey (1916, 1938) and Kilpatrick (1918, 1925) that stressed social facets of learning and the role of the school in educating students to live cooperative, democratic lives (Schmuck, 1985). As Schmuck (1985) puts it,

Dewey argued that if humans are to learn to live cooperatively, they must experience the living process of cooperation in schools. Life in the classroom should represent the democratic process in microcosm, and the heart of democratic living is cooperation in groups. Moreover, Dewey argued that classroom life should embody democracy, not only in how students learn to make choices and carry out academic projects together, but also in how they learn to relate to one another. This approach could involve being taught to empathize with others, to respect the rights of others, and how to work together on rational problem-solving. (p. 2, cited in Eyring, 2001, p. 334)

Thus, the project was seen as a means by which students can practice cooperative and democratic forms of behaviors under the guidance of their teacher (Dewey, 1916, 1938). Congruent with this view, Stoller (1997, 2002) suggests that when incorporated into content-based classrooms, project work can help teachers “distance themselves from teacher-dominated instruction and move toward building a community of inquiry involving authentic communication, cooperative learning, collaboration, and problem-solving” (2002, p. 107).

According to Haines (1989), projects are student-centered, multi-skill activities, which allow students to choose topics or themes as well as methods for studying them. A project is defined by Bygate (1987) as “a learning activity in which students do an
element of research around a topic to produce a report” (p. 116). It is likewise defined by Wallace (1991) as “a kind of task-based activity which usually involves an extended amount of independent work, either by an individual student or by a group of students” (p. 46) and by Eyri ng (1989) as “a series of content-based activities which focus around one broad topic, which students have had measurable input in creating” (p. 7). Thus, a project involves a series of related tasks⁸ that require students to plan and carry out extended independent work on one broad topic, either in pairs, in groups, or individually by using a variety of skills and knowledge (Beckett, 2002; Beglar & Hunt, 2002; Bygate, 1987; Eyri ng, 1989; Haines, 1989; Helm, Beneke, & Steinheimer, 1998; Henry, 1994; Sheppard & Stoller, 1995; Stoller, 2002; Wallace, 1991). As such, much of project work occurs outside the classroom (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998; Fried-Booth, 1986, 2002; Richards & Schmidt, 2002; cf. Turnbull, 1998). From the activity theory perspective discussed above (Coughlan & Duff, 1994), like a task, a project can be seen as a “blueprint” for the work to be completed by students, but it is a bigger blueprint for students’ work that extends over a fairly long period of time.

Moreover, as Bygate’s (1987) definition quoted above suggests, project work entails an end product which often incorporates multiple literacies (Fried-Booth, 1986; Haines, 1989; Legutke & Thomas, 1991; Parks, 2000; Stoller, 1997, 2002; van Lier, 2003; Warschauer, 2000; Wray, 1988, 1999; see also Wells, 2003). According to Haines (1989), “A clearly defined and agreed upon end product is an essential feature of project work. Whatever its form, this end product should be the final result of the various tasks students engage in during the project” (p. 2). So the end product could be an oral

⁸ In contrast, Leung (2001) states that a task could be a short activity lasting a few minutes or a large project spanning over several lessons. In his view, a project is a kind of task.
presentation, a poster, a video display, a written report, a documentary movie, and so on. Some studies have suggested that tasks that require an end product of written text or oral performance might help L2 learners attend to the form of their language production since they are held accountable for their cumulative task-based interactions (Skehan, 1998a; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Swain, 2001b; D. Willis, 2003; J. Willis, 1996a, 1996b).

It has been suggested that project work can promote meaningful engagement with language and content as well as with higher-level thinking skills (Beckett, 1999, 2002; Jordan, 1997; Mohan, 1986, 2001; Stoller, 1997, 2002). Moreover, Wray (1999) states with respect to group project work that students can “learn from discussion, from sharing, from reading, and from contributing their part to something larger. Project work is an ideal activity in which this kind of learning through cooperation can take place” (p. 20). Grounded in the work of language socialization and Vygotskian sociocultural theory (e.g., Duff, 1995; Ochs, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978), the present study, like Beckett (1999; see also Mohan & Beckett, 2001), views project work as a means to students becoming more fully competent knowers and speakers about academic content and culture in their target communities.

1.6.5 Academic Tasks

I use the term academic task broadly to refer to tasks requiring discourse comprehension and/or production on academic subjects such as literature, science, social studies, and education (Duff, 1995, 2002b; Flowerdew, 1995; Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992, Morita, 2000, 2002; Tin, 2000). Completion of these tasks requires knowledge about subject matter as well as associated linguistic and interactional resources. Thus, academic tasks include listening to a lecture on some academic topic and taking notes,
leading and participating in a class discussion, giving an oral or poster presentation on a
research project or assigned reading, writing a reaction paper to course readings, and
writing a research paper, to name a few (Duff, 1995, 1996; Ferris & Tagg, 1996a, 1996b;
1993; Spack, 1998; Swales, 1990; Tin, 2000; Tracy, 1997; Weissberg, 1993; Zappa-
Hollman, 2002). Obviously, there is an overlap between the notion of academic task and
that of academic project.

1.7 Overview of the Dissertation

This dissertation consists of eight chapters. Chapter 2 will situate the present study in the literature by articulating, beyond the overview in this introductory chapter, theoretical perspectives that frame the investigation and by reviewing relevant task-based L2 studies. The first few sections of the chapter will explain major principles and concepts of sociocultural theories and review major studies in the area of language socialization. In the second section, some of relevant task-based studies will be reviewed under several headings such as peer collaboration and the role of L1 in L2 learning. In the final section, Rogoff’s (1995, 1998) three-plane analysis of activity will be introduced as a major conceptual framework for the study.

Chapter 3 will describe the methodology and data collection and analysis procedures used in the present study. In addition, it will present profiles of the key participants, both teachers and students, discuss the role of the researcher, and the trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and ethical considerations of the study.
Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 present the major findings of the present study. Chapter 4 will examine the community context of the presentation tasks. It will describe the institutional and classroom culture in which students undertook their academic tasks, highlighting the role of the teachers as socializing agents. Chapter 5 will illustrate students’ task preparation. It will show, by providing snapshots of their work at different stages, how the key students and their partners worked together out of the class time to accomplish their in-class presentations. Chapter 6 will report on students’ performance of their presentation tasks. The discourse of students’ actual presentations will be analyzed for self-regulation, peer collaboration, involvement strategies, research report, and discourse management, all of which are categories that emerged from the data. Chapter 7 will explore students’ learning across tasks and contexts. It will trace learning pathways taken by the original key students over the year. Finally, Chapter 8 will explore several major areas of findings and implications that are suggested by the present study.

Pedagogical implications include the importance of providing students opportunities to work on their projects in class time on a regular basis, to reflect on their L2 production by giving them a chance to reflect on their audio- or video-recorded performances or by having them transcribe their own speech, and to share their group experiences with other groups so as to help them make informed choices about their task preparation.

Implications for future research include the importance of asking students about their task performance to identify contingency across tasks and of examining the range of tools and resources used by students in their natural settings in order to undertake their academic tasks.
Chapter 2

SOCIOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVES ON TASK-BASED L2 RESEARCH:
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.0 Sociocultural Perspectives

The present study draws upon several theoretical perspectives that can be described collectively as sociocultural, including (1) Vygotskian sociocultural and activity theory (A. N. Leont’ev, 1978, 1981; Vygotsky, 1978, 1987; Wertsch, 1985, 1991b, 1998), (2) language socialization theory (Ochs, 1988; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), (3) Hallidayan social-semiotic theory (Halliday, 1978, 1993; Halliday & Hasan, 1985), and (4) situated learning theory (Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). According to Wertsch (1991b), “the basic goal of a sociocultural approach to mind is to create an account of human mental processes that recognizes the essential relationship between these processes and their cultural, historical, and institutional settings” (p. 6; see also Wertsch, 1990, 1998; Wertsch & Minick, 1990). In such a perspective, learning and development are seen to be situated within particular contexts or social, cultural worlds which are “constituted in

---

9 Sociocultural theories acknowledge biological factors (Bruner, 1983; Duff, 2003; Gauvain, 2001; Gee, 1996; Lantolf, 2000b, 2003; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Vygotsky, 1987; Wells, 2000; Wertsch, 1991b). Ochs and Schieffelin (1984) state: “sociocultural systems are to be considered as one force influencing language acquisition. Biological predispositions, of course, have a hand in this as well” (p. 309). Bruner (1983) likewise argues that it is the interaction between the innate, biologically constituted Language Acquisition Device and the socioculturally structured environment acting as the Language Acquisition Support System that makes it possible for the child to participate in the discourse community and the culture to which language provides access. To quote Gauvain (2001), “A focus on the social contributions to cognitive development does not imply that internal, biological contributions are unimportant” (p. 46).

10 Wertsch, del Rio, and Alvarez (1995) state: “‘cultural-historical’ or ‘sociohistorical’ are more appropriate terms when referring to the heritage we recognize from Vygotsky, Leont’ev, Luria, and many other Soviet psychologists. However, we believe that ‘sociocultural’ is a better term when it comes to dealing with how this heritage has been appropriated in contemporary debates in the human sciences, at least in the West” (p. 6, emphasis original, see also Wertsch, 1991b). I will use this term in this dissertation (see Cole, 1996; Mercer, 1994; Wells & Claxton, 2002 for other options).
relation with persons acting,” (Lave, 1993, p. 5; see also Lave, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978; Watson-Gecgo, 1992). In the first few sections of this chapter, I will outline the theoretical perspectives informing the present study, discussing their assumptions about language and learning. This will be followed by a review of the literature on task-based L2 studies informed by sociocultural theories.

2.1 Vygotskian Sociocultural and Activity Theory

2.1.1 Sociocultural Origins of Individual Mental Functioning

Vygotsky and his colleagues and followers have argued that children acquire the tools of thinking and learning through social interaction with more capable members of their community, and that this process be viewed in the context of their culture (e.g., Cole, 1996; Luria, 1976; Mercer, 1992, 2000; Newman, Griffin, & Cole, 1989; Rogoff, 1990, 2003; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978, 1981, 1987; Wertsch, 1991b, 1998). In Vygotskian sociocultural theory, language is considered to be a major tool that people use to participate in a variety of sociocultural activities. For instance, Mercer (1995b, 2000) states that people use language to think together, jointly make sense of experience, and solve problems. In this sense, language is a tool for doing joint intellectual activity or what Mercer terms “interthinking” (Mercer, 2000, p. 1). Furthermore, seeing learning as semiotic apprenticeship, Wells (1999a) suggests that cultural resources that mediate human actions and interactions include: “(a) attitudes and values concerning what are worthwhile activities to engage in; (b) understanding of the practice involved in these activities, and (c) mastery of the relevant artifacts and of the procedural and substantive knowledge associated with their use” (p. 138). Among these
resources, language is viewed to be “the master tool” (Cole, 1994, quoted in Wells, 1999a) or “the tool of tools” (Luria, n.d., cited in Cole, 1996; see also Wells, 1999a).

Vygotsky (1978, 1981) claims that children’s higher (cultural) mental functions, including abstract reasoning, intentional attention, planning, and decision making, are developed through language-mediated interpersonal activities led by adults or more competent peers. According to his genetic law of cultural development,

Any function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, the formation of concepts, and the development of volition. (Vygotsky, 1981, p. 163)

Thus, all the higher mental functions are viewed as evolving from social relations between human individuals (Vygotsky, 1978). Knowledge and skills of social origin become part of one’s internal functioning through a process called internalization.\(^\text{11}\)

Here, it is important to note that Vygotsky’s argument is not simply that social interaction results in children’s capacities to think logically, solve problems, or evaluate a variety of processes; it is rather that “the very means (especially speech) used in social interaction are taken over by the individual child and internalized” (Wertsch, 1981, p. 146). In other words, Vygotsky argues that learned social speech is transformed into silent inner speech or verbal thought. More importantly, Vygotsky’s notion of internalization does not refer to a mechanical process of covert imitation (Cazden, 1988), nor does it refer to “the wholesale transfer of external mediation to a preexisting internal plane” (Lantolf, 2000b, p. 14). As Wells (1999a) puts it, internalization always involves an active construction of

\(^{11}\) As Brown, Ash, Rutherford, Nakagawa, Gordon, and Campione (1993) put it, the concept of appropriation (Newman et al., 1989; Rogoff, 1990) is theoretically “more neutral with respect to the location of knowledge for those allergic to the notion of having anything inside the head” (p. 193, cf., Rogoff, 1993, 1995).
the corresponding process based on the individual’s current resources, which may subsequently transform the existing resources of the culture through inventive externalization of the internalized process. Cazden (1988) likewise rejects any mechanical conceptualization of internalization, referring to a study conducted by Resnick and her colleagues on mathematics instruction that found children’s invention of a more sophisticated algorithm than the one taught by their instructor. In short, internalization entails “agentive transformation” (Hicks, 1996, p. 136).

2.1.2 Learning in the Zone of Proximal Development

According to Vygotsky (1978), internalization is best facilitated by assistance aimed at learners’ Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), defined as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). To explain the mechanism of learning in the ZPD, Wertsch (1984) introduced the following concepts: situation definition, intersubjectivity (Rommetveit, 1974, 1979), and semiotic mediation. Situation definitions refer to ways in which participants in a task setting (e.g., an adult and child) define the situation. The same situation can be defined differently by different participants. Thus, the participants need to negotiate to create states of intersubjectivity. This is attained when the participants share the same situation and they are aware that they share the same situation definition, which establishes a common ground for communication. However, as intersubjectivity can exist at different levels, the participants have to negotiate further to create an intersubjective situation definition, using semiotic means, especially language. As Wertsch and Minick (1990) put it, the
ultimate goal of this negotiation is to socialize the novice into the expert’s situation
definition. To this end, the expert must “understand the subjectivity of the learner and
share it so as to influence it” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 89).

2.1.3 Private Speech as a Link Between Social and Inner Speech

According to Vygotsky (1986, 1987), what links social and inner speech as a
transitional stage of development is private speech (see also Berk, 1992). In fact, studies
conducted by Wertsch and his colleagues (Wertsch, 1985, cited in Lantolf, 2000b)
showed that in reconstructing a wooden puzzle in accordance with a given model, young
children first relied upon their parents’ support, but they later became able to perform the
task more independently by appropriating their parents’ verbal instructions in the form
self-addressed speech. This suggests that the children gradually learned to use private
speech, which originated from their social interaction with their parents, and with the
help of this mediational tool, they became able to regulate their own task performance.
However, internalized mental functions do not stay “underground” forever as exclusively
inner speech; they can resurface as private speech (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985; John-
Steiner, 1992; Lantolf, 2000b, 2003; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Ohta, 2001). Individuals,
faced with tasks of increased difficulty, may (re)externalize their inner speech in order to
control the tasks. From this perspective, “an adult is not an autonomous, finalized
knower, but an organism that recovers and utilizes earlier knowing strategies in situations
that cannot be dealt with by self-regulation alone” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, pp. 15-16).
This dynamic nature of human mental process is termed by Frawley and Lantolf (1985)
the principle of continual access.
2.1.4 ZPD, Scaffolding, and Beyond

Related to the Vygotskian notion of ZPD is the metaphor of scaffolding introduced by Bruner and his colleagues (Bruner, 1983, 1985; Wood, Bruner, and Ross, 1976) and elaborated on and researched by many other scholars using the Neo-Vygotskian framework (e.g., Cazden, 1988, 1992, 2001; Greenfield, 1984; Maybin, Mercer, & Stierer, 1992; Mercer, 1994, 1995b, 2000; Rogoff & Gardner, 1984; Stone, 1993). Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) identified the following functions of scaffolding:

1. Recruiting interest in and adherence to the task;
2. Simplifying the task;
3. Maintaining pursuit of the goal;
4. Marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal what is to be recognized as an ideal solution;
5. Controlling frustration during problem-solving;
6. Demonstrating solutions to the task.

Thus, scaffolding refers to various types of assistance, which guide a novice into an activity or task that is initially too difficult for him/her\(^\text{12}\) to perform on her own by reducing the experiences of failure in the task and by encouraging her efforts to advance (Maybin, Mercer, & Stierer, 1992, Mercer, 2000; van Lier, 1988, 1998a). This assistance involves attending to both cognitive and affective aspects of task performance.

The notion of scaffolding is based on the principle of handover (Bruner, 1983). Having examined social interaction between caretakers and young children playing peek-a-boo, Bruner (1983) views scaffolding as a “process of ‘setting up’ the situation to make the child’s entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skillful enough to manage it” (p. 60). In other words, scaffolds are flexible and temporary structures provided to assist children or novices in carrying

---

\(^{12}\) Like Linell (1998), instead of using the expressions of his/her and him/her each time I have an anaphoric reference to make to a prior occurrence of a noun used in a genetic sense (e.g., “a/the novice, a/the individual), I will use either “he (his, him)” or “she (her)” alternately in this dissertation.
out tasks. These structures are gradually removed as novices learn to regulate their own
task performance (Bodrova & Leong, 1996; Gibbons, 2002; van Lier, 1988, 1996,
1998a). Thus, scaffolding entails handover on the part of the expert and takeover on the
part of the novice (van Lier, 1988, 1998a; see also Edwards & Mercer, 1987). Mercer
(1992) illustrates how an eleven-year old girl successfully scaffolded a five-year-old
boy’s retelling of a picture book story, helping him accomplish something he might not
have accomplished alone.

The notions of ZPD and scaffolding have been further developed by Vygotsky’s
followers in developmental psychology, anthropology, and education—for example, as
assisted performance by Tharp and Gallimore (1988), as guided participation by Rogoff
(1990, 1995, 2003) and as construction zone by Newman et al. (1989). These researchers
place more emphasis on the roles of novices as active participants in their own
development as well as others in organizing activities and assisting the developing
competence of the novices. Rogoff’s notion of guided participation refers to “the process
and systems of involvement between people as they communicate and coordinate efforts
while participating in culturally valued activities” (1995, p. 142). As we will see later in
this chapter, this concept together with two other concepts constitutes Rogoff’s three-
plane analysis of sociocultural activity. The notion of guided participation refers not only
to face-to-face, expert-novice interaction, which has been the focus of much Vygotskian
research (see also Lave & Wenger, 1991, for a critique), but also to “the side-by-side
joint participation that is frequent in everyday life and the more distal arrangement of
people’s activities that do not require copresence” (p. 142, see also Rogoff, 2003).

Building on this work, Guberman (1999) examined Brazilian children’s commercial
transactions as mathematical activities in non-school settings and shows how caregivers can arrange children’s activities from a distance, thus extending Vygotsky’s notion of ZPD. As we will see later, this aspect of ZPD is relevant to the project work that the participants in the present study engaged in.

Moreover, van Lier (1996) proposes the notion of multiple zones of proximal development based mainly on the findings of an L2 study that he conducted with a colleague (van Lier & Matsuo, 2000). In this study, an adult learner of English, Yuko, had conversations with her friends who varied in L2 proficiency. Analysis of these conversations showed that in a conversation where Yuko and her partner were equally proficient, they both contributed to the conversation to a similar degree, whereas in a conversation where two participants differed in proficiency, the more proficient participant did most of the conversation management such as topic nomination, questioning, and back-channeling. This indicates that learners may benefit more in certain situations from symmetrical interactions than from interactions with interlocutors of higher proficiency. Van Lier and Matsuo also suggest, drawing on van Lier’s (1988) earlier work, that interactions with those less proficient may be beneficial to learners since they provide for them learning opportunities to make choices in L2 communication that are appropriate to settings, participants, topics, and activities. Furthermore, van Lier (1996) states, “learners of all ages need (or can benefit from) expert guidance, but in addition to that, older children and adults increasingly have inner resources on which they can rely to provide guidance and support to themselves” (p. 193). Thus, for van Lier (1996), the ZPD can be constructed in multiple ways using experts, peers of various proficiency levels, and the self as resources. This too extends the conception of ZPD in
Vygotsky’s theory, which emphasizes the roles of “experts” or members with more experience and knowledge (see also Ohta, 2001; Rogoff, 1990, 1993; van Lier, 1998b; Wells, 1999a, for discussions of peers as resources).

2.1.5 Activity Theory

Fundamental to the Vygotskian sociocultural framework is the notion of activity (Donato, 1988; A. N. Leont’ev, 1978, 1981; Minick, 1985; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wertsch, 1985, 1991b, 1998). As Wertsch (1985) says, the development of this notion owes a great deal to Vygotsky’s students and colleagues. For instance, A N. Leont’ev (1981) stresses the situated nature of activity, stating that:

Human psychology is concerned with the activity of concrete individuals, which takes place either in a collective—i.e., jointly with other people—or in a situation in which the subject deals with the surrounding world of objects—e.g., at the potter’s wheel or the writer’s desk. However, if we removed human activity from the system of social relationships and social life, it would not exist and would have no structure. With all its varied forms, the human individual’s activity is a system in the system of social relations. It does not exist without these relations. (p. 47)

In this sense, seemingly individual activities which do not entail the physical presence of others, such as making pottery and writing, are inherently situated, since the tools (e.g., wheels, desks, pens, language) mediating the activities are themselves culturally, historically, and institutionally situated (Cole, 1996; Wertsch, 1991b, 1998; Wink & Putney, 2002). To use Lantolf and Pavlenko’s (2001) words, each activity “carries with it historical consequences of other mediation” (p. 149).

In his theory of activity, A. N. Leont’ev (1978, 1981) proposes a three-level analysis to explicate the development of human consciousness. The most global level deals with activity energized by an object-related motive. For example, the activity of grocery shopping may be motivated by the need for food (Göncü, Tuerner, Jain, &
Johnson, 1999; Lave, Murtaugh, & de la Rocha, 1984). At this level, the shopper, although aware of what she needs, is not fully aware of what activity will entail (Göncü, Tuerner, Jain, & Johnson, 1999). The level of activity thus pertains to "why something is done" (Lantolf & Appel, 1994, p. 21). The intermediate level is concerned with a goal-directed action. Again, in the context of grocery shopping, the shopper may, for example, wish to go to the produce section to pick up some vegetables. To accomplish this goal, she may ask for directions to that section. It is this notion of goal-directedness that distinguishes actions from the third concept, operations governed by instrumental conditions. Operations are automated behaviors that require little conscious attention. For a shopper who is familiar with the store, turning the cart at the end of an aisle to move it to the next one may be automated (Göncü, Tuerner, Jain, & Johnson, 1999). Such operations are governed by the conditions of the grocery shopping such as lengths of aisles and the size of the cart. In short, the level of action addresses what is done whereas the level of operation addresses how it is done (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; A. N. Leont’ev, 1981).

A. N. Leont’ev (1981) argues that the same action can contribute to the realization of different activities; conversely, the same motive can lead to different goals, which in turn can generate different actions. Wertsch (1985) summarizes the theory of activity as follows:

An activity can be viewed as a social institutionally defined setting. An activity or activity system is grounded in a set of assumptions about appropriate roles, goals, and means used by the participants in that setting. In terms of levels of analysis in the theory of activity, one could say that an activity setting guides the selection of actions and operational composition of actions, and it determines functional significance of these actions. (p. 212)
Thus, the goal-directed action of going to the produce section in a supermarket, for example, can be performed in different activity settings, but the functional significance of this action will vary depending on whether the agent is doing everyday grocery shopping or working there (see Wertsch, 1985). As we will see later, the notion of activity has been incorporated into language socialization research (Ochs, 1988, 2002).

2.1.6 Bakhtin’s Contributions to Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory

In recent years, an increasing number of sociocultural theorists and L2 researchers have explored the compatibility of Vygotsky’s theory of learning and development and Bakhtin’s (1981, 1986; Volosinov, 1973) theory of dialogism (e.g., Cazden, 1993; Johnson, 2004; Ochs, 1988; van Lier, 1996; Wells, 1999a; Wertsch, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1998; Wertsch, Tulviste, & Hagstrom, 1993). Bakhtin (1986) states, “Language is realized in the form of individual concrete utterances (oral and written) by participants in the various areas of human activity” (p. 60). Utterances are produced by a voice or “the speaking personality, the speaking consciousness,” which “always has a will or desire behind it” (Emerson & Holquist, 1981, p. 432).

One of the most important characteristics of the utterance is addressivity or responsiveness. According to Bakhtin (1986), every utterance is directed to someone. In other words, it has both an author (speaker or writer) and an addressee. Similarly, Volosinov (1973) argues that a “word is a two-sided act” because it is “the product of reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addressee and addressee” (p. 86). This addressee, Bakhtin explains, can be an immediate interlocutor in a face-to-face conversation, a group of like-minded people or opponents, or the self engaged in “inner dialogue” (Volosinov, 1973, p. 38; cf. Vygotsky, 1987). It can also be a “virtual other”
who is not actually co-present (Linell, 1998, p. 35, following Bråten, 1992; see also
Wenger, 1998) or even an “indefinite, unconcretized other” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 95).
Smagorinsky (1997, 1998) reports on the addressivity exhibited by a high school student,
Doug, who participated in his case study on writing. As a research participant, Doug was
provided with a portable tape-recorder and asked to audio-record himself at his
convenience as he reflected on his writing activities. Despite the infrequent personal
contacts with the researcher as well as his physical absence, Doug often addressed the
researcher in his protocols. As Smagorinsky (1998) puts it, Doug was not simply
providing protocols, but he was providing them to someone. Such use of protocols was
also made by all of the participants in the present study who were asked to keep audio-
journals.

Bakhtin regards each utterance as a response (as understood in the broadest sense)
to previous utterances. Hence, the utterance is sociohistorically and socioculturally
situated in that it is responsive to other utterances as well as addressed to someone living
in a historical, cultural, and institutional setting (Wertsch, 1990, 1991b). In short,
Bakhtin’s use of the term utterance here seems to correspond with what others call
discourse and/or text (Hasan, 1996). However, as Hasan (1996) points out, Bakhtin also
uses the term to refer to a turn as in turn-taking or turn-allocation in conversation. To
avoid confusion, unless specified, I use the term utterance to refer to a unit of language
production (whether spoken or written) that is “inherently contextualized” (Schiffrin,
1994, p. 41). This meshes with Wertsch’s (1998) view that “language is a cultural tool
and speech is a form of mediated action” (emphasis original, p. 73).
The process by means of which an individual (or voice) speaks through a social language or voices of a social community is termed *ventriloquation* (Bakhtin, 1981; Wertsch, 1991b, 1998). According to Bakhtin (1981),

> The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes “one’s own” only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his words!), but rather it exists in other people’s mouths, in other people’s contexts, serving other people’s intentions: it is from there that one must take the word, and make it one’s own. (pp. 293-294)

What Bakhtin suggests here is that in speech communication, there are always at least two voices at work: the voice of the author (speaker or writer) producing the utterance and that of another author or other authors who have utilized the same patterns of discourse. As Wertsch, Tulviste, and Hagstrom (1993) put it, “from the perspective of how children come to be socialized such that they can function successfully in particular sociocultural settings, then, the issue is one of learning how to ventriloquate through new social languages” (p. 345). As we will see later in this dissertation (Chapters 6 & 8), the discourse socialization of the undergraduate students through their participation in oral academic presentations involved learning to speak through the voices of experts including their teachers, seniors, and textbook writers. Importantly, such learning process, according to Wells (1999a), is not limited to childhood, but continues throughout one’s life each time one encounters something new in the utterances of others as one engages with it in the context of a meaningful activity.

---

However, for some L2 speakers/writers, dictionaries are major sources from which they get their words.
2.2 Language Socialization Theory

2.2.1 Principles of Language Socialization and Early L1 Research

Another theoretical perspective informing the present study is work on language socialization (Heath, 1983; Ochs, 1988, 1990; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, 1996; Watson-Gegeo, 1992), which originates from linguistic anthropology (Hymes, 1972, 1974). According to Schieffelin and Ochs (1996),

The notion of language socialization is premised on two assumptions about the nature of language, culture, and socialization. First, the process of acquiring language is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of a society, and second, the process of becoming a competent member of society is realized to a large extent through language, by acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in and across socially defined situations. This is largely achieved through participation in exchange of language in particular social situations. (p. 252)

In other words, language socialization theory holds that children and other novices are socialized through language as they are socialized to use language (Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin, 1990). Thus, language and culture are seen to be inseparable, and language is considered to be both a major object and medium of socialization (Bloome & Bailey, 1992; Mohan, 1987; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). This meshes with the Vygotskian view of language as a major symbolic tool that mediates our mental and social activity (Vygotsky, 1987). The locus of language socialization is social activities in which children and other novices participate with other members of the

---

14 Jacoby and Ochs (1995) state: "to study language behavior, discourse, and social interaction...is to study communicative competence, not as an abstract construct or a model, but as it plays out in all its complexity as people go about managing their identities, their relationships, and their lives" (p. 179). It is in this sense that I use the terms "competent" and "competence" in the present dissertation.

15 According to Shweder, Goodnow, Hatano, LeVine, Markus, and Miller (1998), much of language socialization research has been inspired by the work of Edward Sapir, who stated: "Language is a great force of socialization, probably the greatest that exists" (Mandelbaum, 1949, p. 15).
society, such as adults, siblings, and peers. Ochs (1988), drawing upon the work of Vygotskian scholars, states:

> the notion of social activity is of central importance to the sociocultural perspective. Social activities involving language are structured by linguistic and sociocultural knowledge; at the same time it is through participation in these structured activities that children and other novices acquire knowledge in these two domains. (pp. 21-22)

In a similar vein, Rivera and Tharp (2004) state that “activity represents the framework society uses for communal actions and for the socialization of its members” (p. 206).

According to Jacoby and Ochs (1995), activities or speech events are co-constructed or “collaboratively built by co-participants” (p. 175). For example, some studies suggest activities such as storytelling and oratorical performances are “co-authored” not only by the teller and orator, but also by their audiences (Duranti & Brenneis, 1986; Tannen, 1989; see also Clark, 1996, for his view of story-telling in conversations as extended “joint projects”). Furthermore, Ochs (1990) suggests that through the process of language socialization, both novices and more competent members transform their knowledge structures and understanding vis-à-vis discourse and culture. For example, teachers may be socialized by their own students whom they are apprenticing into subject matter discourse. Their ways of communicating about the academic content as well as understanding of it may be transformed by their students’ classroom participation.

The majority of traditional language socialization studies, conducted mainly from late 1970s to 1980s, examined how children in various communities (often non-urban, non-Western) interacted with their caregivers and learned to use their first language (L1) in various sociocultural settings (see Duff, 2003; Watson-Gegeo, 2001, for a historical overview). Major language socialization studies include the research by Ochs (1988) with

For example, Heath (1983, 1986) conducted an ethnographic study in three culturally different rural communities located only a few miles apart in the Piedmont Carolinas, called Trackton (a black working-class community), Roadville (a white-working class community), and the community of townspeople (middle-class blacks and whites), and examined how children in these communities learned to use language in their homes and schools. She found that both Roadville and Trackton offered different literacy practices from those of the townspeople, and that neither community prepared its children for the school literacy practices. This study revealed how different “ways with words” shaped children’s academic success.

Language socialization practice can take either explicit or implicit forms (Ochs, 1990). One example of explicit socialization is what is called “elicited imitation routine,” in which an expert member of the community provide a verbal model for a novice and instructs the novice to follow this model (Ochs, 1990; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). For example, Schieffelin (1990) reports that there was much direct instruction in interactional routines in the Kaluli community she observed. According to Schieffelin, a Kaluli mother who wants her child to say something to someone other than herself, provides the language that she wants the child to use, followed by the imperative elema “say like this.”
Another type of relatively explicit socialization is that caregivers make assertions about social norms and expected behaviors, such as “Boys don’t cry” (Bernstein, 1972, cited in Ochs, 1990).

As the above review indicates, researchers have gained valuable insights into the process of language socialization from those relatively explicit practices and routines; however, as Ochs (1990) puts it, “the greatest part of sociocultural information is keyed implicitly, through language use” (p. 291). For example, Duranti and Ochs (1986) report that in traditional Samoan communities, if someone driving a car avoids crashing into another vehicle, the passenger will say, “Maaloo le fa’a’auli!” (Well done the steering!). The driver will then respond by saying “Maaloo le taapua’i!” (Well done the support!). According to Duranti and Ochs, underlying this practice is the traditional Samoan view that “something is accomplished because of and through the recognition that others are willing to give it” (p. 222). Thus, through repeated exposure to and engagement in the maaloo exchange in their lives, Samoan children may be apprenticed to view activities and tasks as collectively and not individually accomplished (Duranti & Ochs, 1986).

Relevant to this is what Ochs (1990, 1996) refers to as Indexicality Principle. According to Ochs (1996), socialization is partly a process of assigning indexical meanings to particular linguistic forms such as interrogative forms, diminutive affixes, and raised pitch. In the process of becoming more competent participants in their social groups, children learn to index sociocultural information through associations between particular linguistic forms and particular social identities, social acts and activities, affective and epistemic stances, and the like (Ochs, 1990, 1996, 2002). In the maaloo exchange discussed above (Duranti & Ochs, 1986), the speech act of acknowledging the
passenger’s contribution to the completed action (avoiding a collision with another vehicle) indexes an ideology of joint task accomplishment in traditional Samoan communities (Ochs, 1990, 1992).

Ohta (1991) examined how native speakers of Japanese use linguistic resources to index their epistemic stance. According to Ohta, epistemic stance, which provides information about the speaker’s commitment to the truth of his message, the speaker’s sources of knowledge, and the speaker’s certainty about his utterance, is communicated through epistemic markers. As Ohta says, learning to use these markers is an important part of language socialization because they are the resources that people draw on to display their knowledge and construct themselves as experts or novices. Ohta’s analysis of a conversation showed that her participants frequently used epistemic markers including adverbials (e.g., apparently) and sentence final particles that reduce responsibility for their utterances. Ohta suggests that the use of these markers may be instrumental in increasing the politeness of the speakers’ utterances because it helps their interlocutors to maintain or contribute their own points of view. In sum, the Principle of Indexicality is seen to be central to language socialization research. Ochs (1996) explains, “indexical knowledge is the core of linguistic and cultural competence and is the locus where language acquisition and socialization interface” (Ochs, 1996, p. 414).
2.2.2 Language Socialization beyond Early Childhood and across Languages and Cultures

Although many studies have focused on small children learning language and culture, language socialization is viewed as a lifelong process\(^{16}\) through which individuals transform themselves and others as they participate in different sociocultural activities and adopt shifting expert-novice roles (Heath, 1999; Ochs, 1988, 2001). In their edited volume, *Kids Talk: Strategic Language Use in Later Childhood*, Hoyle and Adger (1998) comment that the contributors to the volume would all agree that language socialization “does not stop at the age of five or six (in fact, it can be argued it never stops)” (pp. 3-4). In the same volume, Heath (1998) reports on the language socialization of adolescents in out-of-school youth-based organizations such as performing arts programs and sports leagues (see also Heath, 1991, 1999, 2000b, 2001; Heath & McLaughlin, 1993). Many of the participants in these organizations saw themselves to be “marginalized” in their schools and feared by adults in their institutions and neighborhoods. However, in the youth organizations, they were regarded not as problems to be fixed or remedied, but as fundamental resources to be cultivated and as assets to themselves and their society (Heath, 1999, 2000b; McLaughlin, 1993). Moreover, the participants were allowed to make important decisions about the activities of the organization. Findings suggest that the youth were afforded many opportunities to plan their organizational activities and prepare and evaluate their own performance with each other and under the guidance of adult leaders and older members, and by participating in

\(^{16}\) Given the existence of internal biological predispositions, one may question this view. However, as Gee (1996) puts it, “even if biology does determine large parts of the grammar of human languages, this fact is germane only to rather formal (and sentence-level) parts of language. It still leaves language as an interactive and communicative phenomenon to be explained in terms of sociocultural aspects of human activities” (p. 272).
these activities, they learned over time to use complex linguistic structures that reflects planning, hypothesizing, and self-evaluating (Heath, 1998). This seems to lend support to Vygotsky’s claim regarding the social foundations of higher mental functions including planning, problem-solving, and logical thoughts (Vygotsky, 1981, 1987).

Furthermore, Jacoby’s (1998) study reports on the language socialization practice of a group of physicists at an American university, focusing on their conference talk rehearsals. Conversation analysis indicated that participants in the speech event co-constructed post-rehearsal feedback as “common sequences” through which the presenter and comment providers pursued consensus as to what was problematic in the presentation and how those problems should be resolved for future performances.

The theory of language socialization has recently been applied also to L2 and bilingual/multilingual studies conducted in a variety of settings (e.g., Bayley & Schecter, 2003; Crago, 1992; Duff, 1995, 1996, 2002b; Morita, 2000; Ohta, 1994, 1995; Poole, 1992; Willett, 1995; see Duff, 2003; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003 for reviews). Like Heath’s (1983) study, Crago (1992) found that Inuit children in her study experienced a disjunction between the L1 discourse behaviors expected at home and those required in French lessons at school. Likewise, Harklau (1994) and Atkinson and Ramananthan (1995) reported on the discontinuity that L2 students experienced as they moved from ESL to mainstream programs at a US high school and university, respectively. In her ethnographic study, Willett (1995) examined the participation of four ESL first graders (three girls and one boy) at an American elementary school located in a small international community of graduate students and their families. While the three girls successfully completed their tasks by working collaboratively, the boy experienced
difficulty appealing for help from his classmates and depended on the teachers much more often than the girls. This difference led the adults to see the girls as hard workers and good students and the boy to be a “needy child who could not work independently” (p. 497). Willett explains that the boy’s difficulty related to the social norms of the boys in the classroom that downplayed help-seeking. In short, this study showed how the sociocultural ecology of the classroom shaped the children’s identities as well as their use of interactional routines and strategies.

Moreover, drawing on the Principle of Indexicality (Ochs, 1990), Poole (1992) investigated the types of cultural messages that teachers of beginning-level ESL classes at an American university displayed through classroom discourse. Through her analysis of the interactions that these teachers had with their students, Poole found that they encoded in their discourse cultural norms and beliefs vis-à-vis (a) expert accommodation of novice incompetence, (b) task accomplishment (as individual product), and (c) the display of asymmetry. These routine interactional patterns, Poole reports, were in agreement with a number of Ochs and Schieffelin’s (1984) interpretations of middle-class American caregiver language. This suggests that a teacher’s language use is culturally shaped to a much greater degree than previously acknowledged by most L2 research literature. I will review some language socialization studies that focused particularly on students’ participation in academic tasks later in this chapter.

2.3 Hallidayan Social-Semiotic Theory

Thirdly, the present study is informed by Hallidayan social-semiotic theory (e.g., Halliday, 1970, 1978, 1993; Halliday & Hasan, 1985). As several scholars suggest (e.g., Martin, 2000; Mercer, 1995a; Wells, 1999a, 1999b), including Halliday (1994b) himself,
this theory appears to be compatible with the Vygotskian sociocultural and language socialization perspectives discussed above. Like Vygotsky (1987) and unlike Chomsky (1965), Halliday (1970) views language as a resource for making meaning, not as rules which are formalized in the individual’s head, thus rejecting the competence-performance dichotomy. This resonates with Bakhtin’s interest in utterances (Hasan, 1996).

According to Halliday (1993), “the prototypical form of human semiotic is language, ...the ontogenesis of language is at the same time the ontogenesis of learning” (p. 93). Moreover, Halliday (1978) too articulates a language socialization perspective:

The child learns his mother tongue in the context of behavioural settings where the norms of the culture are acted out and enunciated for him, settings of parental control, instruction, personal interaction and the like; and, reciprocally, he is ‘socialized’ into the value systems and behaviour patterns of the culture through the use of language at the same time as he is learning it. (p. 23, emphasis added)

Like Ochs and Schieffelin (e.g., Ochs, 1988, Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Schieffelin, 1990), Halliday sees language socialization as comprising both socialization in the ways of language and socialization through language (Mohan, 1987). Moreover, he discusses the centrality of language in socialization:

In the development of the child as social being, language has the central role. Language is the main channel through which the patterns of living are transmitted to him, through which he learns to act as a member of a “society”—in and through the various social groups, the family, the neighborhood, and so on—and to adopt its “culture,” its modes of thought and action, its beliefs and its values. This does not happen by instruction, at least not in the pre-school years; nobody teaches him the principles on which social groups are organized, of their systems of beliefs, nor would he understand it if they tried. It happens indirectly, through the accumulated experience of numerous small events, insignificant in themselves, in which his behavior is guided and controlled, and in the course of which he constructs and develops personal relationships of all kinds. All this takes place through the medium of language. (p. 9)
Here, again like Ochs and Schieffelin, Halliday is referring to the relatively implicit nature of language socialization. To borrow Ochs's (1986) words, children “acquire tacit knowledge of principles of social order and systems of belief (ethnotheories) through exposure to and participation in language-mediated interactions” (p. 2, emphasis added). In short, the social-semiotic view of language development encourages us to regard education as a process in which people learn to participate in their society as they develop language practices that fulfill functions that are valued by that society (Cooper, 1990).

In their book on English casual conversation, Eggins and Slade (1997) state that Halliday's theory of language can be characterized as a “semantic-functional theory of language” (p. 48). They explain that it is functional in that it construes conversation as a goal-oriented behavior, and that it is semantic in that it regards conversation as a meaning-making process. Halliday (1978) identified three metafunctions of language: ideational (experiential and logical), interpersonal, and textual. The ideational function enables us to make sense out of our experiences and to describe how things are related. Halliday (1978) describes this function as “expressing the speaker's experience of the external world, and his own internal world, that of his own consciousness” (p. 45). The interpersonal function encodes relations among people in social situations. Language is a major means through which individuals take part in the world, interact with others, negotiate roles and identities, and establish and maintain rapport (Derewianka, 1999; Eggins & Slade, 1997). Finally, the textual function allows us to organize ideational and interpersonal meanings into a coherent text (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, & Yallop, 2000). Ideational meanings realize field, interpersonal meanings realize tenor and textual meanings realize mode. These three parameters together constitute the “register” of a
text--both spoken and written, and define the context of situation (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). Here it is important to note that the relationship between text and context is bidirectional. As Halliday (1978) explains, “the context plays a part in determining what we say; and what we say has a part in determining the context” (p. 3). Thus, a text both shapes and is shaped by its context (Derewianka, 1999).

2.4 Situated Learning Theory

Finally, the present study is informed by Lave and Wenger's (Lave, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) situated learning theory (see also Lave, 1988). Based on their analysis of situated learning in various communities including traditional midwives in Yucatan, tailors in Liberia, butchers in U.S. supermarkets, and participants in an Alcoholic Anonymous (A.A.) program, Lave and Wenger, like Rogoff (1990, 1995, 2003), argue that central to learning as situated activity is a process similar to apprenticeship termed “legitimate peripheral participation.” According to Lave and Wenger, this process refers to “the point that learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and that the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community” (p. 29). Lave and Wenger go on to say that the concept of legitimate peripheral participation “provides a way to speak about the relations between newcomers and old-timers, and about activities, identities, artifacts, and communities of knowledge and practice. It concerns the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice” (p. 29). For example, apprentice tailors in Liberia learn to produce clothes in reversed order. That is, they first learn the completing stages of producing a garment, then learn to sew it, and finally learn to cut it out. This practice not only provides the
novices with opportunities to consider how the previous step leads to the present one, but also helps minimize the scope for serious failures.

Of particular interest to the present study is the case of the A.A. program (Cain, n.d., cited in Lave & Wenger, 1991). Newcomers to this community attended several meetings a week with near-peers and more experienced members. Their meetings comprised whole group sessions and smaller group discussions. In the former, old-timers would tell elaborated stories about their lives as alcoholics, which they had polished over time. In the latter type of sessions, participants tended to talk about the content of a story about the reconstructed life. Newcomers learned to tell their stories not through explicit instruction, rather through exposure to A.A. models and through interaction with old-timers. Thus, in their attempts to tell stories, newcomers were not corrected unless their interpretations ran counter to the group’s beliefs. Rather, old-timers, while ignoring inappropriate parts of the newcomer’s story, would build on appropriate parts of it in their comments, provide analogous accounts with different interpretations, or compare the newcomer’s stories with their own.

By participating in such practices, newcomers became socialized into the A.A. model of alcoholism encoded in the practices. This socialization included learning the group’s propositions, and learning to use appropriate episodes as evidence and to make culturally valued interpretations of events. Becoming a member of this community therefore required not only cognitive change in the individual, but also the mastery of particular forms of discourse through legitimate peripheral participation in the A.A. community of practice. To quote Lave and Wenger (1991), “learning to become a legitimate participant in a community involves learning how to talk (and be silent) in the
manner of full participants” (p. 105). Another important aspect of the socialization was newcomers’ transformation of their identities as “non-drinking alcoholics.” To remain in the community, members must make continuing efforts not to drink. By participating in the practice of telling personal stories, they came to understand that they were alcoholics. As such, recovery in this context was not just a transformation of behavior, but also a transformation of identity and narratives/discourse.

In sum, Lave and Wenger view learning as increasingly responsible participation in a community of practice. Newcomers learn the sociocultural practices of their community and transform their identities through a process of apprenticeship called legitimate peripheral participation, becoming different persons with respect to the possibilities enabled by the social environment (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Lave and Wenger explain that the key to this learning is access by newcomers to a wide array of communal resources including artifacts, information, and the knowledge and skills of old-timers and other members as well as opportunities for participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). As such, this theory resonates with the theory of language socialization reviewed above.

2.5 Human Agency in Sociocultural Theories

in sociocultural perspectives, including those inspired by Vygotsky and his colleagues, people are not viewed “as passive bearers of unconscious patterns of language and culture, but rather as active agents whose actions and sensibilities at different moments influence the organization, meaning, and outcome of events” (p. 6). For example, in the theory of activity (A. N. Leont’ev, 1981), the individual person is visualized as an active agent who makes something that was not her own into something new that belongs to the person, although in a novel form (Valsiner, 1998). A good example of this would be a Japanese student’s creative use of her professor’s utterance reported in Morita’s (2002) study. Rie, who felt isolated not being able to participate as much as some of her classmates in discussions based on technical readings in one of her graduate courses, sent her professor an email message explaining her situation and asking her to make certain adjustments to her classes. In that message, Rie used the term “voiceless,” taking it from the professor who stressed this notion in the course related to educational equity. In other words, the student appropriated her professor’s utterance in her attempt to change the learning environment. As mentioned earlier, language socialization is seen as a reciprocal process through which children and others novices both socialize and are socialized by more competent members through discourse (Ochs, 1990). Just like the relationship between text and context as discussed by Halliday (1978), the relationship between people and their physical and social environment is therefore bidirectional; in other words, their actions both shape and are shaped by the environment (Ahearn, 2001a; Norton & Toohey, 2001; van Lier, 1996, 2000; Vygotsky, 1997).

Linell (1998) defines human agency as “the ability to think and act freely (under the given circumstances)” (p. 270), and discusses two characteristics of this ability, both
of which distinguish human beings from computers. The first is “the ability to instigate events or initiate actions (or inhibit impulses for action) in ways that can be described as due to ‘choice’ or ‘free will’” (p. 271). Likewise, Harré (1983) considers “pure” agency as involving the capabilities to decide between alternatives and to overcome temptations and distractions to realize plans. To put it another way, agency assumes choice (Bruner, 1996; A. A. Leont’ev, 1981). Thus, some individuals may choose to participate actively in a certain event while others may choose not to participate in it at all (Eyring, 1989; Lantolf & Genung, 2002; Morita, 2002; Norton, 2001; Shamim, 1996), and such actions and inactions have reasons (Bruner, 1996; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001).

The second characteristic of human agency that Linell (1998) discusses is the capability to assign meaning to situations, events, behaviors, and actions. Here, Wenger’s (1998) story about two stonemasons becomes pertinent. When asked what they are doing, one of them answers that he is cutting a stone in a perfectly square shape while the other answers that he is building a cathedral. Even though these two individuals are doing the “same” thing, they assigned different meanings to it, thus having different experiences. Wenger argues that this experiential difference may have consequences, suggesting that the two stonemasons may be learning different things from the same activity.

Additionally, Pepper (1995), portraying newcomers to an organization as active participants in their own socialization, states that they do not just assimilate the framework of the new organization; rather, they negotiate meanings with people around them, both experienced members and other newcomers (see also Gutierrez, 1995).

Moreover, although not from a sociocultural perspective, Bandura (1997) defines human agency as “acts done intentionally” (p. 3). He then cites Davidson (1971) as
saying that agentive acts or actions intended to fulfill a certain purpose can lead to an unexpected outcome, referring to the example of Hamlet. Hamlet intentionally stabbed the man through the curtain, believing that he was King Claudius. But Hamlet later found to his great horror that he had killed Polonius instead. In this case, the killing of the man behind the tapestry was intentional, but the killing of Polonius was not. Therefore, “effects are not the characteristics of agentive acts; they are consequences of them” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Bandura’s (1997, 2001) social cognitive theory extends the notion of human agency to collective agency. People as social beings often work together to produce outcomes they desire. According to Bandura, the essence of collective agency is that people share the belief that by working together, they can produce desired effects. Harré (1993) also states that people as active agents act together intentionally to accomplish a variety of common tasks and that these actions are shaped by the norms and conventions of the community of which they were part. Likewise, Bruner (1996) develops a link between agency and collaboration, saying that an agentive mind “seeks out dialogue and discourse with other active minds” (p. 93) and that it is through this dialogic, discursive process that people come to know others and their points of views. Here, it is important, however, to note that the relations among agencies can be conflictive at one time and collaborative at another (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001).

Furthermore, informed by Vygotskian sociocultural theory, Wertsch and his associates (Wertsch, 1998; Wertsch & Bivens, 1992; Wertsch et al., 1993) see agency as socially distributed and shared (see also Salomon, 1993), and incorporate the notion of semiotic mediation. For example, Wertsch et al. (1993) write:

Individual(s) involved certainly continues to bear the major responsibility for initiating and carrying out an action, but the possibilities for formulating certain
problems, let alone the possibilities for following certain paths of action are shaped by the mediational means employed. The resulting picture is one in which the irreducible unit of analysis for agency is “individual(s)-operating-with-mediational means.” (p. 342)

Here, agency is seen to “extend beyond the skin”\textsuperscript{17} (p. 337) in two senses. Firstly, it applies not only to individuals, but also to groups of people functioning on the interpsychological plane (see also Spivey, 1997). Secondly, it is mediated by cultural means, tools and signs, especially language (see also Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001). Wertsch and Bivens (1992) state that these mediational means are usually not invented anew by the individuals using them, but rather are provided largely by the cultural, historical, and institutional context in which these individuals live. This point suggests that human beings are “empowered as well as constrained in specific ways by the mediational means of a sociocultural setting” (Wertsch & Bivens, 1992, p. 41). Another Vygotskian scholar, Matusov (2000) sees agency as the final authority over an individual’s action and as involving “processes of developing and prioritizing goals, problems and choices, problem-solving, and making and realizing solutions (including moral ones)” (p. 396).

Like Wertsch et al. (1993), he believes that agency has essentially a sociocultural nature, because, as Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism outlined earlier suggests, “the final cause of an individual’s actions always has a distributed character in time, space, meaning, and among direct and indirect participants of the activity” (p. 396). This also meshes with Ahearn’s (2001b) view of agency as “the socioculturally mediated capacity to act” (p. 111, cited in Hall, 2002). According to Hall (2002), this view situates agency “in the

\textsuperscript{17} This is a paraphrase by Wertsch et al. (1993) of Bateson (1972), who argues that it often makes little sense to attempt to determine a boundary between the agents and their mediational means, providing a example of a hypothetical blind man who makes use of a cane to get feedback as he negotiates his immediate environment.
discursive spaces between individual language users and the conditions of the moment (p. 35).

Informed by these sociocultural and sociocognitive perspectives, I view agency as involving the capacities to make choices and to assign meanings to situations, events, behaviors, and actions. As such, agentive acts can take various forms including cooperation, accommodation, compliance, non-conformity, and resistance (Ahearn, 2001a; Packer, 2001; see also Duff, 2002b). I also see agency as applying to people working as a group as well as to individuals acting alone. People often collaborate to accomplish their common goals using a variety of cultural means. In such situations, agency is distributed and shared. However, individuals are not completely free to make any choices they like, as their actions and perceptions are fundamentally shaped by the sociocultural contexts in which they are embedded. Agency therefore is socioculturally mediated.

In this chapter, I have so far outlined four major sociocultural perspectives informing the present study, paying attention to some of their major principles and concepts and some related studies. In the next section, I will review some of the task-based L2 studies that draw on the theoretical perspectives outlined above.

2.6 Task-Based L2 Studies Informed by Sociocultural Theories

2.6.1 Peer Collaboration

Several task-based L2 studies have recently reported that peer collaboration allowed their participants to perform tasks that were beyond their individual levels, thus providing them with rich L2 learning opportunities (e.g., Donato, 1994; Ohta, 1995,

---

18 The potential role of peer collaboration and cooperative learning has recently been explored by researchers in various fields including educational psychology and L1 literacy education (e.g., Forman & Cazden, 1985; Hertz-Lazarowitz & Miller, 1992; Hogan & Tudge, 1999; Wells, 1999a).
2001; Storch, 1999; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; van Lier & Matsuo, 2000). For example, Donato (1994) examined group interaction among three students of French at an American university as they prepared for an oral activity based on a scenario by Di Pietro (1987). His microgenetic analysis of this task-related discourse showed that these L2 students collectively strived to achieve grammatical accuracy and that they were able to provide one another with scaffolds similar to those which experts provide novices, as reported in developmental psychological studies, suggesting that learners themselves can be seen as a source of knowledge in sociocultural context. Moreover, some of the scaffolded utterances identified during the planning session were observed in the solo performance of the students. This serves as evidence to indicate that the collective scaffolding documented in the study may have resulted in L2 development.

Ohta (1995) examined teacher-fronted and peer interaction involving two students in an intermediate Japanese class at an American university. She analyzed how students at different levels of proficiency used polite requests, focusing on an instructional sequence comprising a pair role-play activity and the teacher-fronted pre- and post-task activities. One of the focal students, Becky, was more proficient in Japanese than the other, Mark. Analysis showed that unencumbered by teacher allocation of conversational turns and from the formality of public performance in a whole-class situation, these students were able to use the L2 for a variety of purposes in collaborative pair interaction: for example, to work on the assigned task, to express humor, to actively test hypotheses through language play, to talk about the here-and-now in Japanese, and to experiment with lexical choice. Her analysis showed that despite the difference in L2 proficiency, both Becky and Mark benefited from the interaction. They were able to share each
other’s strengths and learn from each other, achieving a higher level performance than might have been achieved by either of them working alone. Like the aforementioned study by van Lier and Matsuo (2000), this study expanded Vygotsky’s notion of ZPD.

More recently, drawing on Vygotsky’s notion of language as a mediational means, Swain and Lapkin conducted a series of studies to examine how students’ engagement in collaborative dialogue might contribute to their L2 learning (Swain, 1995; 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2000, 2001; see also Swain, Brookes, & Tocall-Beller, 2002 for a review). For example, Swain and Lapkin (1998) examined task interaction by two French immersion students, which was part of data collected in a larger study. In this study, student dyads were given a set of numbered pictures, and instructed to jointly make a story based on the pictures and then write it out. Discourse analysis showed that the two grade eight students used language--both their L1 and L2--to co-construct the language they needed to express the meaning they wanted and to co-construct knowledge about language. Swain and Lapkin conclude that collaborative dialogues serve as a mediating tool for L2 learning as well as for communication. This leads us to the review of role of L1 in L2 learning.

2.6.2 The Role of L1 in L2 Learning

While use of L1\(^{19}\) may not be considered desirable in many L2 classrooms (see Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Stryker & Leaver, 1997 for relevant discussions), its useful roles in L2 learning have recently been reported by an increasing number of task-based studies (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Brooks, Donato, &

\(^{19}\) There is a growing body of literature on use of L1 in L2 classrooms (e.g., Broner, 2000; Cook, 2001; Collins, 2001; Duff & Polio, 1990; Faltis, 2001; Faltis & Hudelson, 1998; Hall, 2001; Kaneko, 1992; Liang, 1999; Liang & Mohan, 2003; Nikolov, 2002; Polio & Duff, 1994; Stryker & Leaver, 1997; van Lier, 1992, 1995).
McGlone, 1997; de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Fotos, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2000; Platt & Brooks, 1994). For example, Brooks and Donato (1994) report on the use of L1 by high school students of Spanish during a jigsaw task. The analysis showed that some students used English (L1) to talk about the task, which allowed them not only to regulate the discourse and the task, but also to sustain their conversation in the L2. Antón and DiCamilla (1998) examined the use of L1 in the task-based interactions of adult native speakers of English enrolled in an intensive Spanish class. These students were audio-recorded as they collaboratively worked on writing tasks in pairs. Their analysis indicated that students used L1 (1) to provide each other with scaffolded help, (2) to create and sustain states of intersubjectivity with each other, and (3) in the form of private speech to regulate their own mental activity (see Wells, 1998b for a response to this article). These findings, according to Antón and DiCamilla, suggest that use of L1 is beneficial for L2 learning as it serves as “a critical psychological tool to create a social and cognitive space” (p. 338) in which individuals are able to provide each other and themselves with help in their meaning-making effort.

More recently, Swain and Lapkin (2000) examined the use of the L1 by French immersion students in two tasks, the dictogloss task and the jigsaw task. The former task involved individually taking notes on an L2 text read aloud twice at normal speed and then jointly reconstructing it as a written text, whereas the latter involved jointly constructing a story based on a series of pictures first orally and then in writing. Swain and Lapkin found that lower-achieving student dyads produced more turns in L1 than higher-achieving student dyads. They also found that task types influenced the functions of the L1. Students who performed the dictogloss needed to use their L1 to comprehend
the story more than those who performed the jigsaw. The former group used the L1 to understand the oral text whereas the latter used the L1 mainly to do vocabulary search. Swain and Lapkin conclude that this difference may have to do with the stimuli used for the tasks: textual versus visual. In short, these task-based studies all seem to support the view that the L1 can serve as a vital tool that mediates L2 learning (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Platt & Brooks, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

Moreover, Liang and Mohan’s (2003; Liang, 1999) study on cooperative learning adds complexity to this literature on L1 use. Their participants were Chinese immigrant students from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and China, enrolled in ESL classes at a Canadian secondary school. An analysis of interviews with students suggested that many of them had ambivalent feelings about use of L1 and L2 during task-based group work in class. While students gave reasons for their use of L1, including speed and convenience, perceived lack of L2 vocabulary, lack of familiarity with L2 use among same-L1 speakers, and peer pressure, they expressed their desire to speak more English and not to speak their L1 in ESL classes. Furthermore, a functional analysis of the students’ task-based interaction illuminated differences in the functions of their L1 and L2 discourse. For one thing, it was found that while their L2 was employed much more for ideational functions than for interpersonal functions, their use of the L1 for the two functions was much more evenly balanced. Another finding was that the L1 was employed more for reasoning (as opposed to informing, Staab, 1986) than the L2. Liang and Mohan report that while the L1 was used to help learn the L2 and content knowledge, the L2 was often used to perform more immediate and concrete actions such as memorizing questions and answers for tests and writing answers to questions for assignments as well as to negotiate
content only learned in English. This study sheds a useful light on L2 students’ use of L1 and L2 for academic purposes and their dilemmas over the language choice.

2.6.3 Activity Theory and L2 Tasks

Several task-based L2 studies have been informed by activity theory (e.g., Brooks & Donato, 1994; Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Donato, 1988; Roebuck, 2000; see Ellis, 2003; Lantolf, 2000a, 2002 for reviews). In the aforementioned study on scaffolding by Donato (1994), no attempt was made to force the students to use their L2, to influence the process of their task completion, or structure their task interaction in terms of what steps to take or what to focus (form and/or meaning). However, presented with the choice as to how to plan and structure the activity, the students attended to grammatical accuracy as a collective and provided each other with linguistic scaffolds (Donato, 1988, 1994). As Donato (1994) explains it, “Focusing on form was not a requirement for the task but rather how the students operationalized their motive for activity at the particular point in the interaction” (p. 43). In other words, striving for grammatical accuracy was an agentive act that the students performed together.

As briefly mentioned in Chapter 1, the present study adopts Coughlan and Duff’s (1994) distinction between task and activity.20 The researchers report that given the same picture-description task under the same conditions, different participants produced different types of discourse and the same participant produced different types of discourse at different times. This indicates that individuals as active agents can interpret tasks and perform them in ways that are different from those expected by the researcher, and that researchers need to study the situation as defined by their participants themselves.

20 As Coughlan and Duff (1994) note, Newman et al. (1989) made a similar observation based on their comparison of tasks in laboratory settings with the “same tasks” in other settings.
Moreover, Coughlan and Duff's data also illustrated how expert-novice roles shifted in a moment-by-moment fashion in the task interaction between a Cambodian participant and the researcher, suggesting that the nature of task can vary depending on a number of resources the co-participants bring to the task, including topic familiarity and L2 proficiency (see also Ohta, 1995, for a similar finding).

More recently, inspired by the work of Coughlan and Duff (1994), Roebuck (2000) examined how intermediate students of Spanish at the university level positioned themselves in written recalls based on three different texts (news reports, one each in the L1 and L2, and one expository text in English). Importantly, in this study, protocols produced by participants who did not follow the instructions were retained for analysis. Roebuck presents the case of one participant who admitted after finishing the first of the three texts that he had misunderstood the instructions. There were three paragraphs in the first of the three texts; however, he thought that he was required to read and write about only one paragraph, and assessed the demands of the task considerably differently from other participants. Based on this assessment, the participant approached the task as memorization, thus producing a literal translation of the Spanish text. Interestingly, having completed the first task with a relative success, he continued to approach in the same manner the English expository text he read next. However, he was only able to copy the first few sentences of each paragraph of the original text. This protocol, which might have been eliminated from analysis in other research, provided valuable insights about the "complex relationship between assessment, previous experience, orientation, and even learning within the context of the experimental task" (Roebuck, 2000, p. 87).
Furthermore, Roebuck notes that while some participants operated in a frame in which they were positioned as "subjects in an experiment" and "university Spanish students" whose abilities to complete the assigned tasks were to be evaluated by the researcher/instructor, others appeared to contest this frame by adding their own voices and by repositioning themselves in various ways. For example, in their written protocols, some participants used linguistic resources to express their uncertainty (e.g., *thinking* and *saying* verbs, question marks) regarding the content of their protocols, which can be interpreted as the students' attempts to distance themselves from the information that they were not certain of. Others attempted to reposition themselves by questioning the conditions of the experiment or by criticizing the experimental text and the researcher’s decision to use it. These findings support Coughlan and Duff’s (1994) argument regarding tasks and student agency.

Although not grounded in sociocultural theory, Foster’s (1998) classroom-based study lends additional support to an activity-theoretical perspective on tasks. As Foster makes it clear, this study was conducted during naturally occurring classes of part-time EFL students at a large British college, and the teacher was also the researcher. Observed tasks included two required information exchange tasks (picture description task and map task) and two optional information tasks (grammar-based task and discussion task). Audio-recorded discourse was transcribed and coded for features of negotiation of meaning as discussed in the SLA literature (e.g., Pica, 1992; Pica, Halliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989), including confirmation checks, clarification requests, comprehension checks, and various types of output modifications. The results showed that none of the observed tasks led to many instances of meaning negotiation. Foster
suggests that this finding may relate to the students' perception of the task-based pair/group work as an informal part of class to help "make the classroom a more relaxed and friendly place where they can practice the target language" (p. 19), not as a learning activity.

These studies have important implications for the present study. The first has to do with the argument regarding task and agency. For example, Mercer (1992) argues that "any task or activity does not exist independently of the ways in which participants (experimenters and subjects, teachers and learners) contextualize it" (p. 33). It follows that researchers must consider participants' perspectives of tasks, which are shaped largely by their previous experiences (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Kinginger, 2000; Roebuck, 2000), "in order to better understand what they perceive to be goals, procedures, and the significance of the tasks" (Duff, 1993b, p. 86).

Another implication is that given the distinction between task and activity, it is vital to study the process as well as the outcomes of task-related learning (Mercer, 1992). The task-based L2 studies reviewed above have contributed greatly to our knowledge about microprocesses of students' discourse within tasks (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992) by illustrating how people jointly construct knowledge and understanding through collaborative discourse. As Donato (1994) puts it, a microgenetic analysis of task-related discourse "allows us to observe directly how students help each other during the overt planning of L2 utterances and the outcomes of these multiple forces of help as they come into contact, and interact, with each other" (p. 42). However, there are more macro-level processes that surround those tasks (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992) or to appropriate Cole's (1996) words, more macro-level processes that weave them together (p. 135). For
example, Wertsch et al. (1993) discuss the importance of "connecting cultural, historical, and institutional processes with mediated intermental and intramental processes" (p. 343).

Along similar lines, Watson-Gegeo (1992) suggests that sociocultural research go beyond the examination of dyadic and small group interactions to include the larger institutional contexts within which the individual, social group, and community live, and that "frame, inform, and constrain the socializing interactions of everyday life" (p. 52). As we will see in the next section, this seems to be an area in which language socialization studies can contribute largely to task-based L2 research (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992).

### 2.6.4 Academic Tasks and L2 Discourse Socialization

This section examines several studies that explored L2 socialization through analyses of academic tasks. One example is Mohan and Marshall Smith's (1992) qualitative case study conducted in a graduate course in educational program planning at an English-speaking university. They examined how and why a group of Chinese students managed to successfully complete the writing assignments in this seminar despite the fact that they lacked background knowledge about the subject matter and that they had not obtained the minimal TOEFL score required in the program. Qualitative analysis indicated that this success was attributable to the cohesive plan and support of the course instructor. For one thing, the instructor organized the course coherently and communicated the course organization clearly to the students at the onset. Another important factor was that the assignments were connected as opposed to stand-alone tasks, "with earlier assignments building a context for later ones" (Mohan, 2001, p. 125; see also Mohan, 1990). According to the researchers, the students initially had little
understanding of the tasks; however, through their participation in lectures, discussion
groups, and group tutorials, they developed a contextual understanding of the writing
assignments over time, which in turn contributed to their successful accomplishment of
these academic tasks.

Duff's (1993a, 1995, 1996) longitudinal ethnographic study investigated the
interplay of the macro- and micro-level changes that took place in Hungary from the late
1980s to early 1990s. To this end, she examined transformations in academic discourse in
the context of history lessons at high schools running English immersion programs. In
this study, Duff examined two types of oral presentations in high school history lessons:
the *felelés*, recitation conducted mainly in traditional Hungarian-medium lessons, and the
student lecture, which “represented a new genre of public speaking in the Hungarian
context” (Duff, 1995, p. 514). The *felelés* was a form of assessment and rehearsed public
speaking that was most commonly practiced in Hungarian classes at various levels of
education. Students were required individually to deliver formal oral reports of teacher-
selected themes from previous lessons without recourse to any written materials. After
each presentation, the teacher would announce the grade for the student’s task
performance in front of all the classmates. According to Duff, the *felelés* served many
functions including exercising school discipline, ensuring daily reviews of lessons, and
preparing students for high school matriculation and university entrance examinations. It
was thus “a rich locus for language socialization” (Duff, 1996, p. 407).

The student lecture was a short presentation (5-15 minutes in length), conducted
in English and assigned on a voluntary basis. Unlike in the *felelés*, students were allowed
to choose topics considering a number of factors, including the nature of the topic, the
due date, the scope of the topic, and classmates’ preferences. For this task, students were also allowed to consult any references they considered pertinent; they were not expected to memorize their texts. As a result, students tended to prepare their lecture notes, which they referred to during their presentations. Duff’s observations suggest that whereas the interaction during the Hungarian-medium recitation was limited to the teacher and the presenter, in the English-medium student lecture, the conversational floor was open to student-audience members as well. In fact, some members of the audience—especially inquisitive boys—provided the presenter with corrective feedback on her linguistic errors and assistance for her search for L2 expressions, and asked for clarification about the historical content of the presentation. In other words, the student audience negotiated both the language and content of the oral presentation, thus co-constructing the activity with the presenter and teacher. Surprisingly, in some situations, students corrected their teachers’ English as well, which indicated the dynamic, bidirectional nature of language socialization in the schools (Duff, 1996). In short, the student lecture, which was replacing the traditional recitation practice in many of the English medium lessons, allowed students to play a more active role by supporting greater student contribution to the selection of presenters and topics, and in negotiation of form and meaning during the task performance (Duff, 1993a). These micro-level changes were seen to reflect the macro-level changes that were occurring in Hungarian society.

Also of great relevance to the present study is Morita’s (1996, 2000) ethnographic study on the discourse socialization of 21 graduate students including 6 non-native speakers (NNSs) of English (2 from China and 4 from Japan) in an MA TESL program at a Canadian university. This study analyzed the classroom culture of two graduate
seminars, focusing on students' oral academic presentations (OAPs) of course reading material. Having analyzed her triangulated data (i.e., field notes, video-recorded classroom interactions, questionnaires, interviews), Morita identified three major features of the discourse socialization in relation to this particular task: (1) learning how to communicate an epistemic stance on the chosen material, (2) use of various strategies to engage the audience (e.g., making personal connections to the topic of the presentation, communicating a sense of novelty), and (3) the presentation being co-constructed by the participants, representing multiple roles, voices, and levels of expertise.

Morita reports that students learned through their engagement in a various sub-activities related to the OAP: (1) negotiating about instructors' expectations, (2) preparing for the presentation, (3) observing and performing presentations, and (4) reviewing the presentation with the researcher. For example, students exercised their agency in various ways to accomplish the presentation task. In the preparation phase, the majority of the NNSs chose to rehearse their presentations, primarily to compensate for their perceived difficulties. They also tried to prepare well-organized handouts, and made extra notes to refer to during their presentations. In the actual task performance, NNSs used audiovisual aids such as transparencies for the overhead projector, collaborated actively with their back-ups, and encouraged the audience to make verbal contributions. Interestingly, these strategies were perceived as very effective by many of their native English-speaking (NES) peers. Moreover, NES students too had their difficulties, including struggles to present a concise summary of the chosen article and to interact effectively with the audience. These findings suggest, "the NN-NNS distinction alone did
not determine how successful a student would be in performing an OAP” (Morita, 2000, p. 300).

Despite their different foci, these L2 socialization studies have important implications for the present study. They reveal the dynamic relationship between students’ learning of academic language, content, and culture, and the social and historical context—with part of that history being their own prior interactions and conversations. To use Wink and Putney’s (2002) words, people, whenever they engage in any conversations, begin to build historicity upon which they can draw as resources in later conversations (see also Frey, 1996; Halliday & Hasan, 1985; Wardhaugh, 1985; Wenger, 1998 for relevant discussions). Thus, context is constructed and reconstructed not only in a single interaction, but also over time through a series of actions and interactions (Watson-Gegeo, 1992). Likewise, Putney, Green, Dixon, Durán, and Yeager (2000) argue that knowledge constructed in one situation becomes socially and academically consequential in subsequent situations, suggesting that learning may be an outcome of the “cumulative effects of a number of events,” rather than that of a single event (van Lier, 1988, p. 91). Moreover, Keyton (1999) argues that since relationships among individuals in a task group develop over time (see also Donato, 1988), researchers “must be ‘there’ to see ‘these’ happen” (p. 217). All of this suggests that in order to understand the context for students’ task, researchers need to conduct longitudinal field studies and examine their long conversations (Mercer, 2000) about the task as well as the social and spatial circumstances in which they are situated.

Furthermore, the three L2 studies reviewed above report on the active roles student-participants played in their socialization. For example, Duff’s (1995) and
Morita's (2000) studies provide evidence to suggest the bidirectional nature of the academic discourse socialization between high school teachers and students and between NES students and NNS students, respectively. In short, the three studies reviewed above primarily examined the processes of learning through academic task work and the processes of participating in new discourse communities (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Rogoff, 1990).

2.6.5 L2 Project Work

As briefly mentioned in Chapter 1, only a few studies have examined project work in the context of L2 teaching and learning. These include Eyring’s (1989) study on the implementation of project-based instruction in ESL classes at an American university and students’ responses to this instruction, Beckett’s (1999) ethnographic study on the implementation of project-based instruction for ESL students in a Canadian high school context, Turnbull’s (1998) case study on the effectiveness of multidimensional project-based teaching in core French classes at Canadian schools, Leki’s (2001) longitudinal qualitative study on the experiences of two NNS students studying at a US university, and Mohan and Becket’s (2001) discourse analysis study on their teacher participant’s grammatical scaffolding of her students’ causal explanations in a sheltered content class at a Canadian university.

Findings from Beckett’s (1999) study suggested that the teachers evaluated project-based instruction positively, commenting on the creativity of secondary school students and on unexpected learning opportunities that project work can provide for their students. This evaluation was supported by the researcher’s classroom observations, which suggested that project work provided students opportunities to learn a variety of
things, including how to work cooperatively, make decisions, conduct research, and give presentations in English. On the other hand, despite their teachers’ explanations, students were often unable to see the value of project work. From the activity-theoretical perspective discussed earlier, students, as active agents, assigned their project work different meaning from those of their teachers. The present study aims to contribute to this body of literature by directly examining students’ group project work both in and out of their scheduled class times for an extended period of time.

2.7 Rogoff’s Three-Plane Analysis of Sociocultural Activity

While informed by all of the four sociocultural theories reviewed above, the present study adopts Rogoff’s (1993, 1995, 1998, 2003) three-plane analysis of sociocultural activity as a central conceptual framework to examine the microprocesses of students’ discourse within tasks and the macroprocesses weaving them together (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992). Like Lave and Wenger (1991), Rogoff (2003) sees human learning and development as “a process of people’s changing participation in sociocultural activities of their communities” (p. 52). Congruent with other sociocultural theorists’ views outlined above, she acknowledges the bidirectional nature of this participation; in her words, “people contribute to the process in sociocultural activities at the same time that they inherit practices invented by others” (p. 52). Central to her analysis are the constructs of apprenticeship, guided participation, and participatory appropriation, which reflect different planes of focus in sociocultural activity: community/institutional, interpersonal, and personal (Rogoff, 1990, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2003). The first concept, apprenticeship, focuses on the community and institutional aspects of the activity, “involving active individuals with others in culturally organized
activity that has as part of its purpose the development of mature participation in the activity by the less experienced people” (p. 142). As Rogoff puts it, research focusing on this plane examines socioculturally and institutionally defined purposes, cultural constraints, resources, tools, and values regarding appropriate means for reaching goals. This plane of analysis seems to correspond most closely with Barton and Hamilton’s (1998, 2000) approach to literacy research: that is, to analyze events or activities in order to learn about social practices (see also Barton, 1994).

The second concept, guided participation, focuses on the interpersonal aspects of the activity. “Guidance” here refers to the directions provided implicitly by cultural and social values (e.g., internalized norms), as well as social partners that facilitate or restrict people’s involvement in activities, while the term “participation” refers to both hands-on involvement in and observation of an activity. The final concept, participatory appropriation, focuses on the personal aspects of the activity and refers to “how individuals change through their involvement in one or another activity, in the process becoming prepared for subsequent involvement in related activities” (Rogoff, 1995, p. 142).

Importantly, Rogoff (1995, 1998, 2003) stresses that these planes—community/institutional, interpersonal, and personal—should not be seen as separate or hierarchical, but rather as different ways of looking at the same activity. Thus, choosing one plane for observation and analysis does not mean that the other planes are separate or irrelevant; it simply means that one plane is foregrounded. Figure 2.1 includes three versions of the same picture of three people participating in a group activity in a

21 I owe the development of this figure to Rogoff’s (1993, 1998, 2003) papers, which present different versions of the same photograph showing a boy playing a word game with an adult and other children.
classroom. For example, in the picture illustrating the personal plane, an individual’s contributions are in focus while those of the others are blurred (Figure 2.1c). Applied to my study, to be described in the next chapter, Rogoff’s apprenticeship analysis would shed light on the social practices of the classroom community into which the students were socialized; the guided participation analysis would help uncover the interpersonal processes involved in students’ task-based activities; and the participatory appropriation analysis would reveal their personal transformations in relation to the particular task.

Figure 2.1 Rogoff’s Three-Plane Analysis of Activity

Figure 2.1a Community/Institutional Plane

Figure 2.1b Interpersonal Plane
2.8 Summary of the Chapter

The major purpose of this chapter was to situate the present study in the relevant theoretical literature. In the first few sections, I outlined several sociocultural theories and research informing the present study: (1) Vygotskian sociocultural and activity theory, (2) language socialization, (3) Hallidayan social semiotic theory, and (4) situated learning theory, which collectively emphasize participation, agency, and social context.

I also reviewed some of the task-based L2 studies pertinent to the present study. Many of these studies examined peer collaboration in pair/small group situations, suggesting that L2 students can use their own and each other’s knowledge and skills as well as their L1 as resources to negotiate, interpret, and accomplish their tasks. I then concluded that Rogoff’s three-plane analysis provides a useful conceptual framework for research on socialization through L2 project work. In the next chapter, I will provide an
overview of the research methodology used in the present study, including the setting, participants, and methods for data collection and analysis.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

According to Hall and Verplaetse (2000), the study of individual development grounded in the sociocultural framework (e.g., A. N. Leont’ev, 1981; Wertsch, 1994) starts with

the analysis of the concrete historical conditions surrounding the individual and entails the study of the actual processes of interaction between individuals and their learning environments to understand the specific changes that occur, the conditions that bring about these changes, and the developmental consequences that result. (p. 9)

Likewise, Schieffelin and Ochs (1996) state that one major goal of language socialization research is to link microanalysis of discourse and more general ethnographic accounts of cultural, social, and historical practices of communities into which individuals are apprenticed (see also Watson-Gegeo, 1992). The present study integrates an ethnographic approach with a qualitative, multiple-case study. An ethnographic approach is employed to address the cultural attitudes, beliefs, and values of the community in which L2 students perform their tasks, whereas a multiple case study approach is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of individual students’ task-related learning and development over time. In what follows, I will discuss the sampling procedure as I describe the participants, sites, and the unit of analysis. In other words, I will weave together detailed descriptions of the contexts of the study and my sampling decisions with the goal of providing for the reader an audit trail to help authenticate the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998). As we will see later, the sampling procedure for the present study was purposeful (Patton, 1990) or purposive (Miles & Huberman, 1994) in that research
sites and participants were selected because they were expected to provide rich information about the phenomenon under investigation. I will then introduce my key participants and describe methods for data collection and analysis. This will be followed by a discussion of the relationship between the researcher and the researched. Finally, I will discuss the trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of the study.

3.1 An Ethnographic Case Study Approach

To examine the complex and dynamic processes of L2 students’ learning through project work embedded within sociocultural, historical, and institutional contexts, the present study employs an ethnographic case study approach (Faltis, 1997; Johnson, 1992, 1993; Merriam, 1998; Nunan, 1992; Stake, 1995). Although the study is ethnographic research as distinguished from a full-scale ethnography (Heath, 1982; Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999), it shares certain basic principles of ethnography which are described in this chapter. Watson-Gegeo (1988) defines ethnography as “the study of people’s behavior in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behavior” (p. 576). The emic (as opposed to etic) principle in ethnography refers to the insider perspective of the people functioning in their communities, whereas the holistic principle suggests that actions and events must be understood in their social and cultural contexts (van Lier, 1988, 1990; Watson-Gegeo, 1988; see also Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999).

According to Wolcott (1988, 1992), ethnography refers to both the research process and the research product. As research product, ethnographies “re-create for the reader the shared beliefs, practices, artifacts, folk knowledge, and behaviors of some group of people” (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, pp. 2-3). Thus, the primary goal of
ethnography is to make tacit the cultural knowledge (Spradley, 1980) of the focal group or community explicit by producing a “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) or a rich, participant-informed account of the sociocultural phenomena under investigation (Duff, 1995; Duranti, 1997; Green, Dixon, & Zaharlick, 2003; Heath, 1982; Johnson, 1992; Nunan, 1992; Schieffelin, 1979, 1990). To achieve this goal, ethnographers spend a great amount of time in the field doing participant observation, observing the cultural behaviors of the people under study, conducting interviews and conversations, and collecting their cultural artifacts (Spradley, 1980; see also Duranti, 1997; Erickson, 1986; Heath, 1982; Johnson, 1992; Patton, 1990; Rossman & Rallis, 1998; van Lier, 1988; Watson-Gegeo, 1988). In short, ethnography aims to “learn about what counts as membership and appropriate participation” (Green, Dixon, & Zaharlick, 2003, p. 210, emphasis original) in the focal community/communities.

However, as Watson-Gegeo (1988) states, while acknowledging the importance of individual differences, most ethnographic research is concerned with group or community “because cultural behavior is by definition shared behavior” (p. 577). To examine the role of L2 students’ agency--both individual and collective--in shaping their project work and their participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 1993, 1995) in relation to particular project-related tasks, the present study combines an ethnographic approach with a multiple-case study approach.

According to Yin (1994), a case study is “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13). Miles and Huberman (1994) define a case as “a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (p.
25), conceptualizing it as a circle with a research focus in the center. As will be discussed later, eleven students were selected as cases in the present study. To quote Miles and Huberman (1994), “by looking at a range of similar and contrasting cases, we can understand a single-case finding, grounding it by specifying how and where and, if possible, why it carries on as it does” (p. 29). Thus, multiple sampling helps “strengthen the precision, the validity, and the stability of the findings” (p. 29, see also Merriam, 1998). Merriam (1998) states that case study is a design particularly suited to an investigation of process, rather than outcome. This research strategy is appropriate for the present study because it allows the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of processes of L2 students’ learning through project-related tasks in their natural contexts.

Bromley (1986, cited in Merriam, 1998) states that case studies, by definition, seek to “get as close to the subject of interest as they possibly can, partly by means of direct observation in natural settings, partly by their access to subjective factors (thoughts, feelings, and desires)” (p. 32). Because of my social constructivist stance, like Guba and Lincoln (1994), I assume that

Realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature (although elements are often shared among many individuals and even across cultures), and dependent for their form and content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions. (pp. 110-111)

Similarly, Lave and Wenger (1991) argue, “objective forms and systems of activity, on the one hand, and agents’ subjective and intersubjective understandings of them, on the other, mutually constitute both the world and its experienced forms” (p. 51). These arguments point to the need to examine the case from participants’ emic perspective as well as from the researcher’s etic perspective, suggesting that both
interviews with participants and direct observations of their activities are important. Therefore, the present study examines, by using ethnographic and discourse analytic techniques, the discourse of task-related activities in which L2 students learn to participate with the support of their teachers and peers, paying attention to the larger socio-educational contexts that shape and are shaped by that discourse.

3.2 Research Site and Context

The study was conducted from August 2000 to June 2001 mainly at Western Province University (WPU), a large research university in Canada. Participants involved 80 Japanese undergraduate students (initial TOEFL mean: 502) and their teachers in a one-year academic exchange program between WPU and Keishin University, a major private university in Japan. This unique joint program, which began more than ten years earlier, brings approximately 100 Japanese students to WPU every year to live and study in an academic and residential environment. Most participants in this joint program are college sophomores and juniors (second- and third-year students) who receive transfer credits for academic work completed at the Canadian university. Their major fields of study varied from economics and business administration to literature to sociology and international relations to law and engineering (see Table 3.1). All participants in the academic exchange program were required to attend a series of pre-departure orientation sessions.

22 The minimum TOEFL score for admission to the joint program was 450. Keishin Program participants were selected on the basis of their statement of purpose, interview, and TOEFL scores.

23 All names are pseudonyms. Key participants were asked to choose their own pseudonyms.

24 There were more sophomores than juniors. For one thing, it was sophomores that Keishin University encouraged to participate in the joint program. Another thing is that the bachelor’s thesis requirement would discourage seniors from participating. Also, many Keishin students told me that in Japan, university students start their job search in their junior years, and that being away from home during this important year would put them at a great disadvantage. There was only one senior (fourth-year student) who participated in the program in the Academic Year 2000-2001.
meetings in Japan from mid-April to early July, where they learned about academic and residence life from the preceding group of students as well as from the Director of the program and a WPU student-adviser. At these meetings, students had opportunities, for example, to observe volunteers from the previous Keishin group perform model presentations and perform group presentations in either Japanese or English on topics relevant to their upcoming life in Canada, such as course work, residences, and university facilities. They also took an intensive academic writing course.

Table 3.1: Students’ Fields of Studies (Academic Year 2000-2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Keishin students come to Canada right before the program starts in September; however, each year, approximately 30 choose to come to Canada one month earlier to study in a three-week ESL program at WPU through the English Language Institute (ELI). Thus, the present study can be divided into three phases. In the first phase, students enrolled in the summer intensive ESL program were invited to participate in the study, and several students were followed as key participants throughout their stay in Canada. The second phase, which is the major focus of this study, began when the rest of the Keishin group arrived in Canada to start their studies in the academic exchange program. At this time, more students were invited to participate in the study. The final phase was the pre-departure orientation meetings held at Keishin University in Japan for
the following Keishin group. Two of the key participants volunteered to give a model presentation for the next generation. I observed two sessions on how to do a “good” presentation at WPU. This final phase thus provided me with opportunities to observe the students’ uptake from their year-long experiences in the academic exchange program. In the next two sections, I will explain my sampling decisions as I describe the first two research phases in some detail.

3.2.1 The University Preparation Program at ELI

In the summer of 2000, 31 Keishin students (11 males and 20 females) out of 99 chose to study in the university preparation program at ELI. According to information in the ELI program handbook, one major objective of this ESL program was to familiarize students with the instructional styles of North American universities and assist them in developing knowledge, skills, and confidence that are necessary for academic studies. The program was open not only to undergraduate students, but also to those starting their graduate studies and those who already held a bachelor’s degree and wished to improve their academic language skills. On the first day of the three-week program, students took the Institute’s in-house placement test that was designed to assess their English skills and knowledge. Students were placed in one of the three classes (Classes A, B, and C) based upon the results of this test, rather than on the TOEFL scores they had submitted to the Institute. Thus, it was possible that a student with a TOEFL score of 600 was placed in a lower-level class than a student with a score of 550.

Since the three classes were offered concurrently, I had to choose one for observation. After consulting with Ms. Brown, a head teacher who had planned the university preparation course, I decided to observe Class C for three major reasons. First,
Ms. Brown told me that although all the three classes were designed to promote international students' preparation for their university lives in North America, the curricula of Classes A and B were modified to accommodate students’ levels of L2 proficiency and Class C was the only one that followed the “true” university preparation curriculum of the Institute.

Secondly, I learned that there were six Keishin students in Class C (3 males and 3 females) and that they all had different majors (i.e., American and British literature, economics, engineering, interdisciplinary studies, policy science, sociology). This diversity was deemed ideal for a maximum variation sampling based on fields of study (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990). The rationale for this type of sampling is that by selecting a small sample of great diversity (e.g., students from different departments), “it is possible to more thoroughly describe variation in the group and to understand variations in experience while also investigating core elements and shared outcomes” (Patton, 1990, p. 172). The third reason for choosing Class C had to do with the instructor Mr. Jamal Khan (henceforth Jamal). According to Ms. Brown, Jamal was much more experienced than the other two instructors in teaching, directing programs, and conducting research, and he was also doing a Ph.D. in applied linguistics. For several summers, he had taught ESL courses and teacher training courses at WPU’s ELI. Because of this extensive experience, Jamal, I decided, might be more tolerant of my constant presence as a researcher. Also, I learned from Ms. Brown that Jamal used a student-centered approach relevant to project work, the focus of my study. Thus, Jamal’s class provided me with

---

25 I chose to address the teachers by their first names in this dissertation because that is what their students and colleagues called them.
rich opportunities to learn a great deal about the initial phase of L2 students' academic discourse socialization.

Fortunately, Jamal agreed to participate in the study and introduced me to his class (see Appendix A for teacher consent form). An invitation letter written in both Japanese and English (see Appendix B for the English version) was distributed to all the 15 students in his class, including the six Keishin students. After my brief presentation of the research project, they all agreed to participate in the present study (the informed consent form is shown in Appendix C). Although I focused on Class C, I became familiar with many of the Keishin students in the other classes because I observed whole-program events such as guest speakers' talks and university panel presentations as well. While attending ELI, Keishin students stayed with Canadian families in the suburban areas, with whom they were matched up through the Institute.

3.2.2 The Content Course at WPU

During the academic year, Keishin students generally take three courses in the first semester and four courses in the second semester. Each class consists of approximately twenty students. Students who meet WPU's Faculty of Arts TOEFL criterion for admission (580, according to the 2000-2001 guidebook) are allowed to take seeki kamoku or regular\(^{26}\) courses of their interest in the first semester; students who have obtained a high TOEFL score and average for their Semester 1 courses are allowed to take one regular course or two in the second semester, depending on their calculated index number and wishes.

\(^{26}\)Technically, all the courses offered in the joint program were "regular" courses in that students received transfer credits toward their bachelor's degrees from Keishin University. But Keishin students and staff members used the word "seeki" or "regular" to refer to non-sheltered courses. Thus I adopt this definition in this dissertation.
One of the courses required of all students who do not meet the university’s pre-requisites is a two-semester, sheltered content course \textsuperscript{27} through the Department of Language Education, Language Fieldwork A and B. In the Academic Year 2000-2001, when the present study was conducted, Language Fieldwork A, offered during the first semester, dealt with intercultural communication whereas Language Fieldwork B, offered during the second semester, dealt with research methods in social science and education. I chose this particular course because I had learned from my casual conversations with some of her students from the previous year (Keishin 9) and her colleagues that the instructor of the course, Dr. Izzat Mukkammal (henceforth Izzat), was an expert in the integration of language and content through project-based instruction as well as being a very respected and popular teacher in the joint program.

After conducting informal classroom observations of Izzat’s lessons, as well as casual conversations with some of her students between February and April 2000, I decided, like Morita (1996, 2000), to focus on one type of academic task as a unit of analysis: oral presentations of research projects. In contrast to her study though, mine looked at ESL undergraduate students’ project work both in and out of the classroom, focusing on their preparation for and performance of oral presentations of their research projects. Viewing oral presentations as tasks situated in the context of wider project work (Beckett, 1999; Mohan & Beckett, 2001; see also Mohan, 2001; Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992), the study explored Japanese undergraduate students’ language socialization in a content course in relation to this particular task.

\textsuperscript{27} This course was designed for Keishin students although some other non-native-English-speaking (NNES) students could register for it with the permission of the joint program faculty. In sheltered content-based ESL courses, NNES students do not have to compete with their native-English-speaking counterparts (Adamson, 1993; Faltis, 2001; Reppy & Adams, 2000; cf. Crandall, 2000).
In September, I sent out an invitation letter to all the 60 students in Izzat’s courses except for the ELI program participants who had already signed the consent form (see Appendix C) and begun participating in the study. All the students as well as Izzat and her TA, Mr. Abraham Simons, agreed to participate and signed the consent form. As mentioned earlier, six Keishin students were enrolled in the ELI course that I observed during the summer. Four of them chose to take Izzat’s course (two males and two females, all sophomores) in the fall of 2000 and were thus invited to participate in the study as key students. Subsequently, seven more students (2 males and 5 females, 1 junior and 6 sophomores) were invited, resulting in eleven key students (initial TOEFL mean: 510, slightly higher than the cohort average). Their majors included American and British literature, engineering, international relations, interdisciplinary studies, law, policy science, and sociology, most of the major fields of study of the joint program participants. Again, this strategy was intended as purposeful sampling to strengthen the external validity of the study (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990). In the second semester, Izzat taught three sections of Language Fieldwork again. Forty students remained in Izzat’s course (more wanted to, but there was not enough space) and 20 new students registered for it. Again, the invitation letter was distributed and explained to these newcomers. All the students agreed to participate in the study. Thus, there were 80 Keishin students, including 11 key students, in the study. In Chapter 4, I describe the curricular context in more detail, based on observations and other data.

3.3 Key Participants’ Profiles

To develop an in-depth understanding of Keishin students’ language socialization through oral presentation tasks in the content-based ESL course, this section provides a
few details about each of the key teachers and students involved in this study, including teachers’ educational and professional backgrounds, students’ majors, TOEFL scores, histories of learning English, and purposes for participating in the Keishin-WPU joint program (see Appendix for more details). These are not intended to be comprehensive profiles of the participant, but information that might help contextualize the participants’ task-related activities in the later chapters. I also discuss my role as both researcher and participant and issues of reciprocity and intersubjectivity.

3.3.1 Key Teachers

The instructor of the content-based ESL course, Dr. Izzat Mukkammal, was a native speaker of an Asian language and spoke several other languages including English. She started her career as a teacher at the age of eighteen. After teaching English for a number of years in China, Izzat came to Canada to undertake her master’s and doctoral studies in L2 education. As mentioned earlier, she was particularly interested in integrating language and content instruction through project work. Izzat said that her views on teaching and learning were strongly influenced by the work of scholars such as Dewey (e.g., 1916, 1938) and Mohan (1986). Prior to the present study, Izzat had taught both undergraduate and graduate teacher education courses at WPU. Academic year 2000-2001 was her second year as a teacher in the Keishin program. Izzat was passionate about teaching and learning, and compassionate and kind toward her students and colleagues. She often encouraged her students to strive for more. She knew her expectations were high but she also knew that her students could live up to or even exceed them. Being an “ESL person” herself, Izzat was sympathetic with Keishin students and always willing to avail herself to listen to, and give advice to, them on their
academic and personal matters. As a loving mother, she would often share stories about
her little daughter with her classes, which often brought smiles to her students. Adjectives
many Keishin students used to describe her included “considerate,” “passionate,”
“knowledgeable,” “thoughtful,” “responsive,” and “approachable.”

Izzat’s harmonious relationship with her students seems to be illustrated well by
the following excerpts, both of which were taken from students’ out-of-class group work:

**Excerpt 3.1**

1 Ken: Izzat tte nan sai nan? [As for Izzat, how old is she?]

2 Mai: Ikutsu kurai nan ya ro. [I wonder how old she is?]

3 Yoshi: Nan ka na,: 18 sai no toki kara ne:. moo oshietetan ya tte. [Well, I hear that she has
   been teaching since she was eighteen.]

4 Ken: Un, itteta na:. Itteta, itteta. Meccha wakaina: [Right. She said that. She said. That’s
   a very young age.]

5 Mai: Demo, nan ka ano hito no wa igen ga aru kara ii wa. Sugoi. [But that’s okay
   because her teaching has an air of dignity. Great (dignity).]

6 Yoshi: Un un un. [Yeah, yeah, yeah.]

7 Ken: So ya na. [That’s right.] (Yoshino, Ken, Mai’s group meeting, November, 2000)

Prior to the interaction in Excerpt 3.1, the three students finished rehearsing their
presentation, and Yoshino, one of the key students to be introduced later in this chapter,
commented that she could imagine how Izzat would react to their speech. Because of this,
the topic of their conversation shifted to Izzat. In Line 1, Ken asks his partners if they
know how old the teacher is, which leads to Yoshino’s utterance about Izzat’s teaching
experience (Line 3). In the next line, Ken tells the others that he also heard Izzat say that
she started teaching at the age of 18, suggesting that eighteen is a very young age to
become a teacher. In Line 5, Mai comments that the fact that Izzat became a teacher at
such a young age is all right because her teaching has an air of great dignity, to which
both Yoshino and Ken agree in their following turns. This exchange seems to show the students’ respect toward Izzat as a teacher.

Excerpt 3.2

1 Kiku: ((reading from the computer screen)) someone =

2 Nana: = more thoughtful de more considerate to others te sa [more thoughtful and more considerate to others and]

3 Kiku: Un. Kon na hito to kekkon = [Yeah. Marry someone like this.]

4 Nana: = Kon na hito to kekkon shitai na: [I want to marry someone like this.]

5 Kiku: Izzat to shita ra ee. [You should marry Izzat.]

6 Nana: A-ha-ha. ((laughs))

7 Shin: Ha-ha-ha-ha. ((laughing)) Honma ya na. [Indeed.] (November 14, 2000)

Excerpt 3.2 comes from a meeting of another group. In this excerpt, Kiku and Nana, other key participants, are preparing presentation material with their partner Shingo in Nana’s apartment. In Line 4, Nana, appropriating Kiku’s utterance in the previous line, says that she wants to marry someone thoughtful and considerate. Then in Line 5, Kiku suggests jokingly that she should marry Izzat. Both Shingo and Nana also seem to share the perception of Izzat as a thoughtful and considerate person.

**Mr. Abraham Simons** was the teaching assistant for Izzat’s classes and in his first year teaching in the joint program. His major duty as a TA was to teach the seminar part of the content-based course (Language Fieldwork). At the time of my data collection, Abraham was in his late twenties and working on his master’s thesis in TESOL at WPU. He had taken a graduate seminar on research in ESL curriculum from Izzat in the previous year. Abraham is a French-English bilingual certified to teach both languages in Canadian public schools. After completing his undergraduate studies in linguistics and L2 education at a Canadian university, he taught English and French at a private language
school in Tokyo for three years. He was therefore familiar with Japanese culture and Japanese learners of English. Like Izzat, Abraham never failed to respond to his students’ contributions in a positive manner. He was nice and polite to everyone. His lessons were always well prepared and well organized. Abraham’s cultural familiarity, coupled with his young age, seemed to help him relate to the Keishin students. He was considered by many Keishin students to be “kind” and “considerate.”

Izzat and Abraham met on a regular basis in the office during their lunch times and after school to report on their classes, inform each other of their future lesson plans, and share insights and observations about their students. They respected each other as language professionals and worked in tandem for the course.

3.3.2 Key Students

Key students for the present study can be categorized into two groups: original key students who began their participation in the present study when they were studying at ELI in August, and other students who began their participation in the study after the academic year started. Like the students in the former group, all students but one in the latter participated in the intensive university preparation program at ELI, but were in different classes. Before moving on to the student profiles, brief descriptions of the student residences will be provided, as students’ residential choices seem to provide us with important information about their personalities and purposes for participating in the joint program.

3.3.2.1 Student Residences

Keishin students had three residential choices: the Keishin House, Dorm A, and Dorm B. The Keishin House is a three-story building where the majority of the Keishin
students are housed with approximately 100 WPU students each year. In each apartment, there are four private bedrooms, a shared kitchen and living room, and one and half bathrooms. During the Academic Year 2000-2001, 51 Keishin students (17 males and 34 females) chose to live in this residence, and all but four were placed in apartments with three WPU students. In this building, there are three classrooms, a computer lab, an activity room, a Japanese-style room, laundry facilities, and offices for staff members in addition to the apartments. This is the newest and quietest of all the three residences.

Dorms A and B are older apartment complexes especially for first and second year students at WPU that consist of several buildings. All buildings at Dorm A are co-educational; there are male and female students in the same building with alternating same-gender floors. In contrast, Dorm B consisted of single-gender buildings and coed buildings. During Academic Year 2000-2001, 35 Keishin students (4 males and 31 females) chose to live in Dorm A whereas 13 (2 males and 11 females) chose to live in Dorm B. Each Keishin student was assigned a single room. Each floor had a lounge with sofas, a TV, and a microwave oven, and shared bathrooms. Thus, Keishin residents living in these dorms had no roommates; instead they had “floor-mates” with whom they participated in a variety of activities and events. At the center of each of these two dormitory complexes lay Commons Block where a cafeteria, an activity room, a weight room, and a snack bar were located. Since Dorm A was next to the Keishin House, many residents of the latter often went to the cafeteria of the former for lunch and/or dinner. Dorm B was an approximately ten-minutes walk from Dorm A and the Keishin House. At both residences, Keishin students lived in “Quiet Houses” or buildings with extended quiet hours. But even these buildings were not as quiet as the Keishin House.
3.3.2.2 Students' Profiles

Table 3.2 summarizes the key students’ profiles. Although all coming from the same university, these eleven key students vary in fields of studies, interests, personalities, experiences, and levels of English proficiency. Given the importance of human agency in learning and socialization as suggested by many scholars, the information provided in this table would then help contextualize the participants' activities reported in the following chapters.
Table 3.2: Key Students’ Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kiku</th>
<th>Nana</th>
<th>Otome</th>
<th>Tomo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University year</strong></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Environmental System Engineering</td>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>American and British Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial TOEFL</strong></td>
<td>517</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final TOEFL</strong></td>
<td>543</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaningful English learning experience</strong></td>
<td>-English Speaking Society</td>
<td>-Started to study English at 11</td>
<td>-One-year study-abroad program in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Listened to radio programs in English since grade 9 or 10</td>
<td>-Once a week English lessons: movies, folk tales, books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Watched TV programs in English</td>
<td>-Went to a Japanese high school in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversea experience</strong></td>
<td>-10-day trip to the US</td>
<td>-Went to a Japanese high school in the U.S.</td>
<td>-One-year study-abroad program in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1-month trip to New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Plan</strong></td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Wanted to become a flight attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for participating in the exchange program</strong></td>
<td>“I was expecting I would gain a certain level of English in terms of writing, reading, and especially communicating (speaking and listening). Also I was vaguely expecting myself would be an more flexibly understandable person towards other cultures by being surrounded by various ethnic groups of people and seeing different happenings from what I had seen in Japan. So, as a whole, I was hoping my sense of value would be changed in a better way.”</td>
<td>“When I found the Keishin-WPU program, I decided to study English again and wanted to be a great speaker, because I did not make much effort to study English in senior high... I wanted do my best and challenge to the things that seems to me difficult.”</td>
<td>“I felt my English ability has gotten worse recently, and wanted to improve it in Canada... Also I found my university life in Japan quite boring and wanted to escape from it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ichiro</td>
<td>Koyuki</td>
<td>Rei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University year</strong></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial TOEFL</strong></td>
<td>543</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final TOEFL</strong></td>
<td>597</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaningful English learning experience</strong></td>
<td>-Studied grammar to prepare for TOEFL before starting his studies at WPU</td>
<td>-Read English textbooks aloud -Making speech</td>
<td>-Learned English songs and games from friend’s mother and her English friend in the elementary school. -Watching videos and getting used to hearing slung used in them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversea experience</strong></td>
<td>-Three-week study in Australia -One and half weeks home-stay in Korea -One and half weeks travel to the U.S</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Plan</strong></td>
<td>Planned to do MA studies in North America</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Recipient of the Keishin Program Scholarship</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for participating in the exchange program</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Because thinking about studying at an English-speaking graduate school after my graduation from university, I wanted to experience studying at a foreign institution and thereby to know whether I can follow courses taught in English. Hence, participating in the Keishin-WPU programme seemed to meet my needs.”</td>
<td>&quot;The best basic reason was that it had been my dream to study abroad for about one year in school days. I wanted to improve English skill, to live in somewhere nobody knows me and to become strong.”</td>
<td>&quot;I really wanted to study English in countries where people speak English. Although many people who they have never been abroad can speak English pretty well, I have thought that it is another thing to learn how English speakers think of things in English.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University year</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>International Relations Studies</td>
<td>American and British Literature</td>
<td>Social science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial TOEFL</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final TOEFL</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful English learning experience</td>
<td>-Three-week home-stay in the U.S.</td>
<td>-Participated in an ESL program at a British university in his Freshman year. -Traveled to several English speaking countries with his parents</td>
<td>-Nine-day trip to U.S. -Went to private language school for five years in elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversea experience</td>
<td>Three-week home-stay</td>
<td>Participated in an ESL program at a British university in his Freshman year. Traveled to several English speaking countries with his parents</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plan</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for participating in the exchange program</td>
<td>I do not know exactly why I wanted to study abroad. I decided to go to overseas and study before I entered Keishin University. Originally, I was interested in study abroad. I thought it will make me more flexible person by meeting foreign people.”</td>
<td>I expected to experience actual Canadian life in point of University and family. I also expected my English ability would be improved through this programme. But just improvement of my English ability was not prime purpose to study in Canada for me, but I thought what I would learn in Canada would be helpful for my future studying in point of Canadian culture.”</td>
<td>“Through my music activities, I came to search for “my music” or “my sound”… People in Canada are from all over the world. So I thought that I can meet many people who have own background and many music based on many background. If I know them, I guessed I came to know who I am and what my music (sound) is.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3 The Researcher and the Researched: Joint Participants

From a constructivist perspective, Guba and Lincoln (1989; Lincoln, 1990; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, 1990) maintain that the relationship between the researcher and the researched be recognized because “it is precisely their interaction that creates the data that will emerge from the inquiry” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 88; see also Maxwell, 1996). Likewise, Holliday (2002) suggests that “the dynamics of the researcher’s presence in the research settings, how it affects the research, and what she learns from it” must be included in a written report (p. 154).

As described above, I was a moderate participant (Spradley, 1980) while observing students’ project related work in and out of the classroom. The following classroom excerpt in which I was asked to speak illustrates such a role (Masa refers to me):

Excerpt 3.3

1 Izzat: So we- what we decided to do in Classes 1 and 2 was that - they did something like a lucky draw. They did uh: number - drawing? …let’s say. Those who got uh - number one had the first choice. She could go somewhere to say this is when I’m presenting. Then too bad for the rest of you. And then whoever has No. 2, then go do that. And that’s what - Class 1 did. And Class 2 went - this. ((makes a rock with her hand.)) Jun- ((looks at the researcher, smiling))

2 Masa: Janken. [Paper-rock-scissors.]

3 Izzat: Janken. Okay. So no matter how you want to do it, you decide when you want to present - and you decide how to do the choice. Okay? Either you want to choose a number or you want to do the Janken. Okay. (classroom observation, November 6, 2000)

In my journal entry for this day, I wrote:

Looking back, it’s interesting that Izzat asked me, rather than her students, to give her the Japanese word (janken). This is probably because I had observed two other classes of hers and Izzat might have thought that I would know what she wanted to say. I guess we shared a “common ground.” I wonder how the students saw that exchange, my role and identity, my relationship with Izzat, etc. (November 6, 2000)
Furthermore, in early March 2001, I was asked by Izzat to give a presentation on my research in her classes. Since my data collection was still continuing, Izzat and I decided that it might be best to focus on the rationale for and methodology of the study. One week before my presentation, Izzat informed her students that she had asked me to do a presentation, giving two major reasons. Firstly, she thought that her students might want to know more about my study as it was about them. The second reason had to do with modeling of the task. As we will see in Chapter 4, Izzat asked her TA Abraham to give a model presentation in October 2000. But since some of the students in her Semester 2 classes studied with another teacher during Semester 1, they did not see Abraham’s modeling of the task. Therefore, Izzat wanted to provide a model especially for these students.

These episodes suggest that my role as a researcher both shaped and was shaped by the ecology of the research site (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mehra, 2001). Nonetheless, in class and group meetings, I kept my role peripheral most of the time (Adler & Adler, 1987). But I participated more actively in social events including lunch times, class parties, students’ birthday parties, academic orientations, and the graduation ceremonies for the ELI program and Keishin program. Also, I was invited to several sport events in which Keishin students and their WPU friends participated.

In addition to the roles of observer, participant, and interviewer discussed above, I played various roles in the field to give back to the community. Spradley (1980) states that personal gains become exploitative when the participants gain nothing from the research, and argues that every researcher has a responsibility to think carefully what might constitute a “fair return” to participants. From my conversations with the key
students as well as with several students from the previous group, I learned that one of the things Keishin students might appreciate was Japanese food. I thus threw several dinner parties for the key students over the year. Also, I invited the key students and their partners to have dinner at my place after their interviews. This was not only because I wanted to do something in return for their cooperation, but also because they often missed their dinner times at their residences by volunteering to attend the interviews. Here, it should be noted that since not all key participants knew each other, by throwing parties, I might have created opportunities for them to become acquainted. Additionally, I occasionally brought *sashiire*, or snacks, to students’ group meetings so that they could eat during breaks.

Moreover, upon the request from the head teacher of the Keishin program, I agreed to offer a series of weekly, lunch-hour workshops on English communication during the first semester. Each year, some of the Keishin faculty members offer lunch-hour workshops on various topics during the first semester. For example, Izzat offered workshops on the Chinese language in the previous year. Twenty-three students, including most of the key participants (i.e., Kiku, Ichiro, Otome, Rei, Ringo, Sakura, Shinpei, and Yoshino), chose to take my workshops. Given the purpose of the workshop, we spent most of the time in small groups doing communicative tasks, such as story retelling and discussion. However, we devoted our last meeting to TOEFL preparation upon the request of the students, all of whom were required to take the test in the following week. Thus my role in these workshops was that of a facilitator, rather than that of a lecturer, except for the last meeting.
In addition to their use of Japanese in interactions with me, for a variety of affective and practical reasons, I learned from my initial observations that Japanese was the major medium for communication among the Keishin students both inside and outside of classes. This observation suggested that using Japanese, more specifically the informal register, would be a crucial condition for me to be accepted into the student community (Gumperz, 1982; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Sharing the same mother tongue was indeed very helpful in getting familiar with the Keishin students (Block (2000) also found use of L1 increased rapport and students’ self-esteem). Of course, the use of Japanese entailed disadvantages too. For one thing, Japanese interview data had to be translated into English. I was aware that this would add extra layers of interpretation. In contrast, I made every effort to use English in class time or in the presence of non-Japanese speakers.

Being a Japanese student studying at a Canadian university helped me to relate to the students of the Keishin program as an insider. Also, all the three teachers in the present study, Izzat, Abraham, and Jamal, were L2 researchers themselves. Belonging to the same community of practice or discourse community, as it were, I was an insider to them as well. Izzat, for example often used first person plural pronouns (we, our, us) to include me when talking about language learning and teaching as in this example:

**Excerpt 3.4**

And Masaki and I know that there’s something called silent period. When they don’t speak English that does not mean that they don’t- they are not learning English. They are learning it. They are taking it in. They are thinking about it. They can understand but when they’re ready they will start speaking English. So when they’re forced to speak before they’re ready, that really is not a good idea. (Class 2, November 9, 2000)

Here, I am constructed as a colleague of the teacher’s through the coordination of my name and the first person singular pronoun (i.e., Masaki and I).
Moreover, the fact that I was ten years older than most of the students seemed to have shaped my relationships with them. A number of scholars (e.g., Fukue, 1991; Nakane, 1970) have suggested that Japanese people see themselves in light of three categories: senpai (seniors), koohai (juniors), and dooryo (colleagues). According to Nakane (1970), age differences, year of entry into institutions, or year of graduation from school, may result in a sense of koohai and senpai even among dooryo. In this light, I was perceived by many of the Keishin students to be their senpai, which was, in turn, reflected in students’ use of the suffix san—a suffix that one would use when speaking to one’s senior (see Fukue, 1991; Nakane, 1970) in Japanese—in addressing me, as in “Masaki-san.” Interestingly, however, many students gradually started to use casual register to speak to me while continuing to use the polite san-suffix.

At the same time, I was an outsider to the students in three primary ways. First, I had never studied abroad as an undergraduate student although I had done shorter home-stays and graduate studies in North America and, in fact, in my research journal I mused, “I wonder what it’s like to study an an international undergraduate student” (Journal, August 31, 2000).

Secondly, I was not living in a dormitory, nor had I lived in a dormitory before. One of the students from the ELI class said jokingly to me, “you should live in a noisy apartment building like Dorm A if you want to become one of us” (Fieldnotes, September 9, 2000). Thirdly, my Japanese was different from those of many of the Keishin students (i.e., variations of the Western Dialect). While I was from Eastern Japan, the majority of the Keishin students were from Western Japan, although this difference did not seem to hinder me from building conformable relationships with my participants.
In sum, I was an insider and outsider to the Keishin students. Interestingly, in March, I was asked by the student-members of the Yearbook editorial team to produce two pages: one to be included in the student section and the other to be included in the faculty section. This seems to reflect Keishin students' perceptions of the dual roles that I played as a researcher in the field.

3.4 Data Collection

Data include over 350 hours of classroom and non-classroom observations of project-related work, in-depth, semi-structured interviews with students and teachers, audio- and video-recordings of their interactions, audio-journals kept by key students, e-mail interviews with students, the researcher's field notes and reflective journals, and a collection of relevant documents such as course outlines, class handouts, and students' written journals, term papers, and notes. These data were triangulated to strengthen the trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998) of the present study. In what follows, I will describe each data collection procedure in more detail.

3.4.1 Observations

One major source of data for the present study was observations. Before describing the procedure for this method, a few details should be provided about the structure of the content course. Like some other Keishin courses, Language Fieldwork consisted of one 90-minute lecture, one 90-minute-seminar, and one 90-minute laboratory session per week, which were intended to complement and reinforce one another. As a rule, lectures and lab sessions were taught by the course instructor whereas the seminar was taught by the TA. During the first semester, most of the lab time was allocated for students' volunteer work and oral presentations. For the second semester, the lecture and
seminar were integrated into a three-hour lesson, and Abraham became responsible for
the lab sessions.

There was a time conflict between Izzat’s lessons and Abraham’s seminars, which
prevented me from observing all of the lessons taught by both teachers, thus forcing me
to make a sampling decision. After learning from Izzat that most project-related work
would take place in her lessons, I decided to focus on these for my observation.
Throughout the academic year, I observed all of her lessons and some of Abraham’s that
my key students were taking.\textsuperscript{28} I also observed and audio- and video-recorded my key
participants and their partners as they prepared for their group presentations outside the
classroom.\textsuperscript{29} To determine which out-of-class activities to observe, I asked the key
participants to advise me throughout the research period. Thus, each time they decided to
meet with their partners, my key participants would contact me to inform me of their
schedules. When one meeting conflicted with another, I asked both groups what they
were planning to do at these meetings, and decided which meeting to observe. I would
then ask the other group to audio-record their session, issuing a Walkman-type portable
tape-recorder and several blank cassettes.

I placed tape-recorders around the room to collect the discourse of the students
and teacher, or the discourse of students themselves. More specifically, I placed desktop
tape-recorders in the front and back of the classroom to collect whole class discussions
and portable tape-recorders close to all of the key students to collect their individual

\textsuperscript{28} In the first semester, I observed all three of Izzat’s classes. In the second semester, since none of the key
participants registered for Class 2, I focused on Classes 1 and 3.

\textsuperscript{29} Also, I observed the students as they worked together in the second semester to write their research
reports. However, to examine this writing activity is beyond the scope of the present dissertation. I will
therefore focus on the oral presentations.
utterances and small group discussions. Key students were asked to keep the tape-recorders close to them when working in small groups.

In the second semester, in order to capture their nonverbal expressions and use of notes and transparencies, I video-recorded\textsuperscript{30} students' presentations and key students' out-of-class group work in consultation with my participants, including the instructor, as well as the key students and their partners themselves. As many researchers (Erickson, 1992; Goldman-Segall, 1992; Kvale, 1996; Saville-Troike, 2003) suggest, video data can never be objective and complete records of what transpired in the field because it is the researcher who makes decisions about what to record and how to record it. In the present study, two video cameras were used in the classroom; one was fixed on a tripod in the back to capture the frontal view of the presenters' actions while the other, which was on a tripod usually on the left side of the room, was moved side to side to capture the audience's reactions.

During the observations, I took fieldnotes to help better understand and interpret the recorded discourse, using Hymes' (1972) SPEAKING grid as an observation guide. This grid, according to Schiffrin (1994), was developed to help find "what counts" as communicative events; each letter represents a different component of communication: setting (scene), participants (e.g., speaker, listener, presenter, audience), ends (purpose, goals, outcomes), act sequence (message form and content), key (tone, mood, or spirit), instrumentalities (channels of communication such as oral or written), norms of interaction, and genre (type of event) (Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 2003; Schiffrin, 1994; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). In making notes, I made notes of participants' utterances (Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Spradley, 1980). Quotation marks were used whenever a

\textsuperscript{30} I did not use video-recording in the first semester to respect the Head Teacher's concern.
verbatim record was made (Merriam, 1998). In addition, I took notes of information or contextual details, including visual information and observer comments (Bloom, 1993; Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Merriam, 1998), which could not be captured by the tape-recorders. My observer comments were always written in Japanese and placed in parentheses to distinguish from my descriptions of observed events. Using the tape counter of the desktop recorder placed in the back, like Schieffelin (1990), I recorded the tape position corresponding to each piece of contextual information which I chose to record so that exact location of such information could be known later in transcribing data.

During these observations, I quietly watched and listened to participants’ interactions in and out of the classroom. I moved around the room with the permission of the teacher while observing classroom activities and with the permission of the students while observing activities in other settings. I did not participate in activities in either situation unless I was invited to do so. Thus, the default role of the researcher in these settings was moderate participant (Spradley, 1980) or peripheral member (Adler & Adler, 1987; see also Palys, 1997). After each observation, I spent time working on my fieldnotes with the understanding that this strategy would help visualize the event, the actors, and the context long after the observation (Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1998).

3.4.2 Interviews and Conversations with Students

Another major source of data was interviews and casual conversations with key participants and their partners. I formally interviewed the key students who were observed in the ELI program five times and the other key participants four times during the research period. Non-key students who worked with any of the key students on group
projects were interviewed as well. I tried to conduct the interviews as early as possible, usually within a week after each presentation, so as to ask the participants questions while their memories about the event were still fresh. At the first interview, students were asked which language they would like to speak for the interview (Rossman & Rallis, 1998), English or Japanese. They all preferred to speak Japanese. Thus, all face-to-face interviews were conducted in Japanese. Initially, I tried to take notes while listening to the students but I soon realized that my note-taking seemed to divert students’ attention. I therefore decided to refrain from taking any notes during the interview and instead wrote detailed notes after each interview.

At these meetings, the students were first asked to review their audio- or video-recorded presentations and share with me what was going on in their mind while doing the presentations. The major purpose of this playback session was to gain participants’ emic perspectives on their actions and interactions during the presentations (Saville-Troike, 2003), thereby triangulating perspectives (Green, Dixon, & Zaharlick, 2003; Green & Wallat, 1981; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). As in Morita’s (2000) study, these sessions were instrumental in showing the convergences and divergences between students’ interpretations of the presentation and my interpretations of the same event. The playback session was then followed by semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998). Following Patton (1990), I prepared an interview guide before conducting a new set of interviews (e.g., interviews for Task 1, interviews for Task 2) by sketching out a set of issues and possible questions to be explored. This guide was intended simply as a checklist during the interview to ensure that all relevant topics were dealt with and the actual wording and order of questions were modified in the context of the actual
The interviews lasted approximately one-and-half hours to two hours depending on the participants' schedule and wishes.

Students were asked, for example, to describe how they prepared for their presentations and to comment on their classmates' task performance and their own, and their teachers' intentions for assigning the particular task (see Appendix D for sample questions). Other questions that were asked during the interview were dependent on participants' responses. At the first interview, key students were asked about their backgrounds and reasons for participating in the joint program.

In order to ensure a careful and thorough analysis of data, all interviews were audio-recorded with the permission of the students. Usually, key students and their partners were interviewed together in my living room although some were interviewed separately. Regardless, I also asked students separately if there were any issues that they could not talk about at the interview in their classmates' presence. Moreover, I often asked key students and their partners questions while they were taking breaks during their group meetings. These on-the-spot interviews, also audio-recorded, were helpful in getting students' immediate reflections on their discourse.

Additionally, from time to time, I also communicated informally with students about their studies, family and friends, etc. These informal interviews and casual conversations, usually not audio-recorded but recorded in my fieldnotes, not only

---

31 The six Keishin students who studied with Jamal at ELI (including the two students who did not take Izzat's class in the fall) were first interviewed in August, while the other key students were first interviewed in early October.

32 Wolcott (1999) states that he placed casual conversations at the top of his list for a variety of interview approaches "to underscore its importance not as a source of information, but in recognition of the everyday nature of fieldwork itself" (p. 52).
provided me with valuable information about my participants’ learning and socialization, but also helped me get to know them as people and build rapport with them.

3.4.3 Interviews and Conversations with Teachers

I conducted semi-structured interviews of approximately one hour to two hours with teachers. I interviewed Jamal, the ELI instructor, once toward the end of the university preparation program in August and asked him follow-up questions by e-mail after the program when he was no longer in town. Also, I interviewed the two Keishin program teachers, Izzat and Abraham. Izzat, the instructor, was interviewed twice a semester whereas her TA, Abraham, was interviewed once a semester. To examine their potentially important roles as major socializing agents in Keishin students’ academic discourse socialization, I asked the teachers questions, for instance, about their intentions in assigning particular tasks, their expectations regarding task performance, their assistance with student tasks, and their teaching philosophies (see Appendix E for sample questions).

Furthermore, I often asked the Keishin teachers questions more informally about their teaching and students’ task performance during our lunch breaks and after school. At the end of each student presentation day, I asked Izzat questions about the students’ task performance in her office. These sessions helped me gain her perceptions of students’ task performance, which were more immediate than those gained through interviews scheduled for later occasions.

3.4.4 Audio-Journals by Key Students

Key students were asked to keep audio-journals. Like the participants in Block’s (1996) study, each key student in the present study was provided with guidelines
(Appendix F) as well as with a micro-cassette recorder\textsuperscript{33} and blank cassettes. The students all chose to record themselves primarily in Japanese.

Audio-journals were intended as on-going reports on their project work that took place in my absence or at off-campus locations, such as travel agencies and senior citizens' centers where they volunteered, because I was not permitted or able to observe them there. We all agreed that audio-journals would be less demanding and time-consuming for them than written journals.

Students were also asked to record their thoughts and feelings about project-related classroom events such as model presentations. However, the idea of audio-recording oneself with no immediate feedback from one's audience seemed to be a weakness of this method (see Campbell, 1996).

3.4.5 E-mail Interviews with Students

The e-mail interviewing (Fontana & Frey, 2000) employed in the present study allowed me to find out how non-key students prepared for their presentations. I e-mailed several questions (Appendix D) to all the non-key participants enrolled in Izzat's courses after each presentation task within the academic exchange program, resulting in three sets of responses. Another purpose of this e-mail interviewing was to gain non-key participants' perspectives on their classmates' presentations including the key participants'. For this, all the students enrolled in Izzat's course during the second semester were asked after each of the three days allocated for student presentations what they thought of the presentations they observed that day, including their own. Again, they normally used Japanese, although in a final round of e-mail with them after they had

\textsuperscript{33} Students used this tape-recorder to record their individual practicing of the oral presentation and group meetings that I could not attend either because I was observing another group meeting or because they took place unexpectedly.
returned to Japan, I asked them to use English so I could quote them verbatim in their own voice.

3.4.6 Collection of Relevant Documents

Written materials were another important source of data for the present study. Collected documents fell into three major categories. The first category was institutional documents of the ELI and Keishin Programs such as program guides and pamphlets as well as handouts distributed during the orientation meetings. These materials included the descriptions and explicit mission statements of the programs. Secondly, I collected teacher-produced documents including course syllabuses and class handouts. Course syllabuses included descriptions of major assignments (tasks) and expected task performance. Thirdly, student products, such as final papers, field journals, class and meeting notes, and presentation materials, were solicited at each interview. These materials were returned to students after they were photocopied with their permission. Again with their permissions, their individual pages in the student profile booklet were also photocopied and consulted and larger products such as posters were photographed. Key students also sent me their papers, journals, presentation materials, and electronic correspondence with their partners. All the Keishin program students were required to take the Institutional Testing Program (ITP) TOEFL (old forms of TOEFL) four times—once in Japan and three times in Canada—as part of their studies in the exchange program, so these scores were also collected.
3.5 Data Analysis

3.5.1. Data Analysis Procedure

As is often the case with qualitative approaches to research (Davis, 1995, Glesne, 1999; Johnson, 1992; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994), data analysis was an iterative process that took place in parallel with data collection. Transcription of audio-recorded discourse began as it became available. Data, including fieldnotes, interview transcripts, students' audio-journals, and audio-recordings of classroom and non-classroom interactions, were reviewed as they were gathered. As I read and reread my fieldnotes and listened to the audio-recordings, I took notes of recurrent themes, which were then copied onto index cards. I prepared two sets of available transcripts. I used one of these sets to do further reading of the data and the other to analyze the data using the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I then read and marked the transcripts to unitize the data. Once units were identified, transcripts were cut into pieces accordingly. By constantly comparing these units and the above-mentioned notes on the discourse data, I constructed tentative categories and subcategories pertaining to students' oral presentations. This was followed by further data collection and analysis, which often resulted in revision of the constructed categories and subcategories.

More transcription and detailed analysis followed once all data were collected. All of the observed presentations (41 student presentations, 3 teacher presentations, and 25 poster sessions) were transcribed adapting the conventions presented by Duff (1995, 2000, see Appendix G). To strengthen the accuracy of the transcription, the key students and their partners were subsequently asked to verify the transcripts of their presentations.
All of the recorded interactions that key students had with their partners while preparing for their Semester 1 presentations were also transcribed. Japanese utterances were romanized following the conventions presented by Minami (1995). All interviews with the teachers, students, and their partners, as well as key students’ audio-journal entries, were transcribed as well. Again, these transcripts were analyzed using the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These analysis processes generated questions that needed to be asked of the participants.

Further data analysis took place in the process of writing this dissertation. In fact, a number of qualitative researchers have expressed the view of writing as integral to data analysis (Lofland & Lofland, 1995; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rossman & Rallis, 1998). For example, Rossman and her colleagues (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Rossman & Rallis, 1998) state that writing about qualitative data is inseparable from the analytic process because “in the choice of particular words to summarize and reflect the complexity of the data, the researcher is engaging in the interpretive act, lending shape and form—meaning—to massive amounts of raw data” (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, p. 182). Likewise, Dey (1993) states,

Producing an account is not just a question of reporting results; it is also another method of producing these results. Through the challenge of explaining ourselves to others, we can help to clarify and integrate the concepts and relationships we have identified in our analysis. (p. 237)

Acknowledging this analytic and interpretive nature of writing, I asked my key participants to comment on my written representations of their realities in order to strengthen the trustworthiness of the dissertation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
3.5.2 Ethnography of Communication

Like other language socialization studies (e.g., Duff, 1995, 2002b; Morita, 2000; Poole, 1990; 1994; see also Watson-Gegeo, 1988), the present study examined one type of activity or speech event (Hymes, 1972; A. N. Leont’ev, 1981; Levinson, 1979; Ochs, 1988; Rivera & Tharp, 2004; Rogoff, 1993) using the discourse analytic tools of the ethnography of communication (e.g., Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 2003; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). According to Schiffrin (1994), the ethnography of communication concerns itself with “holistic explanations of meaning and behavior, i.e., explanations that locate particular behaviors (including, but not limited to, utterances) in a wider framework of beliefs, actions, and norms” (p. 140). Central to this approach to discourse is speech events or activities that are directly regulated by cultural rules for the use of speech (Hymes, 1972). As Hymes puts it,

the speech event is to the analysis of verbal interaction what the sentence is to grammar. When compared with the sentence it represents an extension in size of the basic analytical unit from single utterances to stretches of utterances, as well as a shift in focus from emphasis on texts to emphasis on interaction. Speech event analysis focuses on the exchange between speakers, i.e., how a speaker by his choice of topic and his choice of linguistic variables adapts to other participants or his environment and how others in turn react to him. (p. 17)

Like many other researchers working within sociocultural traditions (e.g., A. N. Leont’ev, 1981; Ochs, 1988; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; van Lier, 1988), Duff (1995) views an event or activity as “a way of framing culturally organized behavior in order to consider what is being done, how it is being done, and what it entails and signifies” (p. 513), suggesting that focusing upon activities help reconstruct well-bounded discursive events and permits comparisons across contexts (see also Heath, 1983). The oral presentation is the major unit of analysis for the current study.
3.5.3 Analysis of Contingency and Intertextuality

Informed by Vygotsky’s theory of learning and development, van Lier (1992, 1996, 1998a) argues that contingency can be viewed as “the essential ingredient making the transformation of social processing into cognitive processing possible” (van Lier, 1992, p. 104). Following this argument, students’ task-related discourse was analyzed for contingency. According to van Lier (1992), contingency can be “provisionally—and incompletely—defined as ways of displaying attentiveness towards other turns” (p. 98).

Van Lier (1996) states that contingency has two features that appear to contradict with each other: dependency and uncertainty:

Contingency is what gives language first an element of surprise, then allows us to connect utterance to utterance, text to context, word to world. The conditions for a contingent language act are set by alluding to the familiar, the given, the shared, then joint interpretive work is undertaken which simultaneously connects the new to what is known, and sets up expectations for what is to happen next. (pp. 171-172)

As such, contingency can be created through the use of various social and linguistic resources, which fall into three major types: proactive, concurrent, and reactive (van Lier, 1998a). Proactive resources are used for planning discourse on the part of the speaker and for predicting what is coming next on the part of the listener; concurrent resources are defined by van Lier as signals that interactants make during their own turn or their interlocutors’ turns; and reactive resources help to summarize, rephrase, and wrap up points being made. Therefore, I also examined students’ task-related discourse for these features.

Moreover, as Bloom and Bailey (1992) suggest, any language event (i.e., both oral and literate, Barton, 1994) is based upon ties with other related texts and events as well as a history of previous events. To address this link between in-time and over-time
relationships, students’ discourse in task-related events was analyzed for intertextuality (Bloome & Bailey, 1992; Bloome & Egan-Roberson, 1993; Kristeva, 1986; see also Halliday & Hasan, 1985; Maybin, 2003; Philips & Jorgensen, 2002; Putney et al., 2000; Wink & Putney, 2002). This concept is closely related to the work of Bakhtin (Maybin, 2003). Recall that from a sociocultural perspective informed by his theory, language learning is seen as a process of learning to ventriloquate through voices of a social community (Wertsch, Tulviste, & Hagstrom, 1993). In this light, language learning is regarded as an essentially intertextual activity.

Influenced by the work of Bakhtin, Kristeva (1986) explains the concept of intertextuality as follows: “Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (p. 37). More recently, Bloom and Bailey (1992) define the term as socially constructed juxtapositions of various oral and written texts and socially constructed links between past, present, and future texts that are recognized by participants. As Philips and Jorgensen (2002) state, “One cannot avoid using words and phrases that others have used before” (p. 73).

According to Putney et al. (2000), researchers can identify what counts as socially significant in a community by examining “what actions members take up, what they referentially propose and acknowledge, how they take up, and build on what is proposed within an unfolding event” (p. 92). Moreover, they suggest that it is also possible to identify, through explorations of the intertextual ties across contexts, what participants bring from earlier events and how their participation in those events is of social relevance and significance. Like Putney et al. (2000), I examined the classroom and non-classroom discourse of key students and their interlocutors by moving back and forth in time across
task-related events. In this process of data analysis, I noted students' uses of intertextual referencing including quotation, reported speech and thoughts, and imitation (Maybin, 2003), as well as deixis that made reference to discourse and actions in earlier events (e.g., their speech, that presentation). I also applied a SFL analysis of some excerpts, drawing on Mohan (1986, 1990), Halliday (1994a), and related work.

3.6 Trustworthiness of the Study

Regardless of their theoretical/philosophical orientations, all researchers must deal with trustworthiness or the questions of reliability and validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), trustworthiness concerns the following questions: “How can an inquirer persuade his or her audience (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of?” (p. 290). In the rest of the present study, I use the trustworthiness criteria discussed by Lincoln and Guba (1985), that is, credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability, rather than the conventional criteria, internal validity, reliability, generalizability, and objectivity, respectively.

According to Faltis (1997), the hallmark of a well-conducted case study is internal validity (credibility), without which not only are findings presented and conclusions drawn by the researcher questionable, but reliability (dependability) also is negatively affected. In the present study, several techniques were used to address the question of credibility, a major criterion for trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The first technique was prolonged engagement, which according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) helps to accomplish several purposes: “learning the ‘culture,’ testing for misinformation introduced by distortions either of the self or the respondents, and building trust” (p. 109).
Like other ethnographic researchers, I spent a great amount of time with participants to learn the culture(s) of their exchange program, test the accuracy of the collected information, and develop trust and rapport with them and others involved in the exchange program. Here, the issue of participants’ reactivity or the observer’s paradox (Labov, 1972) needs to be addressed as well. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the mere fact of being a “stranger in a strange land” (p. 302) attracts unnecessary attention to the researcher, with its concomitant overreaction and that it is unlikely that unless the researcher started out as an accepted member of the group being studied, distortion can be overcome. However, Allwright and Bailey (1991) suggest that reactivity can be reduced— but never erased— if the researcher pays repeated visits to the research site and familiarizes participants with tape- and video-recorders. Likewise, Glesne (1999) suggests that researchers carry a notebook all the time and make it known to participants that they will write in their notebooks. These suggestions were adopted in the present study.

Secondly, my interpretations, translations, and conclusions were tested with key participants and their partners during and after the study. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) put it, if the researcher is to be able to argue that “his or her reconstructions are recognizable to audience members as adequate representations of their own (and multiple) realities, it is essential that they be given the opportunity to react to them” (p. 314). Member checks were thus conducted during and after the study and I asked my key students and teachers to comment on my interpretations. Additionally, I had the opportunity to present some of my findings to a new group of Keishin students taking Abraham’s course in the fall of 110.
2002. Many of these students commented that my key participants’ experiences with the oral presentation task resonated with their own.

A third technique employed to increase the credibility of the present research was triangulation\(^{34}\) (Denzin, 1970; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; van Lier, 1988; Yin, 1994). As we have seen, different kinds of data were collected from different people involved in the study at different places by utilizing different methods and research tools (see Figure 3.1).\(^{35}\) In other words, multiple methods for data collection, multiple sources of data, multiple research settings, and multiple viewpoints were triangulated in the study. Triangulation is based on the belief that “at least two perspectives are necessary if an accurate picture of a particular phenomenon is to be obtained” (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, p. 73). The idea is that if different kinds of data lead to the same conclusion, we can have a little more confidence in that conclusion (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). However, as Mathison (1988) points out, triangulation may not necessarily yield data that are consistent. Thus, in the present study, triangulation is seen not as a technical panacea for ensuring validity, but rather as a strategy that helps to develop a holistic understanding of the phenomena being investigated and to construct credible explanations about them (Mathison, 1988).

\(^{34}\) Denzin (1970) describes four types of triangulation: data triangulation, theoretical triangulation, methodological triangulation, and investigator triangulation.

\(^{35}\) Holliday (2002) presents a similar figure based on his data. However, I owe the development of Figure 3.1 to conversations with my father, Matsuo Kobayashi, who for more than 40 years has been a surveyor (the field from which triangulation originates from, as noted by Bailey & Nunan, 1996; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995).
Figure 3.1: Triangulation

I Method

Interview

Audio-journal

Audio-/video-recordings

Observation

Collection of relevant written documents

II Data Source

Discourse transcripts/Logs

Class handout

Field notes

Interview transcripts

Audio-journal Transcripts

Student written products

III Views

Teachers

Researcher

Key students

Non-key students

IV Settings

Lecture

Lab

Seminar

Group meetings
The techniques discussed above—triangulation and member checks—help enhance the reliability of a qualitative case study. While reliability in the traditional sense concerns the notion of replicability, dependability or “consistency” in the constructivist sense (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) concerns whether the findings of a study are consistent with the data collected (Merriam, 1998). According to Edge and Richards (1998), dependability is a matter of “taking care that the inevitable changes in the situation being investigated, in the participants, and in the emergent design of the research itself are properly documented, so that the decisions made and the conclusions reached are justifiable in their own contexts” (p. 345). Thus, this dissertation articulates the theoretical perspectives through which the data were filtered, and provides an audit trail or a detailed description of the procedures for data collection and analysis, and decision-making processes involved so that readers can trace the logic of inquiry (Gee & Green, 1998) and reconstruct the study in their minds (Gillham, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998). This is also taken as a strategy to address the question of confirmability, or a matter of “providing evidence which confirms the presence of the data according to the perspective, standpoint, or value system espoused by the researcher” (Edge & Richards, 1998, p. 345).

Finally, a few remarks should be made concerning transferability. Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that unlike the traditional notion of generalizability (see, for example, Brown, 1988; Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991; Johnson, 1993), transferability depends upon the similarity between sending and receiving contexts and that transferability inferences cannot be made by a researcher who is only familiar with the sending context. Therefore, the researcher’s job is to accumulate and present empirical evidence about contextual
similarity or to provide a detailed description of the sending context so that readers can assess the applicability of the research conclusions to other situations (Faltis, 1997; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In other words, enough detailed description of the study's context must be presented that will allow readers to examine if an "inferential bridge" can be built between the present cases and other cases of interest to them (Shulman, 1988). This is one major goal of the present study.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Every social researcher has ethical responsibilities. Marshall and Rossman (1999) state that the hallmark of a successful qualitative researcher is being exquisitely sensitive to the ethical issues present in engaging in any moral act. Participants were all informed of their rights to refuse to participate and to withdraw from this study at any time without consequences. Because of the intensive nature of the study, especially for key students and their partners (i.e., being observed and recorded both in and out of class time), it was vital for me to be sensitive to my participants' voices and respect their privacy. As Spradley (1980) says, participants as human beings have their problems, concerns, and interests, and thus there will always be conflicting values. At the onset of the study, participants were informed that if they had any questions about the research anytime during the course of the study, I would make myself available to listen and talk to them. Throughout the study, I availed myself after each observation and encouraged students to share any concerns they might have. Moreover, I always consulted my key participants before changing any plans for my data collection, with the decision to use video-recordings in the second semester being one such example. Not only was this kind of consultation important ethically, but it also helped establish trust and maintain it.
3.8 Summary of the Chapter

To summarize, this study employs an ethnographic case study approach. Although case study, like ethnography, aims to understand the phenomena under investigation in terms of the meanings that individuals bring to them, it does not necessarily seek to understand them in terms of cultural attitudes, beliefs, and values that both shape and are shaped by people's actions (Nunan, 1992). On the other hand, ethnographic research is generally concerned with large groups or communities. Given that the purpose of the present study is to examine individual students' language socialization into an L2 academic community over time, it is vital to integrate a case study approach with an ethnographic approach.

The research sites and participants for the present study were purposefully selected to develop a holistic understanding of students' learning and socialization through project work. For instance, the Language Fieldwork course was selected because it was a project-based content course taught by a respected teacher with years of teaching experience. To strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings, eleven students representing a wide range of academic departments at Keishin University were invited to participate as key students. Data were collected over the entire academic year from different participants at different places using a variety of methods. As is typical of qualitative approaches, the present study went through a recursive cycle of collecting and analyzing data, generating and testing hypotheses, and making decisions about further data collection (van Lier, 1990). In other words, data gathering took place in tandem with data analysis (see Figure 3.2). Recorded interactions were transcribed and analyzed using the discourse analytic tools of the ethnography of communication. The results of this
analysis was linked with themes that emerged from other data through constant
comparison. Triangulation, long-term involvement in the field, and member checking
were all strategies utilized to yield credible findings.

Figure 3.2: Recursive Cycle of Data Collection and Analysis

Adapted from Butler (2000)
Chapter 4
COMMUNITY CONTEXT OF TASKS

4.0 Introduction

According to Kohonen (2001), “School is not just preparation for the life to come; it is also a community in its own right, with a specific culture. Learners practice living in community through the ways in which the teachers structure their learning experiences” (p. 20). Likewise, Legutke and Thomas (1991) state that each classroom is a “unique social environment with its own human activities and its own conventions governing these activities” (p. 2). From a sociocultural perspective, it is vital to examine what competent membership of and participation in the classroom entails (van Lier, 1988). Viewing the classroom as a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), I will focus in this chapter on the community and institutional aspects of the task environment, including the culturally defined purposes of the oral presentation tasks, teacher expectations regarding this academic task, constraints on and resources for the task, and the roles of the teachers as socializing agents (Rogoff, 1995, 1998, 2003; Wells, 1999a).

4.1 The WPU-Keishin Joint Program

Before describing the classroom culture of Izzat’s Language Fieldwork course, a few details should be provided about the WPU-Keishin Joint Program. The purpose of this academic exchange program was to help participants develop intercultural understanding through their participation in a residential program that integrates academic, sociocultural, and linguistic studies. To quote its 2000-2001 guidebook, the WPU-Keishin program aimed to promote students’ “learning through academic studies,
everyday life, and cultural exchange” (original in Japanese). Central to this joint program were integrated courses designed especially for Keishin students, including two mainstream arts study courses (e.g., cross-cultural psychology, geography) and two sheltered content-based ESL courses, such as Language Fieldwork and Language across the Curriculum. The arts studies courses were offered in the second semester whereas the content-based ESL courses were offered throughout the year. As such, the first halves of the two content-based ESL courses (e.g., Language Fieldwork A and Language across the Curriculum A), coupled with an introductory course on Canadian studies also offered in the first semester, were designed to help students prepare for the Semester 2 courses, including the required arts studies and/or other regular courses they might wish to take as electives.

4.2 Classroom Culture of the Language Fieldwork Course

In what follows, I will describe the classroom culture of Izzat’s content-based ESL course, Language Fieldwork, which consisted of two half courses, Language Fieldwork A and B.

4.2.1 Course Objectives

During Academic Year 2000-2001, Language Fieldwork A, offered during the first semester, dealt with intercultural communication whereas Language Fieldwork B, offered during the second semester, dealt with research methods in social science and education. The required textbook for Language Fieldwork A was Fred E. Jandt’s (1998) *Intercultural Communication: An Introduction*, which covered a variety of topics related to intercultural communication: barriers to intercultural communication, non-verbal communication, immigration and acculturation, identity and subgroups, to name a few.
The required textbook for Fieldwork B was Judith Bell’s (2000) *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science*, which covered a variety of topics, including designing and administering questionnaires, conducting interviews and observations, doing a literature review, finding and searching information sources, and analyzing documentary evidence.

The major difference between these half courses was that whereas Language Fieldwork A focused on a teacher-determined subject (i.e., intercultural communication), Language Fieldwork B allowed students to choose their topics in social science and education by focusing on research methods. Izzat commented that she chose intercultural communication as course content for Term 1, when students were still new to Canada, so as to facilitate their transition to the new culture. As for the Term 2 course, she explained in her outline why she decided to offer a course on research methodology as follows:

> WPU-Keishin Academic Exchange students come from a variety of backgrounds such as International Relations, Law, and Political Science. After a few months’ study at WPU, some Keishin students decide to get into the field of Education (i.e., to become teachers in the future). **Although all Keishin students wish to take WPU courses that are directly related to their majors and interests, due to some WPU prerequisites, it is not possible for all of them to do so.** Furthermore, **almost all the courses at WPU, including the courses offered in the Keishin Program, require students to conduct some kind of document or empirical research. However, a majority of students are not equipped to cope with this demand.** This course is designed to meet such needs. *(Semester 2 course outline, my emphasis)*

Moreover, Izzat explained in one of the interviews that her decision had been informed by Keishin University:

**Excerpt 4.1**

> Also I heard from my colleagues here that Keishin University uh hopes and wishes and even asked people here to teach their students umm as many things as possible that have immediate relevance to the students’ fields of specialization. But uh - since we have students from many many areas it’s impossible for me or for anybody here to teach uh let’s say law for 20 minutes and Japanese literature for another 20 minutes or and we are not even qualified to do those. So umm but anyway I agreed that uh students if possible would be able to do as much as they can - something that has something to do with their
fields of specialization. But again because we cannot do that - (I mean) we are not qualified to teach law or economics. The other reason is it's impossible to do that due to the many specializations students bring. So I wondered um last year uh - I thought about the ways and methods that I can provide the students to be able to learn as much as they can. (interview, April 27, 2001)

Thus, it was in her attempt to respond better to the disciplinary diversity of the Keishin student body that Izzat decided to offer a research course that would allow students to investigate their chosen topics in social science and education while familiarizing them with various ways to conduct research. In other words, Language Fieldwork B provided students with a wider range of choices than Language Fieldwork A. Because of this, Izzat decided that research methods would be appropriate content in Term 2 when students were more familiar with life in Canada and thus possibly more comfortable and independent.

Despite the difference in content, these courses had several fundamental similarities. Firstly, both courses were organized around student projects that constituted a major part of the course work. Secondly, they were both organized in such a way that the instructor focused primarily on students' development of background knowledge about the subject matter through exposition and reflection whereas her TA Abraham’s lessons focused primarily on students’ development of practical understanding of the same subject matter through hands-on activities. According to Izzat and Abraham, the former teacher’s lessons dealt mainly with the “theory” of intercultural communication and research in social science and education whereas the latter teacher’s lessons dealt mainly with the “practice” of these subject matters. The following excerpt was part of the explanation that Abraham provided about the course at his first class meeting for the second semester:
Same thing as last year, (0.9) (but) we’ll be in a different classroom, - with air-conditioning. ((laughs)) (0.5) …Uh: hopefully I’ll be - helping you do some of the practical stuff. Uh: you’ll be talking about theory with Izzat, and I’ll be doing a little bit of practice - here in the lab. (Class 1, January 10, 2001)

For example, whereas Izzat taught them principles of research designs, methods, and ethics, Abraham taught them how to keep records, make notes, and write a research paper as well as took the students to some of the major libraries on campus.

Thirdly, both Language Fieldwork A and B had as their goals assisting students in developing critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, cooperative skills, and academic interests, as well as academic content knowledge and discourse. Izzat said that her main goal was to initiate her students into the academic culture(s) of “Canadian” universities. In what follows, we will look at these goals as defined by Izzat in class as well as in the course outlines.

4.2.1.1 Learning Academic Content and Discourse

As a content-based course, Language Fieldwork had as a major goal helping students learn the content and language of the subject matters: intercultural communication (Semester 1), research methodologies for social science and education, and their areas of specialization (Semester 2). For instance, in the course outline for Language Fieldwork A, Izzat wrote that the course was designed to provide students opportunities to “gain knowledge about intercultural communication by learning about the cultures of others and their own” and to learn the academic language/discourse in the subject area of intercultural communication” (Course outline for Language Fieldwork A). Similarly, in the course outline for Language Fieldwork B, she wrote that the course was designed to help students gain knowledge about their chosen topics and learn the
language of social science research methods and their specializations. At the first class meeting for each semester, Izzat gave her students time to read the course outline, went over it, and explained the course objectives and assignments to them. The following excerpt illustrates how she explained the goal of learning academic language/discourse:

**Excerpt 4.3**

From now on what you need to do is to go into your own field, and study the language that is needed - in there. Okay? And that's what you need - in order to become - scientists - and be able to talk to everyone in the world. In - people in your field. That's where you're going to present your work - that's where you're going to write - your journal articles - that's where you're going to read - uh: other people's writing. Okay? So that's why - you need to - somehow learn - the language that is needed in your specialization. Okay? And this is a course - that - hopefully helps you - to be able to do that - by doing research in your area of specialization. You will read - books. You will read articles that are written in your field. And uh: by doing research yourself in your area of specialization - you will learn to talk about it by yourself - write about it by yourself. (Class 3, January 4, 2001)

As these excerpts show, this course aimed to apprentice students into the cultures of intercultural communicators and researchers of social science and education.

**4.2.1.2 Developing Critical Thinking Skills**

A third major goal of Izzat’s Language Fieldwork course was to help students develop their critical thinking skills. In the following excerpt, Izzat is starting her lecture about Chapter 13 (entitled “Contact between Cultures”) of the Jandt book:

**Excerpt 4.4**

Izzat: All right. Now let’s get into - the lecture. Yeah as you know um the - today’s topic is - contact between cultures? And uh: because all information is in the text, I don’t want to repeat whatever is in there because you read it - you know what’s in there. What I really like to do is - to help you think critically - to help you think beyond what you read. Or to help you understand what more can be interpreted from what’s written in the text. So I always uh do - a lot of questions and answers kind of lecturing. Rather than just repeating what’s in the textbook. That’s why my uh: u:mm - my lecture today also starts with a question. (November 3, 2000)

Here, Izzat announces that she will not simply go over the content of the chapter as the students are supposed to have read it as homework, and that she would instead like to
help them “think beyond” what they read or “understand what more can be interpreted from what’s written in the text” by asking them questions. As we will see later in this chapter, Izzat would often show computer-printed questions about the text using the overhead projector (OHP) and had the students discuss answers in small groups, as well as ask questions while lecturing in whole class sessions. She also encouraged her students to think beyond not only what they read, but also what they observed and experienced in the field.

The following excerpt was taken from the first class meeting for the second semester in which Izzat explained the plan for Language Fieldwork B. Here, the teacher is discussing the importance of evaluating the trustworthiness of research and drawing one’s own conclusions.

Excerpt 4.5

1 Izzat: So anyway - now you - by - by studying these things ((referring to research skills)) - you learn to be critical. You learn - not to learn to believe everything that you hear - because - we know that - as soon as we know that according to this researcher - so and so professor said this - you think that - this guy’s spend ten years doing this research - it must be true. So we believe in it. But after this course - you are not going to believe in it. You have to find out who this professor is - where did the money come from to do this research - why is he doing this research - who did he do this research for - and then you’re going to interpret the data - by yourself. Then you’re going to make your own conclusions. Okay? That’s how you become critical. Do you understand me?

2 Ss: ((Some students nod.)) (January 5, 2001)

What is more, Izzat often explained the importance of being “constructively critical,” saying that it is not courteous to criticize others’ works unsparingly without considering and acknowledging their possible contributions. Additionally, from the first day of her course, Izzat occasionally stressed in class the importance of “agreeing to disagree” so as to foster constructive discussion conductive to student learning.
According to Pally (1997), development of critical thinking skills benefits from studying one content area over time. This is because sustained content study allows students to accumulate subject matter information, which would in turn help them "to question, synthesize, and evaluate what they read" (p. 293). It is also because such a study allows students to become familiar with the rhetorical conventions of the field. In short, development of critical thinking skills, like the learning of academic language and content, is seen as an important part of academic discourse socialization. Importantly, Izzat expressed similar views when she was asked about the goals of her course at the interview conducted at the beginning of the year.

4.2.1.3 Developing Problem-Solving Skills

Development of problem-solving skills was another important goal of Izzat's Language Fieldwork, especially in the second semester. At the first class meeting for Language Fieldwork B, Izzat provided her students with this explanation:

Excerpt 4.6

Izzat: During - the time you're going to do your research project - you're going to run into a lot of problems. Okay? (0.6) ...In doing research - there are a lot of problems that you have to solve - you have to anticipate - and you have to deal with. (January 5, 2001)

As an example, Izzat referred to the difficulty that a group of her students had collecting questionnaires that they administered in the previous semester as volunteers in psychology research. Faced by this problem, the students enlisted the cooperation of their peers by announcing that they would throw a party for their research participants. Another example she gave had to do with methods for data collection and negotiation of access. Explaining the evanescence of human memory, Izzat said that researchers would soon forget or confuse details of their observed events with the passage of time. She then said that this problem could be solved by using audio- and video-recording, but not all
participants might agree to be audio- and/or video-recorded, which is another problem to be solved one way or another. Giving these examples, Izzat told her students that they would need to deal with a variety of problems as they occur over the course of their projects. Research project work was thus seen to provide opportunities to practice problem-solving skills in the context of a meaningful activity.

4.2.1.4 Developing Cooperative Skills

Another goal of Izzat’s course was to foster students’ cooperative skills through project work. In the following excerpt, which was again taken from the first class meeting for the second semester, Izzat is explaining how doing a research project might help them learn cooperative skills:

Excerpt 4.7

1 Izzat: All right. U:mm - how about cooperative working skills. How does - how do you learn cooperative skills by doing research. ((clears her throat and looks at Yoshino.))

2 Yoshi: Share - share my opinion with other people.

3 Izzat: Okay, by sharing opinion? All right. The other is that - we haven’t uh: gotten to that point - in the course outline yet. ((clears her throat.)) The project - research project is going to be a pair project?³⁶ Meaning that - two of you are going to do one research project. And - that’s already cooperative work. If you cannot - cooperate you are not going to finish this uh project. So that’s one way of cooperation. And along the way you have to be able to cooperate with a lot of people. Again, who are - what are you going to do for your research. Where are you going. How do you do it. Do you - let’s say if you choose to interview (0.9) the first thing you have to do is - you have to know how to cooperate - with the people you’re going to interview. You have to know how to ask them nicely. And you have to learn what to do if they say no.

(January 5, 2001)

As we will see later in this chapter, students were encouraged or required to complete many of their assignments in pairs or groups of three. However, Izzat’s use of the term “cooperation” here is not limited to cooperation among group members. It refers to

³⁶ As we will see later, Izzat encouraged the students to do the Semester 2 project in pairs, rather than in small groups. But there were some groups of three.
students' cooperation with a number of people, including their teachers, classmates, librarians, and research participants. In other words, students were encouraged to use all the available human resources to undertake their projects. Similarly, Abraham often explained the importance of discussing data with others including their teachers, peers, and the researcher. For instance, in one lesson, he said to the students, "Talk to Izzat, me, your friends, and Masaki" (March 7, 2001).

4.2.1.5 Developing Academic Interests

Yet another goal of the content-based course was for the students to develop interests in some of the topics covered in it. Izzat wrote in the course outline that Language Fieldwork A was designed to help students “develop interests in pursuing one or more areas covered in the course for their future studies (e.g., a topic for their bachelor’s degree thesis and/or for their postgraduate studies)” (Course outline for Language Fieldwork A). This was also an important goal of Language Fieldwork B, as the following excerpt suggests:

Excerpt 4.8

Izzat: I’d like you to develop some interests in pursuing one - or more areas covered in the course - for your future studies. And it can be anything from - what you research on or it could be one of the topics that we cover in class. Like uh: research. All of a sudden - you might - start - showing an interest and hey - this - studying how to do research is interesting - maybe I become a researcher - for researches how to do research. Okay? Or you may say - I did my research project - and I found this problem really really interesting. Or - hey this critical thinking thing sounds very interesting, well how to look at research critically. So maybe I’ll study this. So it’s that kind of idea that I have here...One of my purpose is - in teaching you is to introduce you to something more - to be able to enable you to see that there are interesting things you can study - more in the future. Okay? (January 5, 2001)

Izzat often shared with her classes her belief that one fundamental purpose of undergraduate education is to introduce students to as many subjects as possible and help them find out what their academic and professional interests are. Also, Izzat often told
her classes about some of her previous students who, after taking her course, decided to pursue their interests by taking more courses at WPU and/or Keishin University or by doing graduate studies back in Japan. For instance, two of her students who had satisfied the TOEFL requirement decided to take a regular course on intercultural communication through the Department of Anthropology in the second semester. However, this does not mean that students had to develop interests in topics covered in the course. As she often told her classes, her purpose was to provide her students with chances to study what she had to offer and to see if they could find anything they would like to pursue in the future. Thus, even if her students did not develop interests in any of the topics covered in the course, Izzat considered it satisfying because it means that they learned that their interests lie in something else.

4.2.2 Other Values Fostered in the Classroom Community

In addition to the above goals, there were other values promoted in this classroom culture. These included (1) learning by observing and emulating the model, (2) the teacher as an "ESL person," and (3) L1 as a resource for learning. These values as well as the above course goals are necessary to interpret Keishin students' project-related activities in a socioculturally meaningful way.

4.2.2.1 Learning through Observation and Emulation of the Model

As we saw in Chapter 2, from a language socialization perspective, observation is considered to be an important way for novices to learn the sociocultural practices of their community. This aspect of learning seemed to be promoted by the teacher of the content-based course under study. For example, to help her Keishin students understand the requirements of the poster project, Izzat showed them some of the posters produced by
the previous groups of her students that she considered exemplary. As we will see later in this chapter, she also asked Abraham to give a model presentation for her students.

Izzat encouraged her students not only to observe the models, but also to emulate them. She often told her classes how impressive the academic performances of her students in the previous Keishin group (Keishin 9) were, but at the same time, she believed that her Keishin 10 students could excel them. In the following excerpt, Izzat is commenting on the posters produced by her Keishin 10 students. She expresses her appreciation for this work, comparing it with that of Keishin 9.

Excerpt 4.9

Izzat: ((referring to the students' posters on the wall)) This is great. It's better than last year's. [X: Really?] You did it. ((laughs)) Ha-ha-ha-ha. Umm - Okay. (October 5, 2000)

Similarly, in the following excerpt, having seen the student presentations for the day, Izzat is providing positive feedback, referring to the previous group. What is important here is that she is also making explicit her belief that every generation of students should excel the preceding one.

Excerpt 4.10

Izzat: So here it proves one more time that uh - that you truly - are better than Keishin 9 students. That is good. Every gene- every generation - every year... the students should be better than the previous ones. And that's how things should work. So it's really good. And I'm very encouraged. Okay? And umm yeah again I hope you - keep up the good work. (October 27, 2003)

In the following excerpt taken from the discourse of the first class meeting for Semester 2, the instructor is explaining the range of topics that her students chose for their group projects. Once again, she tells her Keishin 10 students that they could do better than those in the previous group.
Excerpt 4.11

Izzat: Last January I tried it and worked quite well actually. People did choose topics in their field. We had a research on human brain. Brain and language. We had a research on capital punishment - people who majored in law - they did research on how to why certain countries have death penalty and others don't. And some people did research on education comparing Canadian primary school education to Japanese primary school education. And others did research on banking - economics people... So it's possible to do what I said here that we could do. So I'm hoping that we'll do a better job this year - because those of you who have been with me for five months you know that I say this a lot that - because I trust that your guys can do it and in many ways you seem to be better than Keishin 9 students. So that's why I'm saying that we should be able to do a better job. Okay? (January 5, 2001)

Izzat said both in class and at an interview that she believed that Keishin 9 students would serve for Keishin 10 students as “good” role models within their reach (see Murphey, 1998, for a relevant discussion). This was another reason why Izzat encouraged her students to emulate the previous group. Additionally, Izzat promoted the intergenerational interaction, as it were, between Keishin 9 and 10 students. For example, she invited to her classes one of her previous students from the Keishin 9 group to talk about her post-WPU experience in Japan. When she heard from another Keishin 9 student about his early acceptance into a graduate program at Keishin University, Izzat encouraged her Keishin 10 students to contact him if they were interested in pursuing graduate studies. Here, it is important to recall that it was Keishin 9 students that, as senpai or old-timers, organized many of the pre-departure orientation sessions for the Keishin 10 group under the guidance of the program director and a WPU student. Thus, the view of previous participants in the joint program as peer role models was promoted at both classroom and program levels.

In addition, many of the Keishin students seemed to value learning through observation. In their interviews, journal entries, and group meetings, students often referred to their teachers’ and peers’ actions, using Japanese words such as minarau...
(learn by seeing), *manesuru* (imitate), *tehon* (copybook), *mihon* (model), and *sankoo* (reference), all of which seem to reflect their conceptions of themselves as observers willing to learn from others (see Singleton, 1996). According to Peak (1998), “Imitation of a superior model has traditionally been the core of teaching-learning process in almost every Japanese art form or discipline” (p. 359). This is because many Japanese teachers believe that “in the effort to approximate an ideal model, students will gain the superior quality of a great performer, rather than lose that which is distinctive about themselves” (Peak, 1998, p. 359). Likewise, DeCoker (1996) states, drawing upon his experience as a student of Japanese art, that in a traditional approach to learning, “Mastery of the model is of foremost importance” (p. 69). In fact, the original meaning of the Japanese word *manabu* (learning) is *manebu*, which means “imitate” (Shinmura, 1998). Keishin students attempted to learn the practices of giving an oral presentation by observing the performances of their teachers and peers. However, they did not simply imitate others’ performances; they also attempted to use their creativity. As reported above, the teacher often encouraged them to do academically better than the Keishin 9 students. At the interviews and group meetings for the poster project, many Keishin 10 students expressed their desire to produce “something different” from their seniors’ products. In other words, they wanted to do better on the task than the previous group by incorporating unique elements into their work (see Excerpt 7.20).

**4.2.2.2 The Teacher as an “ESL Person”**

In giving advice to her students, Izzat often used the first person plural pronouns “we” and “us” in her speech. For example, after Nana and Shinpei’s group presentation, she said
Excerpt 4.12

Izzat: Did you remember some of those? Like uh they found out uh the importance of umm right usage of word for instance. As ESL people - [Nana: Yeah.] Uh especially we learn-sometimes we learn from dictionaries. We- we try- we look up a word- English word in-in Chinese in Japanese in uh in Spanish whatever language. And then looking at the translation it looks like the right word. But sometimes there are little nuances in there. (March 15, 2001)

In this excerpt, Izzat constructs both her students and herself as “ESL people.” When asked at their interviews what they liked most about Izzat’s teaching, several students commented that they appreciated her profound understanding of what it is like to be a non-native speaker and that her presentation of herself as a “learner” made them feel close to her. As a matter of fact, Izzat often told her classes that since they were not only learning an L2, but also studying academic content through their L2, they should be proud of themselves, thereby promoting a positive view of being an ESL student.

4.2.2.3 L1 as a Tool for Student Learning

Although the medium of instruction was English, use of Japanese among students was not discouraged in Izzat’s Language Fieldwork course. For instance, in working in small groups, students sometimes used Japanese. But neither Izzat nor Abraham discouraged their use of Japanese although they sometimes encouraged them to talk to each other in English both in and out of class time. In fact, in her lectures, Izzat, as a Chinese speaker, sometimes wrote Chinese characters on the blackboard for such concepts as goods, theme, liberate, occupy, feminist, and objectivity. Since Chinese characters (kanji) are also used in modern Japanese, when written, most of them made sense to the Japanese students despite the great difference in pronunciation. Also, the instructor gave the option of using Japanese when she had her students write the definitions of 50 key terms in the textbook in mid January, saying that the primary purpose of this activity was
to help them learn the concepts. When he took attendance, Abraham always placed the family name before the given name, which is a custom in Japan. Interestingly, many students commented that these classroom practices made them feel that their language and culture were valued.

Furthermore, Abraham said at the his Semester 1 interview:

Excerpt 4.13

I do believe they feel more comfortable speaking Japanese in groups. I - I'm not very strict on that. They tend to speak English when I come close. But actually I think - recently they become very aware that I even - that doesn't bother me so much so - they feel - they seem to be much more comfortable about speaking Japanese. ((laughs)) I truly feel like - I mean it doesn't have to be in English. Just the idea of working with someone on a project - is one of the skills. Being able to negotiate - "I wanna do this - you wanna do this." And compromise. Umm being able to support arguments - saying uh "this is important" - and so on. (interview, November 9, 2001)

For Abraham, to be able to negotiate, compromise, and support arguments was a more important goal of group project work than to speak L2. In other words, it was the nature of talk, rather than the language of talk, that was valued. Similarly, Taichi, Ichiro's partner for the Semester 1 project, expressed his view on use of L1 and L2 as follows:

Excerpt 4.14

In my opinion, which language I choose, English or Japanese, is influenced by surroundings. If my friend who often uses English, I try to respond in English. As well, if I speak to my friends who are apt to use Japanese, I try to speak in Japanese. In other word, I am required to notice who tend to speak English or Japanese... I may judge the person's priority when I choose language. For example, Ichiro no longer thinks English is the most important thing for him. It may be economics or something. So he regards English as the tool to study subject. On the other hand, Tamiko's priority is English itself. Especially she regards speaking as the most important thing. Therefore I speak to her in English. (e-mail interview, February 8, 2001)

Taichi further commented that since he regarded both English and Japanese as tools for learning academic content, he chose whichever was appropriate in a given situation. This view seemed to be shared by many of the Keishin students, who referred at their interviews and group meetings to Izzat's use of Chinese characters in her lectures.
While there was a tacit agreement about the use of L1 among members of most groups, a few groups seem to have negotiated which language to use for their group meetings. The following excerpt comes from the first group meeting that Ringo had with her partners Tamiko and Fuyumi for their Semester 1 presentation. In Line 1, Ringo uses Japanese to ask Tamiko what she plans to talk about in the presentation. In the following line, Tamiko first asks her partners if she can speak in English and then starts to tell them about her plan in the L2. Interestingly, Ringo continues to speak in Japanese while Fuyumi starts to speak in English. In Line 10, Ringo comments that it is difficult to understand what Tamiko is trying to say.

Excerpt 4.15

1 Ringo: *Tami-chan purezen de nani happyo suru tsumori?* [Tami-chan, what do you intend to talk about in the presentation?]

2 Tami: I ju- Uh: ((laughs)) can I try to speak English? I’m just thinking to like - survey - like focus on the project or facility, of welfare.

3 Ringo: *Fasirit'i? Shisetsu ne.* [Facility? It means shisetsu [facility], right?]

4 Tami: But not so big project - I’m just like uh - thinking to -

5 Fuyu: Eh - what do you mean facility.

6 Ringo: *Fasirit'i tte doo iu koto - hon nara gutaiteki ni.* [What exactly do you mean by facility.]

7 Tami: Like the - uh:

8 Fuyu: Like machine? Or transportation?

9 Tami: I mean - I’m sure Fuyumi knows uh: what- what I’m doing in the volunteer work, but - so I’m always doing like - hmm dropping off their house? When they are back to home from senior center. And I’m just accompanying with her- ah: with them, to see like - to take care about they-

10 Ringo: ((referring to Tami’s utterances)) *Muzukashii naa - rikai suru no.* [It’s difficult to understand.]

11 Tami: Is it? (Ringo’s room, November 13, 2000)
After this interaction, Tamiko continued to speak in English, and Fuyumi responded to this effort by also speaking in English. On the other hand, Ringo stopped speaking although she listened to her partners’ exchange. After several minutes, Ringo started to speak to Tamiko in Japanese again. This time, surprisingly, Tamiko started to speak Japanese. Consequently, this group did the rest of their discussion primarily in Japanese. Ringo later told me that she was against the idea of speaking only English at their group meetings because she thought that they would stumble over too many language problems, which might in turn prevent the group from making a substantial or content-rich presentation in the limited amount of time that they had.

4.2.3 Major Classroom Activities

There were two major types of activities in Izzat’s classes: teacher lectures and small group discussions.

4.2.3.1 Teacher Lectures

Responsible for the lecture component of the course, Izzat spent most of her class time talking about the course content. However, as we have seen earlier (Excerpt 4.4), the instructor did not simply read through the text. To make her lectures more interactive and engaging, she would often ask the students questions about the topic of the day and told them relevant stories. In the following example, Izzat asks her students what the textbook says about the time orientation of people in the Middle East:

---

37 I found this quite surprising because I had never seen or heard Tamiko speak Japanese in any situation. As Taichi’s comment in Section 4.2.2.3 suggests, Tamiko’s primary purpose for participating in the exchange program was to improve her English, especially oral and aural skills. As such, she spoke to everyone in English.

38 According to Jandt (1998), the author of the textbook, polychronic time is characteristic of Latin America as well as the Middle East.
4.16

1 Izzat: This might be interesting to you. (0.7) umm the author talks about the time orientation of Islam. (0.8) And again, this is not to say that all Muslims work this way. But - in general, (0.6) some people believe - that (0.7) uh: Muslims or umm (0.9) people who believe in Islam (1.2) work differently in terms of time. (0.7) So what does the uh: author say in our text. (1.8)

2 Wata: Polychronic. (0.9)

3 Izzat: Polychronic. Good! (0.5) What does polychronic mean? ... ((shares with the students the comments an old Keishin teacher made about their posters on non-verbal communication)) I’m so proud of you guys. Great! (12.8)

4 Wata: ((looks at his text)) Uh: it means ((reading from the text)) “the involvement of people and com - completion of tran - saction rather than (0.7) adherence to schedule?”

5 Izzat: YE:S. It refers to schedules, (0.5) and uh: it- according to the author anyway, he says that polychronic means that (0.8) you don’t uh: adhere to schedules strictly. Like you do many things at a time. (0.6) And you may say - uh: rather than - let’s meet at ten o’clock. You may say oh how about tomorrow morning. (0.5) So any time between seven o’clock in the morning to twelve is tomorrow morning. He he he h - and uh: people don’t get angry if you - are not there - umm exactly at ten. Because everybody understands that- (0.9) yeah: roughly at that time. And things may happen because- I couldn’t come because something else happened. You do many things at the same time. (0.6) And this reminded me of somebody - I think it’s Abraham. I forgot who. (0.6) Somebody told me that a Japanese girl worked at one of the Arabic - consulates (1.0) I think in Japan. (0.6) And she got very frustrated because people seemed to be canceling things all the time...

6 Ss: ((laugh))

7 Izzat: But anyway - I’m not trying to uh - uh: promote this stereotype if it is - of who does what in general term. But - things seem to happen. It seems to me that there’s some truth to what our text is saying about it. Yeah anyway - polychronic means that (0.5) you don’t adhere to time schedules strictly. You do many things at the same time.

(Class 3, October 23, 2000)

In Line 1, Izzat asks the class what the author says about the time orientation in the Middle East. Wataru then answers, “Polychronic,” which is one of the key terms in the textbook. In Line 3, Izzat provides positive feedback and asks Wataru to explain the term. Wataru then reads the author’s definition from the textbook, to which the instructor responds again with positive feedback in Line 5.
This type of teacher-student interaction has been referred to in the literature as IRE (Initiation-Response-Evaluation) or IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) sequence (e.g., Cazden, 1988, 2001; Gibbons, 2002; Mehan, 1979; Newman, Griffin, & Cole, 1989; Poole, 1990; van Lier, 1988, 1996, 1998a). According to Newman et al. (1989), "the three-part unit has a built-in repair procedure in the teacher's last turn so that incorrect information can be replaced with the right answers" (p. 127). This, van Lier (1998a) argues, restricts students' opportunities to exercise initiative and opportunities to develop a sense of control and self-regulation. Moreover, Cazden (1988) states, "IRE is the 'default' pattern--what happens unless deliberate action is taken to achieve some alternatives" (p. 53). In the present context, the IRE sequence was employed to make more interactive and possibly more engaging the lectures which would otherwise have been one-way transmission of information through monological discourse (van Lier, 1996). However, as she was aware of the limitations of the sequence, Izzat used another interactional structure (Ramírez, 1995) in her lecture time, namely, small group discussions.

Before we move on to the examination of this activity, a few more remarks should be made about Izzat's lectures. She often shared her own experiences pertinent to the lectures, which her students seemed to appreciate and enjoy. Moreover, the instructor would often refer to previous events in her lectures. In the following example, answering a question from one of her students, she reminds the class that they have previously discussed objectivity and subjectivity:

Excerpt 4.17

Facts and biases. Mm - it's a very good question. Because I'm sure people have lots of different ideas on this. The first reaction of course is well a fact is a fact. You know? But
as we know, even fact can be as complicated as other things. Umm remember we talked about objectivity, and subjectivity? ((some students nod)) Yeah? We try to be objective, we try to tell the truth. But depending on who is telling what and at what time, - even the fact can be somewhat biased. Okay? (Class 1, January 18, 2001)

Thus, the instructor tried to promote her students' understanding of the two technical terms by building on their previous conversation about it. In other words, this can be seen as the instructor's attempt to continue their historical ("long") conversation about the topic (Mercer, 2000). Furthermore, Izzat would often refer to what her students had previously said within the same lesson or on other occasions. One example is that when explaining the importance of making sense of the volunteer experience in Classes 1 and 2, she shared with them what Tomo and Koyuki's group had said in their presentation given in Class 3. Interestingly, although they were not present when this happened, Tomo and Koyuki later heard from their friends in the other classes what their teacher had said about their task performance. They said that this made them happy. Thus, in this classroom community, making intertextual links to previous events seems to have been an important way to create a shared context for learning and to acknowledge students' contributions to the teaching-learning process (see Duff, 1995; O'Conner & Michaels, 1996, for relevant discussions).

4.2.3.2 Small Group Discussions

Another major activity in Language Fieldwork was small group discussion. As briefly mentioned earlier, in the first semester, Izzat often presented questions about the text using the OHP and had the students answer these questions in small groups.

Excerpt 4.18

Izzat: We're going to do what we did last time? That is uh - just talk to your- the person sitting beside you. Three of you or two of you. An: look for answers for these questions. ((reading from the OHP screen)) “What are the ethnographic and cultural approaches to studying intercultural communication.” This is mentioned in the book? I know
you read it but again - look at the book and talk to the person who’s sitting beside you, to see uh: what was your understanding of that. That’s one question, (3.3) and the other question is (1.9) “What do you think of umm (0.6) the Sugawara Survey on page 51.” (8.3) Okay? (11.0) ((many of the students nod)) Okay. Third question. ((reading from the screen)) “How can assuming similarities be a barrier to intercultural communication” (3.4) Remember? The textbook says that - assuming similarities instead of differences - can be a barrier to - to uh intercultural communication. How could that- how so. How could that happen. Okay? So let’s do what we did last time. (Class 1, October 6, 2000)

As this example suggests, small group discussions were intended to help students understand the content of the textbook and to provide opportunities to use some of the language specific to the subject.

In the second semester, too, students had opportunities to work in small groups in Izzat’s classes. But this time, their task was not to answer teacher-developed questions, but to come up with their own questions. Each group was required to come up with at least two questions. Students would ask the teacher one of these questions in subsequent whole-class discussions and post the other question on the on-line class bulletin board to initiate discussion.

4.2.4 Course Assignments as Tasks

With the goal of initiating her students into the academic culture of the Canadian university, Izzat designed the Language Fieldwork course to maximize student participation in a variety of activities and interactions. As such, she required them to undertake group project work that consisted of various academic tasks such as oral presentations, field journal writing, and research report writing. In this section, I will describe the requirements of these tasks, paying particular attention to the oral presentations. Also, I will examine the resources for and constraints on students’ oral presentations.
4.2.4.1 Semester 1 Tasks

During Semester 1, Kiku, Koyuki, Nana, and Tomo were enrolled in Class 1, one of the three sections of the Language Fieldwork course that Izzat taught; Otome, Ringo, and Ichiro were enrolled in Class 2; Yoshino, Shinpei, Rei, and Sakura were enrolled in Class 3. The first assignment for Language Fieldwork A was a poster project which required students to create a poster on non-verbal communication and explain its meaning to the class. Thus, there was an (informal) oral presentation component to this project. The instructor strongly encouraged students to work in pairs or groups of three in the course outline and orally in class, stressing the importance of learning how to work cooperatively with others (see Appendix H). Students were allowed to design their posters in any way they wished, but they were required to provide definitions of nonverbal communication and explain functions and types of nonverbal communication on the posters.

Major assignments for the Semester 1 course centered around 10 to 15 hours of volunteer work at places of students’ choice, and included three field experience journals (worth 20% of the grade), a 30-minute oral presentation of field experience (10%), and a term paper (i.e., individually written report of the field experience, 15%). Here it is important to note that since many volunteer positions required high English proficiency and area-specific knowledge and skills, some students ended up simply taking positions that were available. While working as volunteers, students were required to keep individual journals in which they wrote about their work and learning. For this assignment, the instructor often encouraged the students to “make meaning” of their

39 The Keishin program first incorporated volunteer work into its courses during the year when this study was conducted. Some students questioned the notion of doing “volunteer” work as a class assignment (see Eyler & Giles, 1999, for relevant discussion).
experience by comparing and contrasting it with their previous similar experiences in Japan and with their learning from the lectures and seminars.

All the assignments were closely related: Izzat explains in the course outline, “Field-experience journals will be developed into your oral presentations and term papers, so that the more thoughts you put into the journals, the less work you have to do for the presentation and term paper” (p. 5). The oral presentation therefore was an end product and a step toward the term paper. Below is a description of the oral presentation task in her course outline:

The oral presentation is the sharing of your volunteer experiences. You will tell the class what you did as a volunteer, what you learned, and what significance this learning will have for your future. You have 20 minutes for the presentation and 10 minutes for discussion. Your presentation has to be well-organized and interesting. You are encouraged to use audio-visual and graphic materials in your presentation and to talk from them. That is, do not read from your notes. There will be a model presentation to show you how oral presentations are done. You are encouraged to do this assignment in pairs (i.e., groups of two) because working with another person can result in more and better ideas. Also, you will feel less nervous at the presentation. However, if you REALLY prefer to work alone, you may do so. (Semester 1 course outline, emphasis original)

For this task, most students worked with a classmate or two who worked at the same place or who did similar volunteer work. For instance, Shinpei chose to work with his classmate with whom he volunteered at the same travel agency. Ringo worked with two classmates who volunteered at a senior citizens center. However, not all students had a classmate who did the same or similar volunteer work. In such a case, students were allowed to work with peers enrolled in other sections of Izzat’s course. For example, Yoshino, who volunteered for a Halloween event, decided to work with two other students who went to the same event but were enrolled in the other sections. After considering their schedule, they agreed to give their presentation in Yoshino’s class. Moreover, there were a small number of students who could not find classmates who did
similar volunteer work. In such cases, Izzat still encouraged students to work with others and to see if they could find something that they all learned from their respective experiences. As we will see in Chapter 5, not having a classmate who did similar work, Tomo and Koyuki decided to work together with another student who had been unsuccessful in getting a volunteer position. Table 4.1 shows a list of the volunteer positions that Keishin students took.

**Table 4.1: Volunteer Placement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer Placement</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daycare centers &amp; Preschools</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior centers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese language classes at WPU</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights committee of a Japanese Canadians’ association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology research projects at WPU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese broadcasting company</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio station at WPU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art events and festivals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others(^{40})</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since all the Semester 1 presentations took place in the Keishin lab, students had access to standard equipment including an OHP and data projector and the lab manager’s help, which made it relatively easy to make PowerPoint presentations.

**4.2.4.2 Semester 2 Tasks**

In the second semester, nine out of the eleven key students decided to stay in Izzat’s course as Ichiro and Tomo, who had satisfied the university’s TOEFL criterion, decided to take regular courses instead. Kiku, Koyuki, Sakura, and Yoshino were enrolled in Class A while Nana, Otome, Ringo, Sakura, and Shinpei were enrolled in Class C. Major assignments for Language Fieldwork B revolved around research projects.

\(^{40}\) Some students could not obtain volunteer positions and attended public lectures instead.
on topics of students’ choice to be completed in pairs or groups of three, and included a research portfolio (worth 25% of the grade, submitted three times), a 40-minute oral presentation of research findings (20%), and a research paper (20%).

What was new in the second semester was that students were required to compile research portfolios and submit them three times over the course period. This assignment was explained in the course outline as a “collection of students’ work that shows the progress of their learning” (Semester 2 course outline). Required components for this assignment included research problems and questions, a literature review, a description of research methods, and analyses of data. Students were also encouraged to include their journal entries. Izzat mentioned in class that the purpose of this assignment was twofold: for her to keep track of her students’ actions and thoughts and to provide them with feedback on their project work. Both the oral presentation and written report were to be co-authored whereas the portfolios were to be compiled individually. This means that 40% of the grading was based on pair/group work, suggesting that cooperation was highly valued in this classroom culture.

The requirements for the oral presentation task were similar to those for the Semester 1 presentation (Appendix I). The only differences were that the Semester 2 presentation was 10 minutes longer and counted 10% more toward the course grade:

Excerpt 4.19

Izzat: The presentation is uh: going to be the presentation of your research - project. Okay? It’s not something different. Just like what we did last term - you will present - what you did - for your research project...And one thing that is different this term is that - I assigned more time for the presentation. We’re going to - spend forty minutes. The presentation is forty minutes each. (0.9) And for some of you - that may sound too much. You may think wow - forty minutes - what am I going to say for forty minutes. If you don’t have enough things to say, that’s okay. But I want to give you enough time - to say what you want to say. Often times 40 minutes actually - last time we knew that 30 minutes was not really enough. (Class 3, January 5, 2001)
In addition, encouraged by the instructor, most of the students chose to conduct their research in pairs, rather than in groups of three. As a result, if divided equally, the time allotted to each presenter was expected to be greater in the second semester than in the first semester. There were some constraints on the students' presentations. For one thing, not all students were able to choose a topic within their area of specialization as some were majoring in natural science rather than social science. As we will see in Chapter 7, for example, Kiku, as an engineering major, decided to study the history and culture of First Nations people with another male student who had similar academic interests.

Another constraint was that unlike the Semester 1 presentations, which took place in the Keishin lab, the Semester 2 presentations took place in regular classrooms in different buildings. This made it difficult for Izzat's classes to have access to the data projector and the lab manager's computer expertise. Izzat thus encouraged her students to "go low-tech" (March 1, 2001), advising them not to make PowerPoint presentations.

4.2.5 Roles of the Teachers as Socializing Agents

As socializing agents, both the instructor and TA assumed different roles in the instructional process to help their students accomplish their oral presentation tasks. These included providing explicit explanations about and modeling of the task.

4.2.5.1 Explicit Explanation of the Task

Throughout her course, Izzat often took some class time to explain the requirements of the course assignments. She said to her classes on several occasions that as a student, she did not like it when her professors required her and her classmates to do assignments without providing enough information. She strongly believed that teachers are accountable for helping students understand the requirements of their tasks. Because
of this belief, for instance, she went over the course outline at the beginning of each semester, which included the descriptions of the course assignments. The following excerpts, which were taken from the transcript of the first class meeting for the second semester, illustrates how the instructor explained her perceptions of and expectations about the oral presentation task:

Excerpt 4.20

Izzat: And this term - because it’s your research - we also want to learn from your research. So I assigned longer time so we now have time to ask you questions. Okay? What this really means is that actually it’s going to be really exciting. It’s a - let’s say we have uh ((counts the number of the students)) - we seem to have 18 students in this class, so if you do your project in pairs - then we have - 18 uh: 9 - different projects will be going on in this class. So by the end of the term - through your presentation - we’ll all have learned about nice things. Okay? So nine pieces of research. And that is - to me very exciting. And that’s why I decided to give you longer time - to tell us what you did - what you found and what you think of it. Okay? (January 5, 2001)

As this excerpt suggests, the instructor regarded the presentations as good opportunities for her students to learn from each other.

In the following excerpt, Izzat encouraged her students not to read from their notes. Recall that she made a similar statement in the course outline for Language Fieldwork A. Nevertheless, as the above excerpt indicates, some students chose to read their speech from manuscripts\(^{41}\) in the first semester. Although she was aware of this method of delivery, Izzat did not push too hard because she thought that some might not yet be ready for the challenge of speaking without manuscripts in public. However, having seen their Semester 1 presentations, she felt that she could and should push them harder on the Semester 2 presentation.

Excerpt 4.21a

Izzat: I know that - ((clears her throat)) you are excellent presenters. (0.9) But one thing I’d like to point out is that last term we had a few people reading - from their notes. Okay? And

\(^{41}\) This kind of delivery is referred to as “manuscript delivery” (Beebe & Beebe, 2000).
um (1.7) what I'd like you to do differently this term - is that I strongly encourage you not to read from your notes. I’d like you to speak from your notes - like I do. See I have notes - in my hand all the time. But I don't read from it. I just uh look at it to remind me what is it that I’m supposed to say (1.0) u:mm next. And uh: believe me - you can do it - because - you will be reporting your research. Nobody knows your research - but you. So we’ll listen to you whatever you say. So rather than reading it - you just tell us what you did. It's the easiest thing to do - because it's your research. Okay? (Class 3, January 5, 2001)

In this excerpt, the instructor encourages the students to follow her example, showing her lecture notes. She then tells her students that they can make presentations without reading their speech because they will be reporting their own research, which no one else knows. She went on to say:

Excerpt 4.21b

Reading from notes is the worst - way of doing a presentation. And that’s the easiest way to put people to sleep. No matter how important your research is - no matter how interesting you think - your presentation is - as soon as you start reading from your notes - people should start falling asleep. Okay? Because you are not looking at people - you are not having eye contact. Because you are not - umm not excited about what you say. By reading you cannot get too excited. But if you look at people - you respond to how people look. And uh that kind of presentation is much more interesting. (January 5, 2001)

What is important about this excerpt is that the instructor expresses her beliefs about what constitutes a “good” oral presentation. As evidenced by her use of the word “worst” in the first utterance, she strongly discourages her students from reading their manuscripts, saying that it is the easiest way to put their audience to sleep. From the excerpt, it follows that to make a “good” oral presentation as perceived by the teacher, presenters must make eye contact with and respond to their audience and convey enthusiasm for the project. To this end, it was considered necessary for the presenters not to read from their notes. Here, it is important to note that the instructor is concerned about the interpersonal actions of the oral presentation task in the above excerpt. As we will see
in the following section, a “good” oral presentation must demonstrate critical reflection on the research by going beyond the surface level description of observed events.

4.2.5.2 The Instructor’s Explanation about and Modeling of the Journal Writing Task

As we have seen earlier, students were required to keep their fieldwork journals and submit them three times during the first semester. Students submitted their first journals in early October (Week 5). In the following week, the instructor told her students that they had done a nice job of describing their volunteer activities, and the next step is to go beyond mere descriptions by incorporating analyses of and discussion on their observations. This advice applies to the oral presentation and the final paper as they were closely related to the journals. In the following excerpt, the instructor explains what this means using as an example what one of her students had written in her journal based on her experience as a volunteer at the Society for Prevention of Cruelty of Animals (SPCA):

Excerpt 4.22

Izzat: ...an analysis is like uh making sense of - what you describe. Say - okay (0.5) so I did all this four or five things so what does this mean to me. (1.2) For instance it means (0.8) okay let’s use the dog situation. Let’s say uh one, ((writes the number one on the black board)) Canadians (0.8) seem to - treat animals (0.9) uh differently than we do in Japan for instance. Uh two umm (4.1) let’s say umm ((speaking softly)) probably - what can we say - two. Canadians treat dogs differently. And then (3.4) ((back to the original volume)) let’s say I don’t understand (1.4) umm why for- for example - that the animals are treated so well here. If this is the two things that you think you can get out of from here from describing - this would be analysis, these two? And then you discuss - you say perhaps - this is the reason why (xxx). Perhaps I don’t understand this because (1.4) because there’s a cultural difference. (0.9) Perhaps I think something happened because whatever. That’s what the discussion is about. (0.5) (Class 1, October 13, 2000)

Here, the instructor not only explains the terms analysis and discussion, but also demonstrates how these sense-making activities can be done.
Izzat returned the journals in Week 7. Although she provided written feedback, she did not grade them. She told her students that she wanted to evaluate their journals after they had developed some familiarity with the writing task and that she first wanted to see how they would write without her support.

After reading the second set of the students’ journals, Izzat provided positive feedback to all the classes. For example, she said in Class 3:

Excerpt 4.23

Izzat: One thing we uh: (1.2) do the quiz (0.9) is uh your journals? (1.0) Uh: (0.7) excellent. And uh: you understood what I meant by analyze and discuss. (0.5) And uh: I enjoyed reading all of them very much. Uh: I stayed up until almost four o’clock this morning. (0.5) If they were boring, I would have fallen asleep. So - that tells you how much I enjoyed reading your journals. (0.5) And I hope you uh keep up the good work? There’s one more journal to go, (0.6) and uh in terms of writing, there’s a report - to go - in the end. It’s getting very close to - a report kind of - writing. Okay? It’s excellent. (Class 3, October 27, 2000)

In this excerpt, the instructor evaluates the students’ writings positively and encourages them to “keep up the good work” (October 27, 2000). Koyuki said after this class that she was glad to know that she was on the right track. This comment suggests that the above feedback seemed to have helped validate students’ task performances.

4.2.5.3 TA’s Modeling of the Oral Presentation Task

In October, Izzat, who believes in modeling, asked Abraham to make a model presentation for their students in all the three sections of Language Fieldwork. Abraham chose to present a research article by Margaret Early (1992) on ESL students’ perceptions of being schooled in an L2. To provide some background information, although the students knew that Abraham was going to make a model presentation on a certain day, none of them knew what he was going to present. Thus, they had not read the article. During the first semester, all of Abraham’s lessons took place in one of the classrooms in...
Keishin House. Abraham made his model presentations in the last week of October, two weeks prior to the first day of the student presentations. For his presentation, Abraham produced overhead transparencies and handouts with Microsoft PowerPoint.

4.2.5.3.1 Explaining the Value of the Task

Before starting his presentation, Abraham explained the value of the oral presentation in university settings. For example, he said in one of the three classes:

Excerpt 4.24

We’ve talked a little bit about this before but - unfortunately or fortunately - presentations are a really important part - of classes at WPU. Uh: almost - every single class- course I’ve taken at WPU and my old university - required me to give presentations. So: it’s one of those skills that we need to work on - as uh students. (Class 3, October 26, 2000)

Likewise, he said in another class:

Excerpt 4.25

We’ve talked a little bit about this before but (0.6) one of the (0.9) the cultural things that happens at WPU and most Canadian universities is is that- (0.4) one of the - very popular activities that professors like to ask their students to do is to make a presentation. (0.5) Umm (0.5) it’s something that we do more and more (to) become university students in North America, - and to become Masters, and PhDs. We start presenting our work. It’s - part of the academic life. (Class 1, October 26, 2000)

In fact, students were evaluated on oral presentations for most of the Keishin courses. For example, a course on popular media required students to make several presentations which counted for approximately 60 percent toward the final grade (see Excerpt 7.17 in Chapter 7). Moreover, one of the major goals of the pre-departure orientation program organized by the director of the Keishin program was to help students “learn how to prepare and deliver an effective presentation” (course outline). Additionally, fifteen students in Jamal’s class at ELI jointly decided to do an oral presentation as one of their course assignments when the instructor told them at the beginning of the course that they could choose assignments that they considered
meaningful for their own learning. These suggest that oral presentations were considered not only by the teachers and students of the Keishin program but also by other members of the WPU community to be important academic tasks that university students needed to learn. Here, it is important to note that in the above excerpt, Abraham used the first person plural pronouns (i.e., we, our), which indexed his identity as a student (see Ochs, 1996, 2002).

4.2.5.3.2 Explaining Choice of Presentation Topic

After explaining the value of the oral presentation task, Abraham explained why he chose to present Early’s work:

Excerpt 4.26

And - I originally wanted to present my own research. But - because I’m a new Master’s well - kind of new Master’s student, my research isn’t finished yet. So if I present my research you will only get 50 percent of the full research. So: what I did is I try to - find - someone else’s research from a- from an article - which uh is very similar to the kind of research that I’m going to do. Uh I also tried to find something that maybe interesting for you guys as well. (Class 2, October 26, 2000)

Notice that in this example, Abraham referred to himself as a “kind of new Master’s student.” Similarly, in Class 2, he referred to himself as a “half new MA student.” Also, in the above excerpt, Abraham states that he tried to find something which is both similar to the kind of the research that he is planning to do and interesting for his Keishin students. Moreover, in his Class 2 presentation, the final one of the three, he said that he tried to choose something interesting and a little similar to what the students were doing, thereby making his presentation topic more relevant to the audience.

4.2.5.3.3 Discussing the Gap in the Literature

A few minutes into his presentation, Abraham told the class that by reviewing previous studies, Margaret Early identified an under-explored area that needs more
research attention. In other words, he described how the researcher “created a research space” (Swales & Feak, 1994), which was accompanied by this written material on the OHP:

The Situation: ESL Students in Vancouver

- There has been an increase in the number of ESL students in Vancouver
- Research on ESL students’ academic achievements has been limited
- The challenge of academic language has not been explored enough
- There have been too many drop-outs and scholastic failures

Notice how Abraham weaves the first two sentences into his discourse in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 4.27

In 1992 - Margaret Early noticed that “research on EL- ESL students’ academic achievement have been limited.” In other words she looked at the research which has been done. And she noticed that - not many people that studies how ESL students succeed - academically or if they succeed academically. So that's one of the things we do as researchers. We usually try to find a- a topic which nobody else has talked about or - we think we should talk about because no one has talked about it. And she noticed that - “the challenge of academic language has not been explored enough.” (Class 2, October 26, 2000)

Here, the two sentences are embedded in the speaker’s oral discourse as reported thoughts which follow the reporting verb “notice.” As we will see in the next section, reported thought was one of the most salient features of Abraham’s model presentation.

Intriguingly, in Excerpt 4.26, Abraham provides background information about the action of identifying a gap in the literature that needs to be filled. This is metadiscourse about how to conduct research. Thus, in the above excerpt, presentational discourse about the propositional content of the article and instructional discourse about research procedures are interwoven. This kind of intertextuality was characteristic of the entire presentation as
Abraham chose to explain how to do research and presentations as well as present the content of the article. In this sense, Abraham’s presentation served dual functions.

4.2.5.3.4 Reporting Other Voices

As a presentation of a research article, Abraham’s activity involved taking on the roles of the researcher and participants and reporting their voices. For example, he performed role-playing to report some of the students’ responses to the researcher’s questions. In the following excerpt, as the presenter, Abraham first described the action of the researcher and her participants. Then he changed his voice to ask a question as the researcher of the study. This is followed by another utterance that Abraham makes again as the presenter. He then changed his voice again, responding to the question as a student-participant. Finally, he spoke again as the presenter.

Excerpt 4.28

Uh: they talked about the students’ perceptions, of their move to Canada. ((holding his pen in his right hand like a microphone and using another tone of voice)) How did you feel when you came to Canada. ((back in his regular voice)) Some students were very happy, some of them were very sad? ((making faces and using a third tone of voice)) Oh no I don’t want to be here. ((back in his voice)) Uh: their feelings about coming to Canada. (Class 1, October 26, 2000)

Thus, in this example, Abraham spoke through three different voices: namely, the presenter’s voice, the researcher’s, and a student’s. In the following excerpt, the teacher reports students’ and the researcher’s voices:

Excerpt 4.29

Most students were happy. Except for two. Two of them were - nothing- were unhappy. But they said that they weren’t yet comfortable and that- that they still felt umm Canada is not their home. Maybe I will go back when I’m old. And finally - remember that she said that she will look in her data and look for themes? (Class 2, October 27, 2000)

What is salient in this example is use of projection (Halliday, 1994a). According to Collerson (1994), this can be compared to “the idea of taking on a role and projecting the
voice, as stage actors do” (p. 106). This is because people take what others have said orally or in writing and ‘say’ it themselves, thus making it part of their own message (Collerson, 1994). As the following table shows, arguably, there are four occurrences of projection in the excerpt:

Table 4.2: Reported Speech and Quoted Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projecting clause</th>
<th>Projected clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>that they weren’t yet comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lb</td>
<td>that they still felt umm Canada is not their home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (they said)</td>
<td>Maybe I will go back when I’m old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 she said</td>
<td>that she will look in her data and look for themes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first example is a combination of a saying verb and indirect speech whereas the second example can be regarded as a combination of a saying verb and direct speech although it lacks the projecting clause. The third example is a combination of a saying verb and indirect speech like the first one; however, it is different from the others in that it is a re-projection of the researcher’s voice, as evidenced by the use of the word “remember,” which proceeds it.

Moreover, Abraham reported the researcher’s thoughts, representing them as if they were wordings (Halliday, 1994a):

Excerpt 4.30

And the reason why she did this research - was that she had noticed that “there were too many dropouts and scholastic failures.” ((paraphrases this utterance)) …Uh - so she was - thinking - ((in a slightly higher tone)) this is important. We need to do research about it. ((back in regular tone)) So that was the situation she was in when she decided okay - I’m gonna do some research. So she decided, - to explore - some questions. (Class 1, October 27, 2000)

42 It would be more appropriate to call this as a verbal process because, in Hallidayan Functional Grammar, “the kind of meaning verbs have is referred to as a process” (Collerson, 1994, p. 18). However, to avoid possible confusions, I decide, like Derewianka (1998), to use the term verb in this dissertation.

43 The that-clauses in 1a and 1b in Table 4.2 are coordinate to each other and subordinate to the main clause “they said.”
What is revealing about this example is that it sheds light on the variety of linguistic resources that Abraham used to project the researcher’s thoughts (Halliday, 1994a). As Table 4.3 shows, these include a combination of a mental verb (e.g., notice, decide) and indirect “speech” (#4 & 7) and a combination of a mental verb and “direct speech” (#5 & 6).

Table 4.3: Reported Thought and “Quoted” Thought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projecting clause</th>
<th>Projected clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>She had noticed that there were too many dropouts and scholastic failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>She was thinking this was important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>(She was thinking) We need to do research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>she decided okay - I’m gonna do some research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>she decided to explore some questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntactically, 5a can be regarded either as a direct speech or indirect speech; however, the speaker’s changing of the voice suggests that it was intended rather as direct speech. As Abraham presented the article in narrative form, the use of reported thought and quoted thought were salient features of the presentation. Here, it should be mentioned that using different tones of voice was one of the strategies that Izzat said at one of her interviews a good presenter would do to engage their audience.

4.2.5.3.5 Interaction with the Audience

Another salient part of Abraham’s presentation was interacting with the audience. In fact, at the beginning, he told the students in all the three sections to feel free to ask questions during the presentation:

Excerpt 4.31

I will invite you to do during the presentation if you have any questions, please ask me. No problems. Uh that’s part of the presentation. So don’t be afraid to ask questions. (Class 1, October 27, 2000)
As can be seen from this example, Abraham considered the audience’s active participation in the form of question asking to be an important part of his presentations. He also encouraged the students to take notes of their thoughts as they listened to his talk so that they could discuss them afterwards.

Moreover, Abraham himself asked questions throughout his talk.

Excerpt 4.32

1 Abrah: Any questions until now. It’s okay?
2 Ss: ((some smile and nod))
3 Abrah: What do you think. You think it’s gonna be an interesting study? (2.0) Yes?
4 Ss: ((some smile and nod))
5 Abrah: I hope so - this is very close to what I want to do. ((laughs)) (October 27, 2000)

In this example, Abraham asks two major kinds of questions. First, he makes two comprehension checks (“Any questions until now.” and “It’s okay?”) to make sure that the audience members are following what he has presented so far. This is immediately followed by two opinion questions (“You think it’s gonna be an interesting study?” and “Yes?”). As the students’ nonverbal behaviors (i.e., nods and smiles) indicate, there is some degree of contingency between the presenter and some of the audience members. In other words, the TA’s use of the questions seems to have facilitated the audience’s involvement in the talk.

4.2.5.3.6 Helping Students Get Started

After his modeling of the task, Abraham gave his students an opportunity to talk about their fieldwork in small groups. For example, in Class 3, he stated:

Excerpt 4.33

Since we have a little time left, (0.8) Izzat thought this would be a good chance to work together - and talk about your presentation and your written reports. (0.8) Now - I know
that you’ve been working in different places, and uh you should- you have done different things… She thought you should be able to work together and - and start talking about some of the problems, - that you are having? And maybe some of the ways other people are solving, and some of the findings and you have also some of things you discovered. (0.5) Uh: this is also - important - part of the research as well. When you are doing the research, (0.5) even though you are doing it alone... I found that talking about your- your discovery is a big help. Cos I sometimes talk to- to someone and they will say oh: that’s a good idea but did you think about this? Oh no. Okay. ((laughs)) So: that’s- I think that’s what Izzat would like you to do. (Class 3, October 26, 2000)

To facilitate group discussion, Abraham then wrote these questions on the white board:

What kind of research are you doing?
What are you going to talk about in your presentation?
Have you had any problems?
Do you have any advice?
What have you discovered? (Fieldnotes, October 26, 2000)

Subsequently, students formed four groups of four or five and spent about 30 minutes talking about their fieldwork and presentations. Abraham walked around the classroom to monitor students’ activities and answer their questions. Importantly, most of the groups discussed the above questions in English. However, this kind of discussion did not happen in Classes 1 and 2 because the model presentations for these classes took longer than the teacher had expected and there was little time left. Instead, each member of these classes had a chance to say a few words about their fieldwork in a whole-class situation so that they would have a better idea about who was doing what work.

4.2.5.4 Progress Report

Two weeks before the first day of the Semester 2 presentations, Izzat asked each student group to give an oral progress report on their research:

Excerpt 4.34

Now I’d like to hear, umm (0.6) the progress that you have made with your research? And umm (0.4) perhaps the way to do is since it’s group research, maybe to get into your groups? …And then - discuss with your partner or your group mate uh: (1.0) what you’re going to tell us (as a) class? (0.4) Okay? Again, what I'd like to know is (0.6) uh: (0.6)
how you’re doing with your research. You can start by saying this is our topic, - we’ve done this, this, this, and uh: umm (0.8) we have - problems or no problems or (0.9) whatever. Okay? Whatever you feel like saying. (March 2, 2001)

Here again, Izzat provides an explicit explanation for her expectations and demonstrated how to approach the oral report task. Students were then given time to discuss with their partners what to report to their teacher and classmates. After approximately 20 minutes, the instructor started to ask the students to give their progress report. The following example illustrates how Yoshino and her partner Sachi performed this task:

Excerpt 4.35

1 Yoshi: Our topic is uh idea- we umm what is the (0.5) ideal enviro- environment (0.5) of food service industry which have live music, [Izzat: Yeah.] (1.1) from musicians and customers and managers perspective. [Izzat: Umm.] And we did the interview with- we chose (0.5) two restaurants, [Izzat: Mmm.] mmm which have the live music. [Izzat: Mmm.] Almost every night. [Izzat: Mmm.] And we did (0.4) interview with the (0.4) these manager and (0.8) one (1.6)

2 Sachi: one- one - [manager,

3 Yoshi: [manager -

4 Sachi: one musician, and three customers [Izzat: Okay.] in each restaurant. Izzat: Okay.] So umm (0.5)

5 Yoshi: And now we are summarize the result and find (1.4) commo- common tendency [(among them).

6 Izzat: Okay. (0.7) So you’re almost done collecting (0.5) your data. So you’re now at the stage of summarizing?

7 Sachi: Yeah. [Almost -

8 Yoshi: [Mmm. [Almost.

9 Izzat: [Analyzing?

10 Yoshi: Almost.

11 Izzat: Perfect! Everybody should have been at this stage. ((laughs)) (Class 3, March 2, 2001)

As the above example shows, just like the portfolio, the oral progress report was a way for the instructor to find out about students’ activities and provide them with
feedback. By this time, Izzat had listened to the progress reports from most of the groups. Many groups reported that they had not completed their data collection.

Moreover, many student groups shared their problems with the instructor. For example, after the above interaction, Yoshino and Sachi mentioned that they were not sure how to decide criteria for categorizing their customer-participants. Izzat commented that it was not necessary for them to categorize these participants because the purpose of their research was to gain a few perspectives about what constituted an “ideal” food service environment of which live music was part. Rei and her partners Kaoru and Nobue, who were studying the ghettoization of Taiwanese people in Maple Tree City, mentioned that they were not sure how to ask Taiwanese people questions without offending them. The following long interaction took place after the three students told the class that they had come up with one possible way to deal with the problem (i.e., asking for the help of a Taiwanese student who was sympathetic with the issue).

Excerpt 4.36

1  Kaoru: But (2.2) I wanna ask (1.8) in class,

2  Izzat: Okay.

3  Kaoru: some other (0.7) solutions?

4  Izzat: Yeah. What do you think they can do? (0.6) How else they can solve this problem. (0.4) You think. (1.2) Yeah you can’t ask people to say, (0.8) uh: do you think you’re ghettoized- you are ghettoizing yourselves? (0.5) Umm (0.6) no you can’t. (1.4) How can they approach then. (1.3) Other than (1.5) talking to some Taiwanese through that guy who (0.8) also understands the problem. (0.4) How else. (0.8) How else.

5  Nana: I think you can ask like the- question like (1.1) do you feel comfortable (0.5) when you are with (0.5) Taiwanese, (0.5) and when you are (1.1) when you are with a friend- people from the same country. [(0.6) (Like Taiwanese.)]

6  Rei: Yeah. We’re (0.4) actually we’re thinking about (1.5) that kind of question too. (0.4) Thank you.
Izzat: Umm (0.6) one other way I would (0.5) do it is that uh: (2.2) I would start by saying that umm I hear (1.2) that people from different cultural groups live in different areas of Maple Tree City. (0.5) For example, (0.7) start from yourself (0.4) then you don’t hurt the people. It’s less likely that you do it. (0.6) If I were you, I would start by saying that I heard that people from different cultural groups (0.6) live in different areas in (0.5) Maple Tree City. (0.5) For example, (0.6) uh: I hear that Japanese Canadians live mostly in [Town A], (0.6) and [Town B]. (0.6) And I hear that uh: Greek Canadians live somewhere near [Street A], (0.6) and I wonder where Taiwanese people live. Could you tell me.

Rei: WOO::

((Many students laugh))

Izzat: Could you (xxx) live, [(xx)

Kaoru: [Very good.

Izzat: Yes. (0.5) Pretend that you don’t [know.

Kaoru: [Yeah especially -

((many students laugh))

Izzat: Yes. Let them tell you.

Kaoru: Especially [Izzat: Yeah.] we can use maybe Japanese -

Izzat: Yes!

Kaoru: - cases?

Izzat: because you’re Japanese,

Rei: [Yeah.

Nobu: [Yeah.

Izzat: if you start by talking from your- well it’s not you, but somebody who are like you - [Kaoru: Mm] then they’ll open to you. If you’re a Japanese and start talking about Chinese, maybe they’ll think ((in a different tone)) what do you want to know about me. ((back in a regular tone)) you know?

Nobu: [Yeah.

Rei: [Hmm.

Kaoru: Yeah.

Izzat: That’s (always) a good way to say that I hear this and I found out, (0.6) I was
very interested in where Japanese Canadians live because I’m Japanese. And I found out that, they live here and here. So I’m wondering if there’s such uh:

27 Kaoru: [Pretending, ((laughing))]
28 ((other students including Nobue and Rei laugh))
29 Nana: ((jokingly)) I’m just wondering. [Izzat: Yeah.] Just wondering.
30 Izzat: Yeah. **I wonder if that happens to Chinese groups too.**
31 Rei: Ah!: sugoi. [great.]
32 Izzat: Especially when Chinese groups are so complicated. There are people of Mainland China, there are people from Taiwan, there’s Chinese people from Hong Kong. **Where do you guys live. Do you all live together** or you know? And then they will tell you oh no no no. We don’t live with the Chinese from mainland China. We live in [name of town] area.
33 Kaoru: Hmm
34 Izzat: Then you’ll ask them why. Why don’t you live with Hong Kong people or people from the Mainland China. You always ask why and how questions. Rather than say do you ghettoize yourselves? Then that’s not good. If you say do you ghettoize yourselves, you’re assuming that they do. You know that. But you don’t have to let them know that you know. (0.9) You say, where do you live, and how, and why. **Let them tell you.** [Kaoru: Mm-hmm]. Then they won’t be hurt. You just asked why. You didn’t say you ghettoized. You know?
35 Kaoru: Very good.
36 ((Izzat: laughs))
37 Kaoru: Very good. It’s like a more not interview. But short conversation.
38 Rei: Yeah.
39 ((many students laugh))
40 Izzat: Right. Yeah I think that’s how I would do it. (Class 1, March 1, 2001)

In Line 4, Izzat restates the problem initially stated by Rei as questions. In Line 5, Nana tells Rei’s group what they could do. Then, Rei responds by saying that they were thinking the same thing and thanking Nana for the advice. In Line 7, Izzat then tells what she would do if she were in their situation, modeling the language. Hearing Izzat’s idea,
Kaoru comments in Lines 16 and 18 on the importance of referring to the cases of Japanese people living in Canada as “insiders” in bringing up the sensitive topic of ghettoization. In Lines 19 and 22, Izzat builds on this comment, saying that it would be a good idea for the students to start by talking about Japanese groups since they are Japanese. The instructor then demonstrates how she would approach the interview task once again between Lines 26 and 32. Subsequently, in Line 34, she advises the students to let their participants tell about the issue themselves without showing their assumptions about the issue. As Excerpt 4.35 suggests, the progress report was a chance for the students to obtain advice from their peers (especially active ones like Nana who were not afraid to speak in class) as well as from the instructor.

4.3 Summary of the Chapter

The focus of this chapter was the environment in which the oral presentation tasks were situated. In particular, I have examined the institutional and community aspects of this task environment, including the goals of the course, some of the major values and practices of the classroom, the teachers’ expectations about the task, and their roles as socializing agents. As we have seen, oral presentations were regarded in the Keishin program to be an important academic task that university students needed to learn. One of the most prominent features of Language Fieldwork was that the instructor carefully organized the course in such a way that students’ choices, and therefore, responsibilities (van Lier, 1996) increased over time (see also Rogoff, 1984). For example, Izzat taught intercultural communication in the first semester and taught research methods in social science and education in the second semester. In other words, the first semester course required the students to study a subject determined by their teacher whereas the second
semester course allowed them to choose what to study as it focused on the “how” of doing research in social sciences and education.

As such, the degree to which students were allowed to make choices about their presentation tasks increased over time. For the poster project, students had a relatively limited choice about their tasks because the medium (i.e., poster) and topic (i.e., nonverbal communication) of the task were given. For the Semester 1 project, they were required to make presentations based on their volunteer work and relate this experience to some aspects of intercultural communication. As such, their roles in the field were those of volunteers. However, they were relatively free to decide which aspects of the subject to focus on and to choose what medium to use for their presentation. For the Semester 2 presentation, the students were free to investigate any topic in social science and education in any way appropriate. Thus, it was for them to decide how to collect data and what roles to play in the field. They were also free to use any available medium for their talk. This was one of the major attempts that the instructor made to gradually hand over her responsibilities to the students (van Lier, 1988, after Bruner, 1983). Also, the three presentation tasks were given increasingly more weight in grading. For the poster project, the students were graded on the content and design of their posters, but they were not graded on their oral presentations of these products. The Semester 1 presentation counted 10 percent toward the final grade, and the Semester 2 presentation counted 20 percent. Furthermore, the assignments were sequenced in such a way that the completion of a task (e.g., journal writing) helped the completion of another (e.g., oral presentation). Thus, to appropriate Mohan’s (2001) words, earlier assignments were structured to build a context for later ones (see also Collins & Green, 1992).
Moreover, both the instructor and TA assisted their students’ accomplishment of the oral presentation tasks in a number of ways. These included providing the students with explicit explanations about and models of the tasks, monitoring their progress, and providing feedback and advice. My examinations of the instructor’s and the TA’s classroom and interview discourse suggest that one of the most important features of a “good” presentation was critical reflection. Students were expected not only to inform the audience of their experiences and observations, but also to demonstrate their critical reasoning about them (see Staab, 1986, 1992 for the distinction between informing and reasoning) by discussing how they related to the content of the course and to their own future. Izzat and Abraham both saw the oral presentations as important opportunities for their students to engage meaningfully in academic discourse and content. Another important feature of a valued presentation seems to have been interaction with the audience. For example, the instructor encouraged the students not to read their notes so as to keep their audience interested. Also, during his model presentation, the TA interacted with his students by asking the students questions. In short, the instructor organized the course to apprentice her students into the academic culture of the university by providing them with scaffolded experiences engaging in the valued activities of this culture. In the next chapter, we will examine how students worked together to accomplish their oral presentation tasks.
Chapter 5

STUDENT AGENCY AND COLLABORATION IN L2 TASK PREPARATION

5.0 Introduction

The focus of the present chapter is students’ task preparation. More specifically, the chapter will examine how key students and their partners worked together to accomplish their L2 oral presentations. As we will see later, most of this work took place out of class time in the absence of their teachers. Thus, I will take a behind-the-scenes view at students’ task-preparatory activities. To yield a holistic understanding of L2 task preparation, the chapter will document four different groups’ activities. In the first few sections, we will examine the activities in which two groups, Kiku and Nana’s group and Tomo and Koyuki’s group, engaged to prepare for their Semester 1 presentations. As we will see later, these groups stood in stark contrast to each other in terms of grouping and field experience. In the final section, I will examine the activities of Rei’s group and Ichiro’s group, both of which had activities that differed greatly from those of the first two groups.

5.1 Kiku and Nana’s Task Preparation

For their fieldwork, both Kiku and Nana chose to go to the university’s Japanese language classes as volunteers who helped undergraduate students learning Japanese. Kiku explains this choice in his term paper, entitled “As a Japanese,” as follows:

Excerpt 5.1

This term, while I was attending LFW 201, I experienced many people voluntarily wanting to help my understanding of “real” Canadian culture, both at WPU and around this city. As a result of this, I immediately decided that I wanted to volunteer in Japanese classes at WPU in return for what the people in this city, in many instances, had done for me. (December 1, 2000, emphasis added)
Kiku, as a native speaker of Japanese, saw going to Japanese classes as a way of repaying the kindness of the Canadian people who had helped his learning about Canadian culture (December 27, 2000). Nana wrote in her second field journal, “I was curious why the students want to study Japanese. They might be interested in something concerned about Japan. And, what’s Japan like for them is my most interesting thing” (October 19, 2000). In addition to attending three Japanese classes, Kiku and Nana, along with several other Keishin students, were asked by the instructor and her TA to meet with their Japanese-as-a-second-language (henceforth JSL) students out of class time and help them prepare for their presentations. More specifically, Keishin students were asked to correct JSL students’ pronunciation. Thus, Kiku and Nana’s task for their intercultural communication course was to report orally on their experience of helping learners of Japanese as conversation partners and their own learning and discovery through this experience (see also Kobayashi, 2003).

5.1.1 Getting Started

In this section, we will examine two major task-related activities that Kiku and Nana engaged in before they started to work as a group: negotiating task definitions and requirements in class time and choosing partners.

5.1.1.1 Negotiating Task Definitions and Requirements

Kiku and Nana worked together with two other students who were volunteering for the university’s Japanese classes, Urara and Yukari.44 Note that at this point, students had not formed “official” groups to do their oral presentations. A few seconds into the group discussion, Nana expresses her concern about the presentation.

---

44 Urara was a second-year law major and Yukari was a second-year sociology major.
Excerpt 5.2

1 Nana: I was worried about - how can I (2.9) how can I (1.6) presentation about my volunteering? Because (1.3) my volunteering is just (1.0) help- just help (1.3) study Japanese? So =

2 Yuka: = Yeah I think so too.

3 Nana: So far I couldn’t find what I gonna find what I learned from Japanese students? - Because I was so - concentrate on (0.7) help them just teaching En- teaching Japanese students? - So I just worried about - what I found- what I found (1.4) during helping him, during helping them? (0.7) So how can I present (0.4) my volunteering. (1.0)

4 Kiku: Hmm. ((nods))

5 Yuka: Through the volunteering I just find that uh: learning another (language) is very difficult. That’s all. ((laughs))

6 Nana: ((laughs)) (October 26, 2000)

In Line 1, Nana makes a problem statement and asks for advice. Obviously, her concern here is that because she was always involved in conversations with JSL students, she could not pay attention to what is going in the classes, and was thus unsure what her findings were from the experience and how to undertake the presentation task. In other words, Nana was concerned about the participant-observation nature of the volunteer work that prevented her from observing the classroom environment as a researcher. To deal with this situation, Nana obtained the teacher’s permission and attempted to audio-record her own interactions with students during her last volunteering session. She was planning to start recording after obtaining the students’ permission. However, she was so involved in conversations that she unfortunately forgot to turn on the recorder. Although other students joined Nana in thinking that it is difficult to be a conversation partner and a observer at the same time, this did not result in extended discussion. As the above excerpt shows, the topic of the discussion shifted when Yukari started to talk about her own thought in Line 5. However, a few minutes later, Nana brings up the same issue again:
Excerpt 5.3

1 Nana: If we do - presentation, like I think - presentation including uh - references, - interviews, (0.5) like research, but in- I think in my case - like our volun- our volunteering, we cannot include researches, and references, - and whatever - like I think - presentation should - based on some researches or interviews to other - [students,

2 Kiku: [U:mm I don’t think so in this case.

3 Nana: But in this case we are thinking about deeply, between Japanese and Canadian - how do they communicate or how do they helping each other, in - to teach English Japanese, Japanese English. So we’re thinking about deeply, I mean - like cultural communication, or - whatever nonverbal communication? So we think- I think (1.0) we have to reference (1.1) u:mm

4 Kiku: [I think we- (0.5) u:mm if you want, you can use those references I guess. Cos - umm you have a some points, - to ar- (argue), in your presentation and then - to support those arguments maybe you find uh some references or materials in - libraries. (1.5) Like (xx) what- why do they uh: feel difficulty (0.8) u:mm speaking - honorific - keigo. [honorifics] (0.9) So: maybe - you’ll find a some references in the library but (0.5) if you want - you can find a: book but I think we don’t have to (use) - references. Do you think? Because the title (of the assignment) is uh: “Field Experience” [not volunteers] (it’s just)

5 Nana: [Yeah.

6 Kiku: I think - yeah it’s okay even if it’s coming from our uh: (0.6) u:mm experiences. (1.3) it’s- it’s kind of like uh formally - it’s gonna - become uh: formal uh: (0.5) if you support your arguments. (1.1) U:mm (0.6) Yeah. (1.0) I’m thinking in that way now.

7 Nana: How about - doing research by myself. I mean (0.5) like make questionnaire, and do it, (2.8) let- let students do - questionnaire,

8 Kiku: I think that’s good.

9 Nana: You think it’s work? (3.2) But (2.2) in my opinion like (0.8) doing presentation means like researches, references, (1.2) yeah so I think like (0.6) oh I have to do some question to ask students?

10 Ura: But you can say what you found in your experience just =

11 Kiku: = Yeah. (2.8)

12 Nana: But for me it is so difficult to thinking about - what found in Japanese class - I just help them teach Japanese (0.8) uh: that’s all I help - I helped them. (1.4) umm (1.0) Because so far I was so concentrate on - help (0.5) teach Japanese, and I don’t have any (0.5) space- I don’t have any room (0.6) in my mind? Like (1.0) I was so

---

45 When asked later, what Kiku meant here was research, not “volunteers.”
In Line 1, Nana explicitly states what it means to do an oral presentation. For her, doing presentation entails using references and conducting interviews. She goes on to say that because the presentation for Izzat’s course is about her own volunteering, she cannot use references or interview data. Kiku then says in Line 2 that the presentation does not require referencing or interviewing. In the following turn, Nana disagrees with Kiku, saying that she thinks that references should be used because they are seriously considering issues related to intercultural communication in the course. Kiku then discusses using references as an option, as evidenced by use of the mental verb “want” in the if-clause and the modal “can” in the main clause (Mohan, 1986). Kiku discusses the advantages of using references for the presentation, and says again that he thinks that it is optional because the assignment is called “Field Experience.” Interjected by Nana’s utterance, Kiku continues to say that it would be okay even if the presentation is based on their own experience and that it will become formal if they make arguments and support them. Nana then asks the others if they think it is a good idea for her to conduct research by using a questionnaire. In the following line, Kiku responds, saying that it is a good idea. Nana further elaborates by saying that since she sees doing a presentation as involving presenting research findings and using references, she thinks that she needs to ask JSL students some questions. This, Nana explained, was the kind of presentation that she had been exposed to as a sociology student at Keishin University.
In Line 10, Urara says, “But you can say what you found in your experience,” echoing what Kiku has said earlier. Kiku agrees with this in the following line. Then, Nana discusses again in Line 12 how difficult it was to participate in small group activities and observe JSL students’ behaviors at the same time. Needless to say, this is a trade-off of which participant-observers should be aware in order to make informed decisions in their research (see Spradley, 1980).

In Excerpt 5.4, the students perform a number of acts. First, with Kiku’s prompting in Line 1, Nana tells the others what she wrote in her field journal. Kiku suggests that she could discuss why there are many Asian students in the Japanese class, and says that she may be able to “find some support and arguments.” Nana builds contingently on this utterance by adding possible information sources, “from just guess, or from books or from researches.” Kiku answers that she could use references or conduct interviews with the Japanese teachers in order to strengthen her argument, but he is not sure if it is a good idea to use guesses. In the following line, Yukari says that she found it very difficult to write about her volunteering in her journal without giving a reason. Kiku responds by saying “yeah.”

Excerpt 5.4

1 Kiku: So what did you write about - field experience in your papers.

2 Nana: Okay. Okay. I just - wrote (2.1) today I met ((laughs)) <Ura: laughs> I went to the Japanese 201 class and uh (1.0) There were so many Asian students, in the class and (1.0) they speak- they spoke Japanese well?

3 Kiku: Then - maybe you can write - you can write about the reason why- why there are many- there are many Asian students in the Japanese class. Maybe - you’ll find some support and arguments =

4 Nana: = from - from just guess, or from books or from [researches.

5 Kiku: [U:mm from uh: - could be interviews, (0.6) umm - yeah I think yeah some books, (2.3) or asking your Japanese teachers, (2.2) umm I don’t know if it’s okay to just
using your guesses, (1.2) then: (2.8)

6 Yuka: I think it was very hard to write a- a journal about my volunteering [experience,

7 Kiku: [Yeah.

8 Nana: What did you write - to journal- for journal.

9 Ura: My feeling ((laughs)) just -

10 Nana: What did you feel.

11 Kiku: U:mm - you don’t worry- I think you don’t have to uh: worry too much about - a lot of things about your - you know - concern about (x) cos ((reading the task description)) this says uh “oral presentation is a sharing, sharing of your volunteer experiences.” Maybe I think it’s- Izzat - maybe doesn’t think take it as a so serious presentation.

12 Yuka: Hmm academic!

13 Kiku: Not the academic thing. (maybe) it’s - my opinion though - reading from this (1.7) statements (xx) yeah. ((reading the course outline)) “You will tell the class, what- what you did as a volunteer - what you learned - what significance this learning will have for your future.” (0.8) It’s sort of like your (0.9) hmm - from your perspective. <Nana: hmm.> We don’t have to borrow so many books from library, (0.6) (not many) references. I think so. Do you think so?

14 Yuka: Hmm.

15 Nana: Umm I think it depends on a person? Like - if person want to do (2.0) just tell - what they do or (1.6) maybe - another wants to do research,

16 Yuka: Uh:

17 Kiku: Umm ((nods))

18 Nana: and references books- some books and do well presentation? <Kiku: Hmm.> So I just worried about (2.8) if there (2.0) if - there are so: many differences between (1.5) the person and person, for the same volunteering, (2.8)

19 Kiku: Exactly right. - Yeah. First things we have to do is anyway to ask Izzat [-

20 Nana: [((laughs))

21 Ura: ((laughs))

22 Kiku: if uh: we have to use uh references or something - [but

23 Nana: [Yeah. (Class 3, October 26, 2000)
In Line 8, Nana asks the others what they wrote in their journals. Urara answers that she simply wrote her feelings. Nana then attempts to clarify Urara’s meaning. However, before she gets Urara’s response, Kiku takes a turn and tells her that she does not have to worry too much. He then starts to read the description of the oral presentation task given by the instructor and comments that the instructor may not see the task as a very serious presentation. In the following line, Yukari utters “academic” with an enthusiastic tone. As informed by my subsequent conversation with her, Yukari produced this utterance to show her understanding that what Kiku meant was that the instructor might not think of the presentation as “academic.” In the following line, Kiku makes the meaning clearer by saying “not the academic thing,” and continues to read aloud the task description. When asked what he meant by “academic,” Kiku answered that since the task was not to present research findings, but to talk about his volunteer experience, he saw the use of references optional. Recall that Abraham has given a model presentation earlier in the lesson. During this modeling, he used the word “academic” to refer to the oral presentation task. Thus, the TA’s notion of academic seems to have differed from that of at least Kiku’s and Yukari’s. After reading the task description, Kiku comments that they do not need to borrow books from the library, and invites the others to comment. While Yukari agrees, Nana challenges this view. From Line 15 to 18, Nana states that it is up to individuals whether they choose to “do research” and/or use references for their presentations. Interestingly, she comments that she is worried about this individual difference. Nana commented after the class, “I’m thinking like, what if I did not use references or conduct interview and others did” (October 16, 2000). Finally, Kiku suggests that they should ask Izzat about this.
5.1.1.2 Choosing Partners

In November, students started to think about who to work with for the presentation. It was not mandatory to work in pairs or small groups; however, since it was strongly encouraged by their instructor and TA, they all chose to do so. During our casual conversations, Nana repeatedly expressed her strong desire to work with Kiku, for she believed that she could learn a great deal from him. But Nana was first hesitant to ask Kiku if he wanted to work with her. This was because she was afraid that he might be interested in working with someone else as there were several others who had the same volunteer work that she thought could contribute more to Kiku’s learning. Despite Nana’s apprehension, Kiku asked Nana to work with him for the presentation. As Kiku commented, having studied in the same class during the ELI program in the summer, they knew each other well after all.

Subsequently, Nana invited Shingo, her partner with whom she did group project work for another course, to join them. Nana said that she had developed a good working relationship with him. Shingo was a second year Japanese literature major. Although he was not as vocal as Kiku and Nana either in or out of classes, Shingo was regarded by Izzat and many of his classmates as a very able and self-assured individual and a good English writer. He decided to take part in the joint exchange program not only to improve his English skills and develop a better understanding of Canadian culture, but also to cultivate his emotional strength and fortitude. Shingo enjoyed watching sports. He did not participate in the ELI program.
5.1.2 Kiku, Nana, and Shingo’s Group Preparation for the Task

In this section, we will take a behind-the-scene look at the peer collaboration in which Kiku, Nana, and Shingo engaged to accomplish their end-of-semester presentation. The three students met five times (more than 13 hours in total) to prepare for the task, which was scheduled for November 16th. This preparation included sub-activities such as negotiating task definition and teacher expectations, sharing experience, making a PowerPoint document, and rehearsing and performance-coaching.

5.1.2.1 Negotiating Task Definition and Teacher Expectations

Five days before their in-class presentation, Kiku, Nana, and Shingo had their first meeting in one of the classrooms in the Keishin Building. Kiku wrote in his term paper as follows:

Excerpt 5.5

Having discussed our results and perceptions many times, we made our final presentation about our experiences in volunteering in Japanese classes. During the process, we discussed and made sure we clearly presented our collective experiences. As a result of this, we came up with some important or significant situations that had been commonly experienced between us. (December 1, 2000)

As we will see later, my observation also suggested that the students spent a great amount of time, especially in early phases of their preparation, sharing their field experiences and trying to make meaning out of them, in other words, negotiating the possible content of their presentation. However, this was not the first thing that they did as a group.

As Excerpt 5.6 shows, following Kiku’s initiation in Line 1, the students started their preparation by reading the description of the presentation task given in the course.

46 Surprisingly, most groups explained why they chose to use PowerPoint for their presentations, saying that they had seldom used an overhead projector themselves or seen their professors use one in Japan.
outline and negotiating the definition of the task and teacher expectations. Because of this, spoken (mostly L1) and written (L2) languages are interwoven in the excerpt.

Excerpt 5.6

1 Kiku: *Are* (0.5) *moo ikkai mita hoo ga yoku nai?* ((referring to the course outline)) [Shouldn’t we look at that once again?]

2 Nana: *Atta. Aa kore ne.* ((produces her copy of the course outline)) (0.6) [I found it. This one, right?]

3 Kiku: *Purezen*[^47] - *mo nani o mananda ka yan na.* = [The presentation is supposed to be about what we learned, right?]

4 Nana: ((reading from the course outline)) = “Oral presentation of field experience. (0.5) Oral presentation is sharing - of your volunteering experiences.”

5 Shin: *Un.* [Yeah.]

6 Nana: ((reading from the course outline)) “You will tell the class - what you learned as a volunteer. What you learned and what significance - significance this learning - will have for - your future.” *Nani?* [What?] (1.8) Will have for fu- uh - future.

7 Kiku: Future?

8 Nana: Future?

9 Kiku: *Oretachi no shoorai ni doo yaku ni tatte iku ka tte koto ya na.* [How it will contribute to our future, right?]

10 Shin: *Un.* [Yeah.]

11 Kiku: *Kore - wasure gachi ni nari soo yan na.* - *Chotto aa our future ne. Wakatta.* [We might forget this. - Our future. Okay.]

12 ((several turns later))

13 Nana: “Your presentation - have to be organized and interesting. (0.5) You are encouraged to - use audiovisual and graphic materials (0.6) in your presentation and - to *talk* (0.6) from them.” Talk *ga nan ka futomoji ni natteru yo.* (0.7) [The word talk is bold-faced.]

14 Kiku: *Un?* [Hmm?]

15 Nana: Talk from them. (2.5)

16 Kiku: Oh - *kore nani?* [What is this?] Your presen- your -

[^47]: Many students used the Japanese word “purezen,” a shortened loan word for “presentation.”
Nana: “Encouraged to use audiovisual and graphic materials - [in your presentation.]”

Kiku: [Sonnan PowerPoint yan na: Definitely PowerPoint, right?]

Nana: PowerPoint. PowerPoint tsukatta hoo ga ii kedo tooku ga mein ya yo tte koto ne. - [This means it’s better to use PowerPoint, but talking is primary, right?] “That is do not read from your notes.” Eeeeee? Anki nan? (1.9) [What? We must memorize lines?]

Shin: Demo yonde - yondeta yan. [But they were reading from notes, weren’t they.]

Kiku: Un - Yondeta zo. [Yeah - they were.]

Nana: E soo nan? 48 [Oh really?] (November 11, 2000)

Notice that Kiku uses the phrase once again in Line 1. This is because Kiku had read the task description earlier in the class discussion that he had with Nana and two other students (see Section 5.1.1.1). Thus, Kiku continued a long conversation about the task with Nana. At the same time, this was the first time for Kiku, Nana, and Shingo to negotiate task definitions as a group. In Line 19, Nana expresses her surprise about the sentence “Do not read from your notes” written in the course outline. Shingo expresses his doubt whether they really must not do so, referring intertextually to one of the presentations given in the previous week, which is then echoed by Kiku in the following turn. However, a few turns later, the students agreed that they should not regard that performance as a “tehon” 49 or copybook (see Chapter 4) as the presenters lacked confidence and interaction with the audience. 50 Kiku, Nana, and Shingo also agreed that they should and could give their presentation without reading from notes since it was about something they experienced themselves and therefore had some authority and confidence. In other words, the students as a group negotiated the teacher’s expectations

48 Nana did not see the presentation because she was absent from the class.

49 This Japanese word is defined by Singleton (1998) as a “model or pattern for practice” (p. 357).

50 Likewise, Zappa-Hollman (2002) reports that earlier presentations served as models for later ones.
about the oral presentation and assessed the demands of this particular task, considering other groups' performance as well as their own knowledge and abilities. Based on this negotiation and assessment, they oriented themselves to the task (Talyzina, 1981, cited in Roebuck, 2000).

After the group meeting, Kiku commented that he remembered Izzat explaining the importance of looking at the course outline from time to time.\textsuperscript{51} Excerpt 5.6 is only part of the extended interaction the students had on this day to create states of intersubjectivity or shared understanding of the task (Rommetveit, 1974). Van Lier (1996) states that when intersubjectivity is achieved, “participants are jointly focused on the activity and its goals, and they draw each other’s attention into a common direction” (p. 161). After this discussion, the students decided that they would do their presentation without reading from notes. Then, they shared their field experience, looking at their journals written in English. By this time, Izzat had read and returned two of the three journals with her comments. Examination of her classroom discourse as well as her comments on students’ journals suggests that she encouraged the students to go beyond mere descriptions of their activities (see Chapter 4), and to relate their field experiences with the course materials and their own future. Here, it is important to note that the group discussion on this day was conducted primarily in Japanese.

\textbf{5.1.2.2 Sharing Experience and Negotiating Content}

As Kiku's writing above suggests, Kiku, Nana, and Shingo shared their experiences and observations and negotiated the possible content of their presentation in early phases of their preparation. First, they each shared their experiences and

\textsuperscript{51} Also, as we will see in Chapter 7, Kiku had learned this lesson from his experience with the poster session.
observations, looking at their field journals. For example, Kiku shared this experience with his group members:

Excerpt 5.7

In the conversation, I recognized one thing that I felt a little uncomfortable with. That was that ((referring to his conversation partners)) they sometimes talked with each other in Chinese when either of two could not find out some phrases that they really wanted to use in the sentence. Then I felt uneasy about exactly what they were talking about, of course, I could guess vaguely what they were talking about because of the situation. But if it was other cases, I might not be able to take a guess at all. Therefore, I reconsidered that I should not do the same thing as they did in case I talk with people who do not understand my language because I felt uncomfortable. (October 5, 2000)

As a result of such sharing, they came up with a list of “things that happened.”

This was followed by extended negotiation of meaning. As reported earlier, the instructor repeatedly advised her students in class that they go beyond mere descriptions of their volunteer activities. In other words, students were encouraged to reflect critically on their own experiences. As such, Kiku, Nana, and Shingo negotiated what lessons about intercultural communication they could draw from their listed experiences and observations.

Excerpt 5.8

1 Kiku:  

Eetto tsugi wa kantonii o (0.4) shabe rare ta. [Well, the next one is I suffered because they spoke Cantonese (to each other).]

2 Shin: ((laughs))

3 Nana:  

E? Shabe rare ta? [You suffered from their speech (in Cantonese)?]

4 Kiku:  

Un. Shabe rare ta. (0.8) Yatte giseesha ya mon. [Yeah. I suffered from their speech (in Cantonese). Because I’m the victim.]

5 Nana:  

Aa soo iu koto ne. Don na koto ga ieruya ro. [Oh I see. What can we say from this?]

6 Shin:  

Mm (0.5) kantonii o shabe rare ta - ne. [Mm - you suffered because they spoke Cantonese (to each other.) Okay. ]

7 Kiku:  

Jibun ga gyaku da ttara aite no kimochi ga wakaru ttoka iu kanji yaro na. [I think we can say something like we could understand how our co-participant might
feel if we put ourselves in her place.]

8 Nana:  *Un.* [Yeah]

9 Shin:  *So ya na. Jibun ga moshi* (0.5) *shabe tiara aite ga doo omoo ka tte iu no o kangaeru no ga taisetsu datte koto ga kore de wakatta tte iu ka.* [Right. Maybe we can say something like this experience helped us understand the importance of considering how our co-participant might feel if we spoke (to each other) in a language she doesn’t understand.]

10 Nana:  *Un.* [Yeah.] (November 11, 2000)

In this example, the students are negotiating the meaning of Kiku’s experience where he felt uncomfortable because his conversation partners started to speak to each other in Cantonese in a small group situation. In Line 1, Kiku initiates discussion about this experience, which is followed by a brief negotiation between Nana and Kiku about Kiku’s Japanese expression. Interestingly, Kiku states in Line 4 that he said that he “suffered” from his conversation partners’ speech in Cantonese because he was the “victim,” indicating the uncomfortable feelings that he had, not quite sure what they were saying. In Line 5, Nana shows her understanding of Kiku’s meaning and then reinitiates the discussion about Kiku’s experience. In Line 7, Kiku suggests that the group could argue that people could understand how someone might feel if they put themselves in her place. Shingo then builds on Kiku’s utterance in Line 9, saying, “this experience helped us understand the importance of considering how someone might feel if we speak (to each other) in a language that she does not understand.” Notice that this is a more general statement than Kiku’s initial statement in his field journal: “I reconsidered that I should not do the same thing as they did in case I talk with people who do not understand my language because I felt uncomfortable” (Excerpt 5.7). Thus, the students as a group drew a lesson about their subject matter from their group member’s particular experience through joint negotiation of meaning. After discussing all the things on their list this way,
Kiku, Nana, and Shingo chose five experiences and/or observations that they considered most important. However, considering the time constraint, they later decided to focus only on three experiences/observations. In these processes of joint meaning making, the students spoke mainly in their L1.

5.1.2.3 Collaborative Dialogue in Making a PowerPoint Document

In their group meetings, the three students not only negotiated the content of their presentation, but also the language of it. Relevant to this is Swain’s (e.g., 2000, 2001a; see also Swain & Lapkin, 1998) notion of collaborative dialogue, which refers to knowledge constructing dialogue in which learners make efforts to use language to solve L2 problems or to construct L2 knowledge (Swain, 2001a). This type of dialogue took place most frequently during their third meeting, when Kiku, Nana, and Shingo started to create a PowerPoint document for their presentation.

5.1.2.3.1 Negotiating L2 Form

One page of the Kiku, Nana, and Shingo’s PowerPoint document initially looked as follows:

How would we be in the future?

(In this kind of unexpected situations)

- Creative

- Flexibility

- Calm down (November 13, 2000, emphasis added)

In Excerpt 5.9, Kiku, who is working on the computer, wonders whether their use of the word flexibility is accurate in this context, saying that “the others are adjectives” in Line 4. Eventually, they come up with the adjective, flexible, which is a more accurate

---

52 In the present study, students often solved L1 problems. For example, they asked each other how to write Chinese characters in taking notes.
word choice here. However, one problem remains unnoticed: that is, “Calm down.” Kiku asks Nana and Shingo if “Calm down” is okay in Line 8. Nana then answers in Line 11 that she thinks it is okay.

**Excerpt 5.9**

1. Nana: **Flexibility da yo sore wa.** [Flexibility. That should be flexibility. Flexibility.]
2. Kiku: *[Akan wa - kore.]* [This is no good.]
3. Nana: *E-?* [What?]
4. Kiku: **Keiyooshi janai to akan, ato no ga keiyooshi yakara.** [It should be an adjective because the others are adjectives.] (0.9)
5. Shin: U:mm (10.3)
6. Kiku: **Soo suru to =** [So it’s]
7. Shin: **= Flexible?**
8. Kiku: **Ya na kore de ii ka na.** [Yeah it is. Does this look OK.] (3.1)
9. Nana: **Calm [down]? -**
10. Kiku: *[Doo?]* [What do you think?] (0.8) mm:

It seems that at least Kiku thought that “calm down” is an adjective in this context. In fact, three days later, in their presentation, Kiku used the word as follows:

**Excerpt 5.10**

> Maybe - some kind of ideas like crea- creative ideas (0.6) or (2.0) so you can be flexible (0.6) and then you can be calm down even if you are faced to that kind of emergency (0.9) emergency. (November 16, 2000, emphasis added)

His use of “be” before the word indicates that Kiku used the word calm as an adjective, rather than as a verb. He might have learned the phrase “calm down” as an idiom and extended it to a situation where the “down” is inappropriate. The grammatically accurate use of the word “calm” here could be any of these (with #3 being perhaps the most
appropriate in this context):\textsuperscript{53} (1) You can calm down; (2) You can be calmed down; or (3) You can be calm. But “calm down” seems to be used as a single lexeme here.\textsuperscript{54}

The revised version of the page looked like this:

How would we be in the future?

(In this kind of unexpected situations)

- Creative
- Flexible
- \textbf{Calm down} (November 13, 2000, emphasis added)

In short, the students were able to jointly solve the first problem in Excerpt 5.9, but missed the second one in this case. It should be noted that this type of collaborative dialogue was conducted primarily in Japanese and took place while the students were making their PowerPoint document. In other words, the students used Japanese to solve L2 problems as they jointly created a written text (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998). Additionally, they often used their bilingual electronic dictionaries to look up English words and phrases.

\textbf{5.1.2.3.2 Negotiating L2 Lexical Choices}

\textbf{Excerpt 5.11}

1 Nana: \textit{Self-centered no hoo ga ii ka na} [I wonder if the word “\textbf{self-centered}” would be a better choice.] (0.7)

2 ((several turns later))

3 Kiku: \textit{Demo selfish no hoo ga minna ni wakari yasuku nai?} [But don’t you think the word “\textbf{selfish}” is easier for everybody to understand?]

4 Nana: \textit{Son nara kaeyoo ya.} [Why don’t we use the word instead.] ((enunciating syllables as she types)) le:ss (3.4) sel - fi - sh.

\textsuperscript{53} My observation suggests that Kiku’s intended meaning was if you have flexibility, you can be (i.e., remain) calm during an emergency.

\textsuperscript{54} This use of \textit{calm down} was made again in Semester 2 (see Chapter 8).
In this excerpt, Nana and Kiku discuss whether they should use “self-centered” or “selfish” in their presentation, considering the vocabulary level of their classmates. What they are concerned with here seems to be not the accuracy of their L2 production, rather the appropriateness (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Larsen-Freeman, 1991) or appropriacy (Eggins, 1994) of it. This is evident in Kiku’s value statement in Line 3 and Nana’s strong agreement in Line 4. Kiku’s utterance in Line 5 and Nana’s response in the following turn suggest that they are wondering if they may end up making their speech sound “cheap” by choosing the word “selfish” over the word “self-centered.” In other words, they are considering a possible consequence of this particular choice. The group eventually decides to use the word “selfish.” Importantly, Shingo comments, in Line 11, “Words like ‘self-centered’ can be used in the term paper,” and Nana and Kiku agree in the following lines. Kiku, Nana, and Shingo had this kind of negotiation of lexical choice several times while making their PowerPoint document, which suggests their high
awareness of audience. Here, two values seem to be at odds: audience’s comprehension and the groups’ presentation of themselves as competent L2 speakers. This clash of values was the problem that appeared to have created the above decision situation in which the three students made a group decision by jointly considering alternate lexical choices and their possible consequences (Mohan, 1986). Note that this decision-making was done primarily in Japanese.

5.1.2.3.3 Negotiating Rhetoric

In the following interaction, Kiku, who is working on the computer, is confirming with Nana and Shingo if they think it a good idea to repeat a phrase that they have used earlier. Nana agrees with Kiku by saying that using the same phrase would help their audience comprehend. Kiku then agrees with Nana and says that they must emphasize the part in discussion.

Excerpt 5.12

1 Kiku: *Mo kkai onaji yoo ni yaru dee jaa. - when - student - stuck toka tte. Onajii [fureezu.- [We will do the same thing then - we will say something like when - student - stuck. The same phrase -]*

2 Nana: *Soo soo soo - onaji fureezu no hoo ga wakariyasui shu Shitsukoi gurai ni wakarasen [to na. [Yeah yeah yeah - the same phrase would be easier to comprehend. We should be persistent so as to make our audience comprehend.]*

3 Kiku: *[Soya na. - Koko wa kyoochoo sena na. Okkee. Soo shiyoo. [That’s right. - We must emphasize this part. Okay. Let’s do that.]* ((continues to work on the computer)) (1.0)

The computer screen that Kiku, Nana, and Shingo are looking at in Excerpt 5.13 looks like this:

*How would we be in the future?*

- More thoughtful
- More considerate
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In the following excerpt, Nana is working on the computer.

Excerpt 5.13

1 Nana: ((reading from the computer screen)) More thoughtful, more considerate.

2 Kiku: Considerate moo iran ka naa. [I wonder if we need no more words.]

3 Nana: Uun = [Hmm]

4 Kiku: = More - respectful gurai no - [sandan shuuto gurai de iku? [Like more - respectful - shall we do something like a triple shoot?]

5 Nana: [Ma - un niko yattara chotto yowai n yo naa. [Well - yeah listing only two words would be a little too weak wouldn’t it.]

6 Kiku: Uun. Niko tte nan kaa. [Yeah. Two words, I’m not sure (it’s good)]

7 Nana: Niko tte chotto na. [Two words, I’m not sure (either)]

8 Kiku: Nan ka purezen dewa baransu waruku naa? = [Somehow in a presentation it ((listing two words)) seems unbalanced doesn’t it]

9 Shin: = Un. Warui naa. [Yeah unbalanced.]

10 Nana: Un warui. [Yeah unbalanced.]

11 Kiku: Koko o toripuru atakku de more: (1.2) more o hitotsu ni seehen? Hondee (0.7) koo more no ato ni nan ka koo [Here let’s make a triple attack and use only one “more” shall we? And then like after the “more” something like]

12 ((Nana deletes the first “more,” instead of the second one. And a few turns later))

13 Kiku: More koko ni oi te - honde koko oo - [Put “more” here ((referring to before the word “thoughtful” and - and this should be -)]

14 Nana: AA wakatta wakatta. ((deletes the “more” before the word “considerate” and types “more” before the word “thoughtful”)) [OH I see I see.]

15 Kiku: Koo- nan te ino no - [pon-pon-pon to [like - what should I say - like bang bang bang]

16 Nana: [Aa wakatta wakatta. ((typing)) Koo ino koto ya na. [Oh I see I see. It’s like this isn’t it] (November 14, 2000)

In Line 1, Nana reads the two phrases that she has typed. Kiku asks Nana and Shingo in Line 2 if they need to add any more words and suggests in Line 4 that they should probably add a third adjective “respectful” to the list. Nana then shows her
agreement by explaining why they need to add another word. Moreover, Kiku states that in the context of a presentation, it seems “unbalanced” to use only two words of the same kind (i.e., adjectives in this case), to which both Nana and Shingo agree in their following turns. In Line 11, Kiku suggests that they should list three words and delete the second “more” before the word “considerate.” What the students are considering here is rhetoric or the art of “effective or persuasive speaking and writing” (Crystal, 1992, p. 333). They are deciding to list three words instead of two in order to make a great impression on their audience. As his utterance (“like bang bang bang”) in Line 15 indicates, Kiku is envisaging the possible effect that his group is aiming to bring about in their presentation by juxtaposing three adjectives.

5.1.2.4 Rehearsing and Performance-Coaching

Excerpt 5.14 is taken from the group interaction that Kiku, Nana, and Shingo had the night before the presentation. They spent most of the time rehearsing their presentation. Because of this, an increase in the amount of English used was obvious. In the excerpt, Nana is rehearsing her part and Kiku and Shingo are listening. In Line 1, Kiku asks Nana to start rehearsing. Hearing Nana’s utterances in Line 2, Kiku suggests that she speak more loudly. Prior to this excerpt, the three students had agreed that this part was the most important in their presentation so Nana should draw the audience’s attention somehow. Subsequently, in Line 4, Nana said the same phrase again, this time with much more emphasis.

55 What Kiku called “triple shoot” or “triple attack” here is similar to what is referred to as a “three-part list.” Incidentally, this is a technique that Atkinson (1984) identified in effective political speech (see Wooffitt, 1996). According to Wooffitt (1996), three-part lists are effective at getting audience’s applause because “their structures allow speakers to amplify and strengthen more general points” (p. 126).
Excerpt 5.14

1 Kiku: Okay, Nana, please.

2 Nana: Attention please everyone. (0.5) So now I’m going to talking about =

3 Kiku: = Dame ya. Sore motto dasana akan na:. [No. Maybe you should speak more loudly.]

4 Nana: ATTENTION PLEA:SE - everyone?

5 Kiku: Soo soo. (0.4) Na: demo poketto ni te irete tara akan ya ro. [Good good. You know - but you shouldn’t speak with your hands in your pocket.]

6 Nana: ((smiling)) Ha:i. [Oka:y.] ((laughs and takes her hands out of her pockets))

7 Kiku: ((laughs))

8 Nana: I’m- I’m going to talking about the most important finding - in Japanese class (0.6) that is unexpectedly, amazingly, (0.7) actually we don’t know much about Japan - even Japanese. (November 15, 2000)

In Line 5, Kiku acknowledges Nana’s effort to speak with more emphasis, but at the same time advises her not to speak with her hands in her pockets. Nana accepts this advice, smiling. In a reflective interview, Kiku explained that for him, who enjoyed doing Japanese comic stage dialogues, presenting oneself positively as well as drawing the audience’s attention was an essential part of doing a presentation. Interestingly, unlike other students, Kiku, while working with his group members as well as reflecting on his actions at the interviews, often used the word kyaku to refer to the audience, in this case, Izzat and his fellow classmates.  

Depending on the context, the meaning of this Japanese word can vary from visitors and guests to customers and clients to spectators and even passengers, all of which refer to people who receive service. Kiku said that as a performer of comic stage dialogue, he saw one primary goal of presenting as entertaining his kyaku. He went on to say that this belief had been reinforced through observation of

56 Shingo was also observed to use the word kyaku during his conversations with Kiku and Nana. For example, he said at one of their group meetings, “It is important to adjust our presentation to our kyaku.” (November 12, 2000, my translation).
Izzat’s use of questions in her lectures as well as through participation in the pre-departure orientation in which a member of the preceding Keishin group coached Kiku and his peers in doing effective presentations (see Appendix K).

Excerpt 5.15

1 Kiku: *Chotto ree demo dashi te miru?* [How about giving some examples?] ((Kiku demonstrates)) ...

2 Nana: *Hai.* [Okay.]

3 Kiku: (xx) *Nan demo.* [Anything will do.]

4 Nana: Okay. One of the my- one of my students I had to help - she is writing about- she was writing about *Samurai.* (1.4) Should I- (0.8) should I - explain about *Samurai?* (1.4)

5 Kiku: Sure. Yeah.

6 Nana: Okay. *Samurai tte nan te ii no eigo de.* [How do you say *Samurai* in English.] (0.6)

7 Shin: *Samurai.* (0.5) *Wakaran.* [I’m not sure.] (1.3)

8 Kiku: *Samurai.*

9 Nana: *Samurai.* (1.1) Japanese old (2.5) soldier.

10 Kiku: *U:n - Izzat kiku kamo shirehen na.* [Yeah - Izzat may ask, like] (0.5) ((imitating Izzat)) “Nana, can you explain *Samurai?* (how x) means *Samurai?* What does *Samurai* look like?” *tte.* (4.3)

11 Nana: *Samurai* looks like? (0.9) So see? I didn’t know much about *Samurai.* ((laughs))

12 Shin: ((laughs))

13 Nana: See? So I don’t know much about *Samurai* if - [Izzat ask me?]

14 Kiku: [Uh ((laughs))] (November 15, 2000)

In Excerpt 5.15, which took place a few turns after Excerpt 5.14, Nana tries to make the point that three of them have realized that they “do not know much about Japan, including its language and culture” (group meeting, November 15, 2000), or about how to translate and explain for outsiders concepts that are widely known in Japan. In Line 1, Kiku suggests that Nana use some examples to support the point that they are trying to
make as a group: i.e., that they lack knowledge about their own country. Nana then starts to talk about her experience of realizing that she did not know much about traditional Japanese warriors when helping one of the students from the Japanese class prepare for his presentation about the topic. What is particularly interesting about this excerpt is that Kiku code-switches to English and imitates Izzat’s tone of voice in Line 10 to prompt Nana to explain the meaning of the word *samurai*. By speaking through the teacher’s voice (Bakhtin, 1981; Wertsch, 1991b), Kiku seems to succeed in making his peer-coaching less face-threatening, as indicated by Nana’s and Shingo’s laughter in Lines 11 and 12. In sum, Excerpts 5.14 and 5.15 suggest that rehearsing and peer-coaching were two other important aspects of peer collaboration for this group in tackling a public, in-class L2 presentation.

5.2 Tomo and Koyuki’s Group Preparation for the Task

In this section, we will examine the task preparation of two other key participants, Tomo and Koyuki, and their partner Yuji. Before examining their task-preparatory activities, some background information needs to be provided about this group. Yuji was a junior in agriculture from another university in Japan.\(^{57}\) Having spent an additional year as a *roonin*\(^{58}\) or a high school graduate preparing for his university entrance examinations, he was two years older than Tomo and Koyuki. Despite this age difference, Yuji did not seem to mind his junior using an informal register with him at all. He was eager to learn and fun to be around. Yuji enjoyed playing basketball.

---

\(^{57}\) LFW201 and LFW202 were designed for Keishin students, but other students were allowed to take them.

\(^{58}\) The Japanese word *roonin* literally means “masterless *samurai*.” As Finkelstein (1991) states, this word is used in Japan to refer to “a high school graduate waiting for another chance to be enrolled in a college” (p. 221).
As briefly mentioned earlier, Koyuki, Tomo, and Yuji's group was unique in that unlike many other groups, they did not have much in common in terms of fieldwork. For instance, Tomo initially wanted to do volunteer work related to medical treatment. This interest was clearly reflected by his choice of topic of his ELI presentation, that is, the provincial medical care plan (see Chapter 7). In Semester 1, when Izzat informed her students during the second lab meeting that there was a volunteer opportunity at a local hospital and asked them if anyone was interested, Tomo showed his interest by raising his hand. In fact, he had previously worked as a volunteer in a medical treatment project for non-Japanese people living in Japan. A few days later, Tomo went to the local hospital to attend a health fair, where he enjoyed exhibitions and presentations about health and tours around the hospital facilities. He then went to the volunteer resource center of the hospital to seek a position, but unfortunately, he found that he was not qualified to work there. He wrote in his field journal as follows:

Excerpt 5.16

They were looking for the person who had previous experiences, more practical skills and knowledge, so I couldn’t get the job... I think ((referring to his previous position in Japan)) my job there was more related to policies of medical treatment, so I did not need any medical skills at all. (October 5, 2000)

Tomo’s next choice was a street youth resource center, which was located in the same hospital building. He found the organization’s information desk at the health fair and learned that they were looking for volunteers to work in their kitchen. Tomo wrote in the journal, “street youth is one of the big social problems. I would like to see what they are concerned about, and what they want to do, just having contact with them in person” (October 5, 2000). This position seemed to be a good opportunity for Tomo, who was interested in health and welfare issues. The following week, Tomo underwent an
interview, which he unfortunately failed for reasons that are unclear. Although he later got a position in a fair trade coffee business, Tomo found his experience at this interview to be a good learning opportunity and therefore chose to talk about it in the group presentation.

As a law major, Koyuki wanted to do volunteer work that had to do with legal and social issues in Canada. In late September, she got a secretarial position in the human rights committee of a local organization of Japanese Canadians. Her duties included making mailing lists of their workshop participants, editing Japanese manuscripts and composing letters informing people of meetings for intercultural couples. Koyuki wrote in her field journal:

Excerpt 5.17

Now I’m really glad to find a place where I can go volunteer, but I’m afraid everything because this is the first time to volunteer for me. And also I’m afraid that I use both English and Japanese for volunteer, but I and she [Ms. Nakano] (works with me) use Japanese during a conversation... And also I can learn concrete issues about rights and law in reality. In Japan, I studied law and learned a lot of issues, but I’ve never seen the person concerned actually. So I think I can learn a lot by working with her, from now. (October 5, 2000)

Apparently, Koyuki’s volunteer job search resulted in a very positive outcome, an outcome certainly more positive than that of Yuji, who failed all the interviews that he took. Yuji expressed his frustration in his field journal: “I didn’t guess this situation. I’m so upset that everyone already starts working. I want to experience many things as soon as possible as everyone” (October 19, 2000).

In sum, Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji had very different experiences. Although they did not see themselves as having much experience in common, Tomo and Yuji, having
worked together on the poster project (see Chapter 7) and developed a good friendship,\textsuperscript{59} decided to do the Semester 1 presentation together. Having no classmate that did volunteer work of similar kind, Koyuki joined Tomo and Yuji. Koyuki said somewhat jokingly, “We were like a group of leftovers” [original in Japanese] (November 4, 2000).

5.2.1 Negotiating Task Definition and Teacher Expectations

Tomo, Koyuki and Yuji’s presentation was scheduled for November 23, the final day for the student presentation. They started their group meetings on November 11, which lasted approximately two hours. Like Kiku and Nana’s group, this group spent much of the time negotiating task definitions and sharing their experience in Japanese. They first discussed what the oral presentation was about. They agreed that they were supposed to report what they did in their chosen fields and what they gained from this experience, and that they should start by sharing their experience with each other. After they each had a chance to tell the others what they did as volunteers and/or volunteer job seekers and what they felt and thought along the way, the three students had the following interaction:

Excerpt 5.18

1 Yuji: \textit{Ore kore doo matomete iino ka wakarahen.} (1.0) [I’m not sure how to put these together.]

2 Tomo: \textit{Uun. Honma doo matomete iin yaroo naa.} (1.7) [Yeah. Really I wonder how we could put them together.]

3 Yuji: ((laughs)) (0.9)

\textsuperscript{59}Tomo and Yuji were on a first name basis. Although they had the option of using first names plus honorific suffixes (e.g., \textit{san}, \textit{kun}, \textit{chan}), they simply used their first names. Although there seems to be a general agreement among linguists that speakers of modern Japanese tend to use the address term in place of second person pronouns especially in polite speech (e.g., Loveday, 1986; Maynard, 1997; Niyekawa, 1991; Suzuki, 1978; see also Kelly, 2001), Tomo and Yuji often addressed each other with a second person singular pronoun \textit{omae}, which is a rough expression “allowed only between close friends”(Suzuki, 1978, p. 122; see also Kojima, 1988). Moreover, I often observed Yuji and Tomo “hang out” with other Keishin students in their leisure time.
As Yuji’s and Tomo’s utterances in Lines 1 and 2 indicate, one major challenge that their group faced in their task preparation was to come up with one coherent presentation about three different field experiences as a group. Importantly, in Line 9, Koyuki quotes Izzat to agree with Tomo’s opinion expressed in Line 8. As this utterance and Tomo’s audio-journal indicate, the students had asked their teacher for advice the previous week and been advised to work together to see if they could come up with themes that might cut across their different experiences. After the above interaction, they started their discussion. However, their task did not seem easy at all. In fact, Koyuki once asked the others if they should do three individual, 10-minute presentations within the allotted 30 minutes. Tomo, revoking Izzat’s voice, insisted that they give one group presentation, with which both Koyuki and Yuji agreed.

5.2.1.1 Collaborative Dialogue in Making a PowerPoint Document

Like many other groups, Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji decided to use the PowerPoint program for their presentation. While Tomo and Yuji were already familiar with the program, Koyuki had never used it before. They also decided that they would first work
individually to prepare documents for their own parts, and consolidate them into one group document. Koyuki then said that she was a little apprehensive about using the unfamiliar program, which led Tomo and Yuji to teach her how to use it. After consolidating their materials, the group got together again to go over their group document. In the following excerpt, the three students are looking at the computer screen together.

Excerpt 5.19

1 Koyu: Be stuck? Get stuck?
2 Tomo: Docchi demo. [Whichever.]
3 Koyu: Kyo nan ka dare ka purezen de saa - [Today someone in his presentation]
4 Tomo: Dare ka itte ta ka na. [Someone said that I wonder.]
5 Koyu: Uun - Kikuirokun no han - ga - nan ka - sore kaite atte - stuck tte yoku kiite ta kedo - kore yatta n daatte omo tte. [Yeah. Kikuijiro’s group - had the word written on the screen. I had often heard the word “stuck” - I thought, oh this is it]
6 Tomo: Uun. Sooya na. [Yeah - right.]
7 Koyu: Demo - uchi mo tsuka ttara akan yo naa - onaji no. Kaeta hoo ga ii? [But it would not be good if I use the same word would it, it’s better to use a different expression?]
8 Yuji: Doo ya ro. [I wonder.]
9 Tomo: Uun. Kamo na [Hmm. Maybe]
10 Koyu: Hon na kae yo. Chigau kotoba hoshii. [Then I will use something different. I want a different expression.] (November 16, 2000)

In Line 1, Koyuki asks Tomo and Yuji which is grammatically accurate, “get stuck” or “be stuck.” Tomo answers in the next line, that either is okay. Interestingly, Koyuki starts to share her observations. She says that she remembers Kiku’s group using the phrase in their presentation. In other words, she has taken it up from her classmates’
presentation and shared this uptake\textsuperscript{60} (Allwright, 1984; Slimani, 1992) with her partners. This kind of uptake was not uncommon among the Keishin students at all. In fact, many other students reported in their interviews that they had picked up new words and/or phrases by observing their classmates’ presentations.

Although she had heard it before, Koyuki did not know what the word “stuck” looked like until she saw it on the screen. She then asks Tomo and Yuji if it is not okay for her to use the same phrase in her talk, about which Yuji expresses his uncertainty in the following turn. Hearing Tomo’s contribution “Maybe” in Line 9, Koyuki states in Line 10 that she will use a different expression. What she is concerned here seems to be originality of expression. In fact, she commented after the meeting that she thought she should find another expression because she wanted her speech to be different.

5.2.1.2 Collaborative Dialogue in Formulating Utterances

After sharing their field experiences and negotiating the content of their presentation, Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji each worked individually in their rooms to think how to orally express their content. Moreover, this group worked together to formulate utterances for their discussion and conclusion. Perhaps this was a unique part of their task preparation, since other groups, while jointly deciding what to say and prepared their presentation materials, did not spend time together thinking how to express their agreed meaning.

In Excerpt 5.20, Koyuki, Tomo, and Yuji are working on part of their discussion for which Yuji was responsible. As Yuji’s utterances in Lines 1 and 3 suggest, their point

\textsuperscript{60}Uptake is defined by Slimani (1992) as “what learners claim to have learned from a particular lesson” (p. 197). In this dissertation, I extend this definition to include what students claim to have learned from other situations including group meetings.
here is that many Japanese employers do not seem to value their employees' volunteer experiences as much as their Canadian counterparts.

Excerpt 5.20

1 Yuji: ((starts to practice his part)) But in Japan, here are few - there are few - volunteer positions in Japan.

2 Koyu: Mm - Demo kocchi no hoo ga wakariyasu soo. (xx) your company will not interested in your volunteer experience at all. Toka. [But this might be easier to understand. (xx) your company will not interested in your volunteer experience at all. Something like this.]

3 Yuji: Because - (x) Japanese companies er - don’t put - don’t put er value on volunteer experience. Even IF you have - much volunteer experience, - mm

4 ((several turns later))

5 Tomo: De mata however tsukau no [And are you going to use ‘however’ again.]

6 Yuji: Iya however- iya even if no [kawari ni - [No. However- no. Instead of even if]

7 Koyu: [Kawari ni however ['However’ instead (of even if)]

8 Yuji: [However]  

9 Koyu: However [you have -

10 Tomo: [However - mm]

11 Koyu: you have - much experience

12 Tomo: ((to Yuji)) Sono mae wa nan te itta? [What did you say before that?]

13 Yuji: Un? [Hmm?]

14 Tomo: However no mae wa nan te ita n? [What do you plan to say before ‘however.’]

15 Yuji: Kore. ((shows his notes)) Kore yutte hon de kore no kuwashii setsumei o koko de suru to. Tatoe anata tachi ga boran- ano borantia no keiken o ikura motete moo <Tomo: Un.> anata no kaisha wa [This. ((shows his notes)) I plan to say this and explain this here. No matter how much volunteer experience you may have] <Tomo: [Yeah.>] your company]

16 Tomo: However tsukau n ya itara naa <Yuji: Un.> ato no bunshoo waa - nan ya tta [If you want to use however <Yuji: [Yeah.>] the following sentence should be - what was it]

17 Koyu: Chigau koto ja nai to akan no? [Should be in contrast?]
In this excerpt, Tomo seems to be thinking of one way to express the intended meaning and Koyuki seems to be thinking of another. Hearing Yuji’s plan to use the word however, Koyuki starts to formulate an utterance in Line 7. In Lines 12 and 14, Tomo asks Yuji what he plans to say before the utterance that starts with the word however so as to understand the linguistic context surrounding this utterance (see Brown & Yule, 1983; Lyons, 1995). After hearing Yuji’s answers in Line 15, Tomo states that the word however cannot be used unless it is preceded in this case by the utterance “Japanese companies put value on the volunteer experience.” Based on this explanation, the following text can be constructed:

Japanese companies put value on the volunteer experience. **However,** you have much volunteer experience.

My conversation with Tomo, on the other hand, suggests that the text that he was actually constructing in his mind was something like this:
Japanese companies put less value on volunteer experience (than Canadian companies).

**However,** you have much volunteer experience.

In other words, he said it wrong, but he was not aware of this mistake. This may have to do with the limitations of spoken discourse, which, according to Wells (1999a), include:

> the evanescence of the understanding achieved in speech and the difficulty of pursuing any one line of thinking in a systematic manner long enough to be sure that progress has been made and to know in what that progress consists of.

(p. 115)

However, even without the mistake, the above text is problematic. As Yuji’s utterance in Line 15 suggests, what the group wanted to say basically was that Japanese companies do not value their employees’ experiences as much as their Canadian counterparts do. Thus, the order of the two ideas above should be reversed in order for the whole text to express this intended meaning. As her utterance in Line 19 suggests, Koyuki might have been more or less aware of this problem, unlike her partners. Despite its problem, Yuji shows his understanding of Tomo’s explanation.

On the other hand, Koyuki was trying to formulate a sentence that included a conditional like the following: “However much experience you have, Japanese companies do not value it.” This sentence, in fact, appears to express the intended meaning more accurately.\(^6\)\(^1\) In Line 22, Yuji announces that he will use *even if,* which he initially used (see Line 3 for example). In Line 23, Koyuki asks Tomo and Yuji if her sentence is grammatically correct. However, Yuji rejects this question apparently without much consideration.

---

\(^{61}\) Koyuki used the however-adverb (or adjective) conditional (see Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985) twice in her speech: “However much we learn other cultures I think there is- there can be still barrier of primitive habits - of life style.” and “However much you can speak other language I think it’s not enough to communicate - pe- communicate with people” (November 23, 2000).
To summarize, in the above excerpt, the three students engaged in a collaborative dialogue, which helped Yuji decide what language to use in order to express the intended meaning. However, neither Tomo nor Yuji seems to have understood or heard Koyuki’s suggestion. Thus, her question (Line 23) remained unsolved. In short, intersubjectivity about the use of the however-conditional was not achieved between Koyuki and her partners.

5.2.1.3 Rehearsing

Like Kiku and Nana’s group, Tomo, Yuji, and Koyuki chose to do rehearsals in one of the classrooms in the Keishin House. However, no one worked as a peer coach. Rather, each member invited the others to comment on their task performance. In this phase of task preparation, the students often asked each other and the researcher if their pronunciation, intonation, and word stress were fine and if their L2 speech made sense. This suggests that they were primarily concerned about production of prepared utterances or what Levelt (1989) refers to as articulation\(^{62}\) (see also Bygate, 2001). Thus, the students mostly spoke in English (see also Kobayashi, 2002). For example, most of Koyuki’s utterances in the next excerpt (5.21) are made in English.\(^{63}\)

At their sixth group meeting, Tomo and Koyuki met without Yuji, who was busy doing an assignment due on the following day for his agriculture course. Anticipating this, Yuji had informed the others that he might not be able to attend the meeting. Tomo and Koyuki, who both seemed very understanding about Yuji’s situation, decided to meet

---

\(^{62}\) Levelt’s (1989) model refers to the individual speaker’s production of utterances. In this dissertation, I use his concepts metaphorically to refer to student groups’ foci during their task preparation.

\(^{63}\) Yuji was not present when this interaction took place; however, when the three of them got together to do a trial run the night before their presentation, they spoke more English than they did in earlier phases of the task preparation.
alone to do whatever preparation they could do, including rehearsing their parts. This was the first time that they did a group rehearsal.

As mentioned earlier, Tomo decided to talk about what he learned from the interview that he underwent to get a volunteer position at a youth organization. At this interview, Tomo was presented with three hypothetical situations in which volunteers for the organization would likely find themselves, and required to answer what he would do as a volunteer in those situations. In the following excerpt, Tomo is practicing his part.

**Excerpt 5.21**

1 Tomo: In the interview uh: - my volunteer coordinator gave me uh - let me imagine the situation while I’m working in the kitchen. So - the first question was this one. ((shown on the computer screen)) “A woman comes to you and according to her - she was raped before. And now she’s pregnant. She’ll take abortion tomorrow. And then - she came to the kitchen - and she asked me - let- let her stay at one night.” So she- she just asked me uh - what would you do. (2.2) Yeah. So: - Dee - koko de - ((laughs)) - dare ka ni = [And - here - ((laughs)) to somebody]

2 Koyu: = soko de kiku nen na. [you will address the question there, right?]

3 Tomo: What would you do? (0.9) tte kii te - [What would you do? (0.9) I will ask (this question) and -]

4 Koyu: ((laughs))

5 Tomo: Everyone - everyone - if you have been I - at that time - how - how would have answered - that question. ((looking at the researcher)) What do you think. (((laughs))

6 Masa: [Uh: - it’s - very difficult. [Hmm -

7 Koyu: [Yeah - I think so.

8 Masa: [Well - I would probably ask my boss umm [what to do.

9 Koyu: [Oh.

10 Tomo: Ah:

11 Masa: I don’t know.

12 Koyu: Oh good idea.

13 Tomo: That’s a good answer.
Masa: [(laughs)]

Koyu: [Yeah I think so.

Tomo: [Yeah. (1.3) Yeah. (3.2) Ye:s.

Koyu: ((looking at Tomo)) And [how about you -

Tomo: [((laughing)) Aa - nan te kotaeyoo (0.7) Nan te kotaeyoo [Ah: what should I say (0.7) How should I respond] (1.2) Yeah that’s a good answer. (1.8) Co:s (1.1) you know, that kind of cases are very serious - and also sensitive? So that - yeah - as a volunteer it’s not good because - I don’t have a good knowledge, about this - that kind of things so - it- yeah in some - it might be uh dangerous if I get involved in - that accident? So - yeah all you ha- all you have to do as a volunteer is uh just hitch the staff, and then - uh tell them uh what - what- what happened to her. And leave all to them. That’s it. (November 18, 2000)

What is particularly interesting about this excerpt is that Tomo asked me his question, positioning me as an audience member, not a researcher. In Line 6, caught rather off guard, I commented, “It’s very difficult.” Koyuki agrees with this in the following line. I then answered that I would probably ask my boss what to do, which turns out to be “right,” as indicated by Tomo’s positive comment in Line 13. His Japanese utterances in Line 18 as well as the long pauses in Line 16 suggest that Tomo did not anticipate this situation. After making the L1 utterances, Tomo repeats the same comment that he made earlier, “That’s a good answer.” He commented after the rehearsal, “since I had not expected that I would get the right answer, I was not ready” [original in Japanese] (November 18, 2000). Thus, the unexpected answer from the researcher made Tomo aware of the need to prepare for the alternative scenario and think how to respond accordingly. In short, Tomo made use of the researcher’s presence as a resource for their task preparation.

5.2.2 Development of a Text through Peer Collaboration and Repeated Engagement

What was particularly unique about Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji’s group was that they were willing to spend time jointly constructing their presentation program. In order
to report on this group nature, we will examine in this section how the students worked together to help Koyuki produce the following concluding statement:

Excerpt 5.22

1 Koyu: Ah - at first, we were so embarrassed, because Izzat told us to make one presentation (0.5) although we have completely different volunteer experiences. So we tried to share and discuss our ideas and experience again and again. (0.6) And - after that, we got- we learned (0.5) this - conclusion. <Izzat: hmm.> And also we found how important - umm - the importance of sharing ideas and experience - even people- among people have - completely different experience. So now we want- (0.6) we strongly want you to do the same things as- as we? (1.8) because we are sure you can find many new things. (1.7) And we ((looking at Izzat)) we really appreciate Izzat giving us such a good opportunity. ((smiles))

2 Tomo: [Yeah.

3 Izzat: [Forcing you to work together? ((laughs))

4 Tomo: Yeah.

5 Yuji: Yeah. (November 23, 2000)

Although not error-free, Koyuki’s text above appears to have done its job. For one thing, it summarized her, Tomo’s, and Yuji’s learning through their group work. Notice her use of rhetorical techniques. By using the “at first we thought” phrase (Jefferson, 1984, cited in Wooffitt, 1996; see also Mercer, 2000), she first presents herself and her partners as individuals who were confused by being advised by their teacher to make one presentation out of their different field experiences. Recall that many other students, including Kiku and Nana, prepared their presentations with classmates who worked at the same or similar places. Having constructed themselves as “ordinary students” who perceived the task to be confusing initially, Koyuki uses the phrases “after that...we learned” and “we found” in order to discuss how this perception changed as a result of the group discussion. As Izzat commented right after the presentation, the students

64 In a way, what Koyuki is doing here is reporting an “extraordinary experience” (Jefferson, 1984, cited in Wooffitt, 1996) in that the task of doing a presentation with classmates who did not share the same or
clearly demonstrated that they were able to make meaning together out of their different experiences and not necessarily positive ones for Tomo and Yuji.

Another thing is that Koyuki’s concluding statement, especially the last utterance, performed the acts of showing appreciation and thanking the instructor (Austin, 1962; Schiffrin, 1994). This is evident from Izzat’s humorous response accompanied by laughter in Line 3, whose complete version would be “Do you appreciate my forcing you to work together?” The speech act was performed by Koyuki through grammatical resources, the sensing verb “appreciate,” and the adjective “good” (Eggins & Slade, 1997).

Moreover, my interview data suggest that Koyuki, Tomo, and Yuji’s group presentation was perceived to be a great success by their teacher and classmates. In fact, they received 98% (A+) for this task, the highest mark of all. Also, many of their classmates commented that they appreciated the group’s thoughtfulness as well as the engaging delivery of the presentation. Here, one may wonder how they achieved this. To address this question, in what follows, we will examine how Koyuki worked in collaboration with Tomo and Yuji in order to develop her concluding statement in Excerpt 5.17 over the last three days of their task preparation.

5.2.2.1 Rehearsing and “Noticing the Hole” in the Presentation Program

The following excerpt is taken from the aforementioned group meeting which Tomo and Koyuki had without Yuji, who was busy trying to finish an assignment for another course. Recall that one major activity of this meeting was rehearsing their presentation. In the excerpt, Koyuki is about to finish her part. In Line 12, she mentions similar experiences was rather unusual in the present context. Wooffitt (1996) cites Jefferson (1984) saying that in reporting such an experience, the speaker first describes “their initial assessment of what was going on—an assessment of which, crucially, turns out to be wrong” (p. 139).
that she is thinking of thanking Izzat, Abraham, and the researcher for their assistance in the presentation. Here it is important to note that Koyuki is not practicing her speech, but informing Tomo of her plan.

**Excerpt 5.23**

1. Koyuki: ...and I am sure - all we: - can be competent intercultures (0.6) communicators. (1.5) Because we learned - in this class. (1.1) Or thanks to (1.1) ((looking at Tomo)) I was thinking (2.5) say thanks - thanks to this class, Izzat and Abraham, Masaki-san. ((Masa: laughs)) Or something like - so (2.3) that's all. And - we gonna (3.6) go to (0.6) con - clusion nai no?[we have no conclusion?]

2. Tomo: Aru yo. [We do] (0.7)


4. Tomo: ((laughs)) Kangaeyo ka. [Let’s think about it] (November 18, 2000)

In Line 1, Koyuki asks Tomo if they do not have conclusions, which makes Koyuki and Tomo realize that they have not thought of what to say. In Line 3, Koyuki appears to hit on some idea. She attempts to express it in English, but has difficulty.

Tomo then suggests that they think about it together. In short, by doing this first rehearsal, Koyuki and Tomo “noticed the hole”65 (Swain, 1998) in their presentation program (i.e., their conclusion). As such, all they know at this point is that Koyuki is considering acknowledging the instructor, the TA, and the researcher.

**5.2.2.2 Negotiating Language and Content (formulating)**

The following excerpts were taken from the group interaction that Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji had the night before their presentation. By this time, the students had decided to acknowledge only the instructor in their presentation.

---

65 SLA researchers such as Swain (1998) and Doughty and Williams (1998) use this phrase to refer to learners’ noticing that they have a problem expressing what they want to say precisely in their L2, in other words, noticing a hole in their interlanguage. Here, I simply use the phrase to refer to students’ noticing that they have not thought what to say in the presentation and/or how to say it in English.
5.2.2.2.1 Collaborative Dialogues Going in a Desired Direction

Excerpt 5.24

1. Koyu: **Thanks to nante ittara ii ka na.** [In addition to thanks what should I say]
   ((enunciating)) **You: gave this opportunity - ka naa.** [Should this be “you gave this opportunity.”]

2. Tomo: **Soo soo.** [Yeah yeah]

3. ((a few turns later))

4. Koyu: At first,

5. Tomo: **Soo soo.** [Yeah yeah]

6. Koyu: we thought it’s difficult - mm (5.3)

7. Tomo: **Koo - hajime waa (0.5) sonoo - zenzen chigau (0.7) borant’ia shita 3 nin ga atsumeraretee - atsumerarete ((laughs)) tte - atsumattan ya kedo - atsumattee - nde - sugoi - chotto muzukashiso ni mieta kedo (0.7) sono naka de - sono - jibun no borant’ia keeken no koto o (0.9) [Like - at first - (0.5) well - three of us who did completely different volunteer work were put together - were put together ((laughs)) - I mean we got together -we got together and it ((referring to the task)) seemed very difficult but (0.7) in that process -well - our volunteer experiences]

8. Koyu: share!

9. Tomo: **Un.** Share. Share dekite koo iu koto o hakken deki mashi ta. Dakara (0.6) minna mo share shita ra jibun no hakken ga aru kamo shiremasen yo tte itte = [Yeah share. We could share our experiences and make these discoveries. So (0.6) if you share your experience you may make your own discovery- you say something like this and]

10. Koyu: = **Un un un.** = [Yeah yeah yeah.]

11. Tomo: = **de - koo iu kikai o ataete kurete Izzat ni (0.6) totemo kansha shite imasu to koo itte** [and - we are very grateful to Izzat, who gave this opportunity - say something like this and]

12. Koyu: **Appreciate!**

13. Tomo: **Soo.** [Yeah.] **I really appreciate you give me such a good opportunity.**

14. Koyu: **Such a good opportunity!** Great! **Sore sugoi.** [That’s great.]

15. Tomo: And uh - ((jokingly)) thank you Izzat.

16. Koyu: “**Such a” - tte - kaite oka.** [“Such a” - I will write this down.] ((writes it down))

17. Yuji: **Such a - such a great opportunity!** (3.6) (November 22, 2000)
In Line 1, Koyuki is wondering what she should say in addition to “thanks” to the instructor, and says, “You: gave this opportunity - ka naa.” Tomo then indicates that she is on the right track by giving her positive feedback in the next line. A few turns later, Koyuki starts again to think what to say, and formulates an L2 utterance in Lines 4 and 6, which is interjected by Tomo’s positive feedback in Line 5. But she seems to be having difficulty producing further utterances, as indicated by the hesitation marker (“mm”) and as well as by the long pause (5.3 seconds). Then, in Line 7, Tomo starts to tell Koyuki in Japanese what she could say. In Line 8, Koyuki builds on Tomo’s utterance by providing the English verb “share” in a timely fashion, which suggests that she was anticipating what Tomo might say next. This seems to be what Levinson (1983) calls projection. According to Ohta (2001), this is a “process of selective attention” in which “the listener anticipates what might come next in the speaker’s production, making predictions about how the utterance may continue” (p. 78). Thus, Koyuki’s provision of the word “share” here exhibits a high degree of contingency.

In Line 9, incorporating Koyuki’s contribution, Tomo continues to tell her what she could say in the conclusion section. Koyuki also continues to display her attentiveness to Tomo’s utterances by her use of back channels (van Lier, 1998a) in Line 10. In Line 11, Tomo expresses in Japanese the content of the message that Koyuki had difficulty expressing earlier. Hearing this, Koyuki enthusiastically utters an English word “appreciate” in the next line. In Line 13, Tomo acknowledges this and produces a grammatically inaccurate but complex L2 utterance, “I really appreciate you give me such a good opportunity.” Koyuki shows her attentiveness to this utterance by repeating the last four words of it (“such a good opportunity”) and making positive evaluations in
both English and Japanese. Subsequently, Koyuki announces that she is writing down this phrase and does so in Line 16, which indicates that her attention was paid to the last four words of Tomo’s utterance rather than to the grammatical structure of it (requiring a gerund complement, Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1983, 1999). Here, it is important to note that although not reflected in the transcript, Yuji was observed to display his attentiveness to the interaction between Tomo and Koyuki by gazing at the speakers and nodding frequently. In summary, what Tomo and Koyuki did here was that they co-constructed an L2 utterance. Tomo first expressed its content in Japanese, and then Koyuki provided the L2 word “appreciate,” which led to Tomo’s construction of the English utterance. In other words, they used Japanese to conceptualize and then formulated an L2 utterance. Japanese thus seems to have served the students as a tool for establishing intersubjectivity and thinking together.

About one hour later, Koyuki, Tomo, and Yuji revisited the same linguistic problem in the following excerpt. In Line 1, Koyuki is trying to formulate the same L2 utterance by herself, but having difficulty. Her struggle is indicated by the frequent long pauses occurring within clauses. As Pawley and Syder (2000) put it, breaks in oral discourse occur for different reasons, which include “organic or physiological reasons (breathing, coughing, laughing, etc.), interactional reasons (pausing for dramatic effect or elicit audience reaction), and reasons for involving the speaker’s cognitive state (as when experiencing a mental block, striving for self-control, or engaged in planning)” (p. 172). The breaks in the present case seem to be occurring for reasons for involving Koyuki’s cognitive states. In fact, she uses self-addressed LI speech (“mm no”). As we have seen in Chapter 2, such private speech, in the literature, is claimed to be a psychological tool
that individuals, when faced with difficult tasks, use to self-regulate their own behaviors (Diaz & Berk, 1992; Lantolf, 2000b; Ohta, 2001; Vygotsky, 1987). Koyuki’s challenge in this case of course is to formulate the appreciate-subject-participle-complement construction (see Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999).

Excerpt 5.25

1 Koyu: [(and - and we:) (0.9) we really want to - Ee chigau. [Mm no.]- We really appreciate (1.0) appreciate - Izzat (1.2) appreciate that Izzat ((looks at Tomo)) (1.3)

2 Tomo: We really appreciate Izzat giving us a - such an [opportunity.

3 Koyu: [such a good o- (0.6) opportunity.

4 Tomo: mm =

5 Koyu: = Matte. [wait.] (0.8) We really appreciate Izzat gave - us [such a good

6 Tomo: [Giving - giving - tabun [maybe].

7 Koyu: [Giving.

8 Yuji: (((speaking very softly)) [Aa doomeeshi nan ya. [Oh - it’s a gerund.]

9 Koyu: Giving. uh - okay. We really appreciate Izzat giving (0.6) us such a good opportunity (1.4) to - uh - good opportunity - [ya kke. [was it]

10 Tomo: [Un. [Yeah.] (November 22, 2000)

After making several attempts to produce the construction, Koyuki looks at Tomo possibly for help. In Line 2, Tomo produces the L2 utterance again, this time, grammatically accurately. Again, Koyuki repeats the last four words of the utterance in Line 3. She then tries to formulate the utterance again in Line 5, but still selects the past tense “gave” instead of the gerund “giving.” In Line 6, Tomo tells Koyuki that he thinks that “giving” might be the right choice. Koyuki repeats the word in Line 7. Having observed this interaction, Yuji comments in Line 8, “oh - it is a gerund,” showing his
heightened awareness of the L2 construction. Given its volume, this utterance may be considered as private speech (see Ohta, 2001, for a relevant discussion).

In Line 9, Koyuki first shows her awareness of the form and then produces an accurate utterance. Koyuki’s use of the “to” after the word “opportunity” indicates that she attempted to add an infinitive. This was later corroborated by Koyuki’s comment that she wanted to describe what kind of opportunity it was that Izzat gave them, but did not know what to say. Nonetheless, Koyuki and Tomo jointly constructed the complex L2 utterance through extended discourse. At first, Koyuki seemed to be attending to the last four words of the utterance and did not notice the gerund despite Tomo’s modeling in Line 6. However, receiving the explicit feedback on her L2 production (“giving - giving - tabun [maybe]”) from Tomo, Koyuki finally became aware and were able to produce it accurately. However, this is not the end of the story. As we will see later, Koyuki continued to engage with the language through rehearsals.

5.2.2.2.2 Collaborative Dialogues Going in an Undesired Direction

Given the students’ concern for accuracy and appropriacy, Excerpts 5.24 and 5.25 can be seen as examples of collaborative dialogues going in a desired direction (see Storch, 1999). However, not all collaborative dialogues went in this direction.

Excerpt 5.26

1 Koyu: At first, - at first - we: we- ett komatta toka tte itte ii? [Can I say we were confused?]
2 Tomo: Ee yo. [Sure.]
3 Koyu: We felt - we felt down - or we got a lost.
4 Tomo: Komatta? [Confused?]
5 Ko’yu: got - lost tte okashii? Komatta tte atashin toko de nan ka tsukatta yoo na. [Is “got lost” strange? I think I used the word komatta in my (previous) part]
6 Tomo: We were - we were embarrassed. (1.2)
Koyu: We were - we were embarrassed.

Tomo: Yeah. (November 22, 2000)

In this excerpt, Koyuki is formulating the very first utterance of her concluding statement with Tomo listening to her while Yuji is practicing his part on his own. In Line 1, she asks Tomo in Japanese if she can say that they were all confused at first. Tomo’s answer in the next line is “Sure.” Koyuki then says, “we felt - we felt down - or we got a lost” in Line 3, which seems different from the Japanese word in meaning. In Line 4, Tomo asks Koyuki if what she wants to say is “confused.” In Line 5, Koyuki asks Tomo if “got lost” is “strange” or wrong, and says that she thinks that she used the phrase in her previous part. Tomo then says in English, “we were - we were embarrassed” in Line 6. Koyuki repeats this utterance in Line 7, and then Tomo provides positive feedback in Line 8. As my translation above suggests, the English word “embarrassed” may not be the best word choice in this context. Koyuki later explained that although she knew the meaning of the word “embarrassed” as in red-faced, she thought that Tomo was talking about another meaning of the word as in “confused,” and thus decided to use it. This decision may have to do with Koyuki’s perception of Tomo as a more competent knower and user of English. Koyuki, in fact, commented that she might have questioned the legitimacy of the word choice if it had come from someone else. At a previous group meeting, Koyuki had said to Tomo (Kaneshiro):

Excerpt 5.27

Professor Yamamoto (the Associate Dean of the Joint Program and personal advisor) recommended that I talk with you, Tomo. He said at the interview, “Let’s improve your TOEFL score.”... And he said, “It is best to ask those who have gotten high scores how they prepared for the test.” Really. He produced a student list and said, something like “I will introduce you to someone.”... He said, “How about Mr. Kaneshiro?” (Tomo laughs)) Professor Yamamoto said, “He is great.” (November 20, 2000)

66 The Japanese word komatta can be translated as confused, perplexed, or uncertain in this context.
Thus, for Koyuki, Tomo had been constructed by the Associate Dean as a TOEFL expert, thus as someone to be consulted. Similarly, Yuji said, “Isn’t that because you are great?” [original in Japanese] (November 20, 2000) when he heard that Tomo, who told the Associate Dean that he would not be able to attend the pre-departure training camp (obligatory for all Keishin newcomers), was exempted from it and did not have to do any make-up.

5.2.2.2.3 Joint Construction of Utterances

The following interaction took place immediately after Excerpt 5.26. Notice that Koyuki has taken up the word “embarrassed,” which Tomo has suggested earlier.

Excerpt 5.28

1 Koyu: At first we were - we were embarrassed - to mm? Iya, gomen. mata kangaeta hoo ga ii? [No, sorry. Should I think about it again?]

2 Tomo: because =

3 Koyu: = we - we were embarrassed because we think - we - we thought it’s so difficult to (1.9) to find - to find - naa- similarity o sagasette itte ten yan naa, Izuizu [Hey - Izuizu [nickname] told us to find similarities (among our experiences) didn’t she.]

4 Tomo: Uun. [Yeah:]

5 Koyu: To find similarity - ya, demo similarity ja nain yan naa. (1.0) [But we didn’t come up with similarities, did we]

6 Tomo: Dakara koo yatte kantan ni ittara ee nen. (0.5) [So you could simply say like this] we were embarrassed - because -

7 Koyu: because,

8 Tomo: Izzat told us to (1.1) to do our volunteer - uh to do our presentation together. (2.1)

9 Koyu: although we have =

10 Tomo: = mm. ((nods))

11 Koyu: completely different [experience.

12 Tomo: [Yeah! (1.6) (November 22, 2000)
In Line 1, Koyuki tries to formulate her first utterance but experiences difficulty. She makes an apology and asks Tomo if she should think about it again. In Line 2, Tomo builds upon Koyuki’s utterance by saying “because” with a prolonged vowel and rising, continuing intonation, seemingly encouraging Koyuki to continue. No sooner had he finished saying the word, Koyuki started to produce L2 utterances again (Line 3). She then checks with Tomo in Japanese her understanding of Izzat’s expectation about the presentation task. Having received Tomo’s confirmation in Line 4, Koyuki tries to continue her L2 production in Line 5. However, in the same line, she makes another confirmation check in Japanese. Tomo then demonstrates what she could say in English in Line 6. Here, notice his use of the cataphoric demonstrative *this* ("...like this") (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). This reference made in Japanese can be considered as a proactive resource to draw Koyuki’s attention to what is coming next (van Lier, 1998a). Koyuki then repeats the word “because” with a prolonged vowel and rising, continuing intonation in Line 7, displaying her attentiveness to Tomo’s previous turn and possibly inviting Tomo to continue. Tomo completes his modeling in Line 8. Koyuki then continues to build on his utterance in the next line, to which Tomo provides confirming feedback in Lines 10 and 12. As neo-Vygotskian scholars might put it, Tomo scaffolded Koyuki’s formulating of the L2 utterance, something which she might not have been able to accomplish by herself (e.g., Donato, 1994; Maybin, Mercer, & Stierer, 1992; Mercer, 1992; van Lier, 1998a; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976).
5.2.2.2.4 Collaborative Dialogue Not Reaching a Consensus

Naturally, not all collaborative dialogues reached a consensus. While Koyuki accepted her peers’ ideas in the previous excerpts, she rejects their ideas in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 5.29

1 Koyu: *Motto iron na koto tte, - nan te yuun daro.* [I wonder how I can say many more things] More - more -


3 Koyu: *Nan ka naa, share idea shitara, koo motto iron na koto ga mitsukaru yotte iitai nen.* (0.7) [You know, I want to say something like - if you share ideas, many more things will be discovered]

4 Yuji: We can find - experience more. (Too much-) many things more.

5 Koyu: Many things?

6 Yuji: *Un. - Many things more.* (9.0) *Okashii ka na - bunpoo teki ni.* [Yeah. - Many things more. Is this wrong - grammatically.] There- they can - they - uh - you can find many things more.

7 Koyu: *Soreka na, you can find many new things toka wa. Okashii.* [Or how about you can find many new things. Is this wrong.]

8 Yuji: ((speaking softly and sounding sullen)) Iin chau. [I guess it’s okay]

9 Koyu: *Un? * [Hmm?]

10 Yuji: *Un.* [Yeah]

11 Koyu: *Honma ka na.* [I wonder if it’s true.]

12 Yuji: Many new things more.

13 Koyu: At first - we were embarrassed… ((continues to rehearse her statement)) (November 22, 2000)

In Line 1, Koyuki says that she wonders how she can say “many more things” in English, again asking for help. Having missed what Koyuki said, Yuji makes a clarification request. Using Japanese, Koyuki then tells him in more detail what she
wants to say in English. In Line 4, Yuji attempts to express the content in English. Koyuki then says, “Many things?” repeating the last part of Yuji’s utterance. While providing positive feedback, Yuji recasts Koyuki’s utterance, adding “more” to the end. After a long pause (9 seconds), he asks Koyuki if his L2 production is grammatically wrong and then produces a complete sentence in English. Koyuki uses a different L2 expression, “many new things,” and asks Yuji if this is wrong. Here, Koyuki seems to be implicitly rejecting Yuji’s suggestion. In the following turn, Yuji says that he guesses it is okay, sounding sullen. Koyuki then makes a clarification request, to which Yuji simply responds by saying “yeah.” In Line 11, Koyuki says that she wonders if Yuji means it. Yuji produces the same utterance, “many things more,” one more time. Without responding to this utterance, Koyuki begins to practice her concluding statement in Line 13.

What is interesting about this interaction is that Koyuki and Yuji are not only formulating the L2 utterance together, but also challenging each other’s idea implicitly. As the transcript shows, they did not reach a consensus. However, Koyuki, as the speaker of the text being constructed, made a final decision as to how to express the content in English, rejecting Yuji’s idea. In fact, Koyuki later told me that she thought that “many things more” was grammatically wrong, but she was not quite sure how to say this to Yuji without offending him. She said that she was hesitant because she was the one with the lowest TOEFL score among the group members and the only one that was not allowed to take regular courses. This suggests that Koyuki and Yuji were negotiating not only L2 form but also their L2 competences and identities.
5.2.2.3 Koyuki’s Repeated Engagement with Her Cognitive Uptake

As the above excerpts suggest, Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji were engaged in collaborative dialogues to construct their presentation text, including Koyuki’s concluding statement. For one thing, Koyuki had a chance to observe Tomo’s production of the “appreciate-subject-participle-complement” construction and produce it herself with the help of him. However, her engagement with the text did not cease here. Koyuki continued to attend to the form throughout the trial runs.

Table 5.1: Koyuki’s Repeated Engagement with the Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial #</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Koyuki’s comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.4) so (2.5) we really appreciate (0.7) we really appreciate Izzat giving us such a good opportunity.</td>
<td>Koyuki: “I wanted to get it right.” [original in Japanese]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.7) and we really appreciate Izzat giving us such a good opportunity.</td>
<td>Koyuki: “I was thinking that it’s giving that comes after ‘appreciate.’ And I told myself, like giving, giving, giving” [original in Japanese] (covert self-addressed L1 speech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0.9) and now we appreciate Izzat give (0.5) giving yana-kore. [this is giving isn’t it.] now we really appreciate Izzat giving us such a good opportunity.</td>
<td>(overt self-addressed L1 speech for self-confirmation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>(1.7) and we ((looking at Izzat)) we really appreciate Izzat giving us such a good opportunity. ((smiles))</td>
<td>Koyuki: “I don’t remember very much. I was nervous. How was it?” But I thought, “Oh I should look at Izzat.” [original in Japanese] (covert self-addressed L1 speech)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.1, Koyuki’s production of the appreciate-subject-participle-complement in each trial (having first used it correctly the third trial) is juxtaposed with her comments obtained through a spot interview. Note that neither utterances nor comments are listed for the first two trials as the students decided to thank Izzat after the second trial. In Trial 3, Koyuki produces an accurate utterance but she makes fairly long pauses before and within the phrase (“so we really appreciate”). As her comment (“I
wanted to get it right.”) suggests, her main concern seems to have been to get her language right. On the fourth trial, Koyuki seems to have produced the utterance with less hesitation. Her reflection suggests that she reminded herself that the verb “appropriate” takes a gerund. In other words, Koyuki used covert self-addressed L1 speech to regulate her own production of the same L2 item.

For the fifth trial, I was not able to conduct a spot interview because Koyuki, Tomo, and Yuji continued their group discussion. But the examination of Koyuki’s discourse suggests that she was still paying attention to the appreciate-subject-participle-complement, which is indicated by her use of overt self-addressed L1 speech. Finally, in the actual presentation, Koyuki produced the utterance accurately and fluently. Notice that here she performed two nonverbal communicative acts: eye gaze and a smile. Although the latter might have come out naturally as a result of her successful production of the language, the former act seems to have taken a conscious effort. Koyuki commented that in producing the utterance, she reminded herself that she should look at the teacher. Again, she made use of inner speech to regulate her own performance.

What Table 5.1 indicates is that Koyuki continued to practice her concluding statement, attending to the appreciate-subject-participle-complement form, after participating in the series of collaborative dialogues with Tomo and Yuji. Here, one might wonder what motivated this repeated engagement. This is what Koyuki had to say:

Since we were the last group to present and I was the final speaker of my group, I thought that I should do my part well. So I worked very hard on my concluding statement. Also, I had observed many great presentations. [original in Japanese] (Interview, December 9, 2000)

Apparently, Koyuki’s repeated engagement with the concluding text seems to have been motivated by her conception of herself as the final speaker of the final group. To
summarize, Koyuki’s seemingly simplistic, eight-utterance text was produced by the cumulative effects of a number of task-preparatory activities (see van Lier, 1988, for a relevant discussion) that she and her partners chose to do, such as negotiating the content and language of the presentation, and rehearsing and revising their speech.

5.3 Alternate Forms of Agency

We have so far examined the task-preparatory activities of Kiku and Nana’s group and Tomo and Koyuki’s group. As the data have shown, members of these groups worked together over several days to accomplish their presentation tasks. As a result, both groups received a high mark from their teacher. However, not all groups were as collaborative and successful as these groups. For example, to prepare for their Semester 1 presentation, Rei and her partners, who volunteered for children in an after-school program, had only two meetings as a group. Each of these meetings lasted less than an hour. At their first meeting, they shared their experiences and decided who would talk about what in the presentation. For instance, the group decided that Rei would discuss the education of children in the program. The group also decided that they would each spell out the content of their talk. A few days later, the group had the second meeting in the Keishin lab to consolidate their notes into a group handout. Rei said that they were planning to meet again to do further preparation, but as the following email message from Rei suggests, they decided not to do so, having several assignments to do:

**Excerpt 5.30**

To Masaki-san,

Our presentation is scheduled for tomorrow. But surprisingly, it turned out that we would perform it without having any more meetings. I wonder if this is a good decision... Since I have several more assignments to do, I don’t even have time to worry about the presentation. But I’ll work hard so as to perform it all right.
See you tomorrow.

Rei [original in Japanese] (E-mail communication, November 9, 2000)

Rei reported that she planned and practiced her speech by herself. Thus, in essence, this group divided their work, carried out their share individually, and put them together on the very day of the presentation. Consequently, they gave their presentation without knowing what their partners had to say. This lack of joint preparation seemed to have been obvious to Izzat, who gave Rei’s group a relatively low mark for their task performance. Subsequently, she commented at the end-of-semester interview that she had thought their presentation to be somewhat incoherent and disorganized. In retrospect, Rei said that it was true that they were all busy with other assignments but she thought that they could and should have held a rehearsal or two.

Another unique case was Ichiro’s group, who started their task preparation two days before their presentation. Ichiro and his partner Taichi were scheduled to volunteer for a UN-affiliated organization, but they wound up not working because they never heard from the organization. Unlike their classmates who did not get their first choice and explored other possibilities, both Ichiro and Taichi persisted in their first choice. Ichiro explained this act at his interview as follows:

To begin with, I didn’t like the idea of having to do volunteer work as a course requirement, and I still don’t. But I have to admit that having listened to my classmates’ presentations, I thought that many of them seemed to have had interesting experiences. Yet, I don’t believe that volunteer work should be a course requirement...It should be voluntary. There may be some people who did volunteer work for the course in Semester 1, but would like to continue it because they found it meaningful. I think that’s great. It’s a case where things ended well. Basically, I am completely against the idea of having to volunteer work as a course assignment. If possible, I wanted to do something which I truly wanted to do. I didn’t want to compromise even if I couldn’t find anything meaningful. I was fully prepared to receive a poor grade. (Interview, November 18, 2000)

Importantly, Taichi shared this feeling. Thus, Ichiro and Taichi were both determined to adhere to the original plan. Here, it should be noted that they both regarded
oral presentations to be an important task for university students to learn especially in North America. In fact, Ichiro said that he appreciated the great number of opportunities that he had to give oral presentations at WPU because of his plan to pursue a master’s degree in North America. Hence, it was the notion of “volunteer” work as a course “requirement” that he resisted (see Eyler & Giles, 1999, for relevant discussion).

In late October, worrying about their situation, Izzat suggested to Ichiro and Taichi that they instead attend university-sponsored events including lectures and workshops (see Chapter 6). The students later said that since they were no longer required to work as “volunteers,” and had choice as to what events to attend, they regarded this option to be more acceptable and meaningful. However, their presentation got scheduled for the first day of student presentations (i.e., November 9) by lot, which left them with only a little time to prepare for their task. On November 8, Ichiro and Taichi stayed up all night and finished their preparation barely in time. As such, they did not have time to prepare computer-printed transparencies or to relate their observations with the course materials. In the following exchange, which took place in the question and answer time, Izzat asks the students about this point.

Excerpt 5.31

1 Izzat: And uh: (0.5) the other question is - so (0.9) this presentation has nothing to do with - any of your observations that you did [(for xxx)

2 Ich: [Uh so - uh (0.5) you’re remi- (0.8) remind, (1.8) that (0.6) uh: (3.0) mmm so (0.8) you’re (0.6) encourage to (apply) the (2.0) lecture (1.1) uh: whose title was uh (1.8) uh: getting to know Canada?

3 Izzat: Ah: =

4 Ich: = Yeah.

5 Izzat: I see.
Ichi: The topic was uh politics. And so sometimes uh lecturer uh talked about uh Quebec or -

Izzat: I see. So it does have something to do.

Ichi: Yeah.

Izzat: Okay. So make sure to mention that in your paper when you write it up. (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

Here, Ichiro succeeded in clarifying the teacher’s question; however, this excerpt suggests that Ichiro and Taichi failed to draw connections between their observations and the content of the course (i.e., intercultural communication), which was an important requirement for the task. Moreover, this group spent more than 40 minutes, thus going over the 30-minute time limit. Ichiro later said that he had to admit that their presentation lacked planning. As a result, this group received the same mark as Rei’s group. In sum, Rei’s group chose to keep their group work to a minimum whereas Ichiro’s group resisted the idea of having to do volunteer work for a course. Both of these acts had the negative consequence of receiving a relatively low mark for the task.

5.4 Summary of the Chapter

In the present chapter, we first examined the task-preparatory activities that two groups of contrasting types engaged in to prepare for their Semester 1 presentations. As Legutke and Thomas (1991) say, “the presentation itself is an event of short duration but it is preceded by a preparatory process of collective decision-making, data organization and skill acquisition” (p. 179). In fact, like many other groups, Kiku and Nana’s group and Tomo and Koyuki’s group both spent a number of hours to prepare for their presentations. This preparation included sub-activities such as negotiating task definition and teacher expectation, sharing experiences, negotiating language, content, and rhetoric, making a PowerPoint document, and rehearsing and revising the speech.
Like other key participants and their partners, Kiku, Nana, Koyuki, and Tomo, and their partners used Japanese in all phases of their task preparation. In early stages, they shared their field experiences to find common themes, looking at their own fieldwork journals with the teacher’s comments. In other words, they negotiated the content of the presentation primarily in Japanese. Then, after hours of discussion about their field experiences and learning primarily in their L1, both groups started to make a PowerPoint document and talked about the language of their presentation. Like previous studies (e.g., Donato, 1994; Kobayashi & Kobayashi, 2000; Ohta, 1995; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; also see Wells, 1999a), this chapter has shown that by thinking together and marshalling a variety of tools and resources, the students were sometimes able to solve language problems. As the interactions between Koyuki and Tomo (Excerpt 5.24 and 5.25) suggest, some students even scaffolded their partners’ L2 production. However, at other times, problems remained unsolved or even unnoticed.

Students often searched for words or phrases that could be understood without difficulty by student members of the audience (e.g., Excerpt 5.11). Interestingly, for Kiku and Nana’s group, this was at odds with another concern that they had: not to sound/look “cheap” by using too many words that are too easy. As Tracy’s (1997) study shows, participants in academic seminars, including presenters and professors, often face similar dilemmas. Because of their perception of the presentation as stage performance, Kiku, Nana, and Shingo were not only concerned about the accuracy of their text, but also about their audience’s comprehension and their perceptions of them as English speakers. Moreover, data have shown that Koyuki was concerned about the originality of her language as well as about its accuracy.
Both groups chose to rehearse their presentations in the classroom. In the former group, Kiku served as a major peer-coach, commenting on his partner's task performance. Although there was some talk about language, at this stage, the students' focus seemed to be on articulation and performance (see Chapter 1). Thus, the amount of Japanese used decreased as group work progressed, which indicates that the L1 might have served as an important scaffold for their task accomplishment in English, handing over the role it played to the L2 (see Chapter 2 for the notion of scaffolding).

This chapter has also documented on the development of Koyuki's concluding statement through peer collaboration. Koyuki, Tomo, and Yuji engaged themselves in negotiating the content and language of the presentation as well as in rehearsing their speech in order to produce the seemingly simplistic, eight-utterance text. My analysis of the discourse and interview data suggests that Koyuki appropriated some of the linguistic knowledge that was negotiated and co-constructed in her group interactions. In this process of appropriation, she used self-addressed L1 speech—overt and covert—to regulate her own L2 production (Lantolf, 2000b; Ohta, 2001; Vygotsky, 1986, 1987). Hence, it was not collaborative dialogue or task repetition alone that seemed to have contributed to Koyuki's appropriation of the grammatical item, but rather a combination of both: her cognitive uptake from the collaborative dialogue followed by her repeated engagement with the item through rehearsals.

However, not all groups worked as collaboratively and successfully as these two groups. Having several assignments to do, Rei's group chose to keep their group work to a minimum. Consequently, their presentation was perceived by their teacher to lack coherence and organization. Resisting the idea of having to do volunteer work for a
course, Ichiro's group did not explore other possibilities despite the fact that they had not heard from their first choice organization. In short, students, as active agents, made decisions and took (in)actions about their presentation tasks, which seemed to have had consequences, positive or negative.
Chapter 6

STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE OF ORAL PRESENTATIONS

6.0 Introduction

Chapter 5 took an in-depth, behind-the-scenes look at the group work that the key students and their partners engaged mainly in out of class time as they prepared for their oral presentations. In contrast, this chapter focuses on students’ public performance of this academic task, weaving together participants’ task discourse and reflective comments where appropriate. Transcripts of their presentations were analyzed for ideational reflection, self-regulation, peer collaboration, interpersonal action and strategies to involve the audience, discourse management, and audience contributions, all categories that emerged from the data but also figure prominently in sociocultural theories. While the activities of the 11 key students and their partners’ are the primary focus of the present study, in this chapter, excerpts from other students’ presentations are presented as well for the purpose of increasing the scope and adequacy of the data. Before looking at discourse samples from the student presentations, we will examine some of the common characteristics of the student presentations in the following section.

6.1 Characteristics of the Student Presentations

Students’ oral presentations were easily identified as they had relatively clear boundaries. The initial boundary was marked by a presenter greeting such as “Good morning” and “Hello everyone.” This was followed by an introduction of group members and statement of the research topic. Many presentations, especially the two end-of-semester presentations, involved justification of the research topic, a statement of purpose, descriptions of the fieldwork, and report of the findings and learning from the
experience. The final boundary of the student presentation was marked by a presenter utterance such as “Thank you for your attention.” and “This is the end of our presentation.” Table 6.1 summarizes the central tendency of actual task duration including the response time following the presentation.

Table 6.1: Central Tendency of Actual Task Duration (minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poster Session</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.7-13.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>18.2-42.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.7-93.4</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the nonverbal communication poster project, many groups mostly explained the meaning of their posters, which were visually shared with the audience. In the following example, Sakura is explaining the meaning of the poster that she made with Yoshino and Shinpei. Their poster was a collection of pictures from a variety of posters.

Excerpt 6.1

Saku: Uh: **this** one (0.9) **this** one says (0.7) “produce for HIV?” (1.1) And (1.1) **these** (0.6) **these** are - doves? (0.5) And doves (1.3) are the symbol of peace. <Izzat: Hmm.> And (1.0) in **this** poster, **these** (0.9) doves - fly away? (1.1) Umm (1.1) That- this mean (0.9) that mean peace also fly away. (0.5) And (1.1) **here** is - sad face. <Izzat: Umm.> Sad face and (0.5) it's kind of red color, (3.5) indicate (0.5) weak future of the world? (0.7) And cause (3.3) cause of AI- AIDS or HIV? (0.9) Uh- Uh, - HIV? Yeah. And (1.2) Po (0.7) and **this** poster say (0.6) “appeals - the- the danger of AIDS and - AIDS could bring - leukemia, too?” (Class 2, October 5, 2000)

As this example suggests, the students’ discourse was characterized by the demonstratives “this” and “these” and the deictic adverb of place “here” (see Levinson, 1983), both of which co-occurred with pointing gestures. In other words, their utterances

---

67 As mentioned in Chapter 3, I observed two of the three sections of Izzat’s course in the second semester to focus on the key participants’ activities.
were bound up with the here-and-now information of the poster. This was a salient feature of all the poster presentations (or, as Izzat called them, poster facilitation) observed in the present study. In contrast, for the two end-of-semester presentations, students described events and information spatially and temporally distant. As we will see later in this chapter, they marshalled a wider variety of linguistic resources.

In their posters, students included the required information (i.e., definitions, types, and functions of non-verbal communication), which was computer-printed in many cases. However, most groups did not refer to this information. For the Semester 1 presentation, 14 groups used PowerPoint; 10 groups used the OHP; and the rest used posters and blackboard. Some groups used both OHP and PowerPoint. In contrast, for the Semester 2 presentation, most groups used the OHP and no group used PowerPoint since they did not have easy access to the data projector and the lab manager’s computer expertise. Just like their teachers’, most of the students’ transparencies were computer-printed. During their Semester 1 presentation, one student even apologized to the audience for using hand-written transparencies. Interestingly, she said that this was what her other teacher usually did, which elicited laughter from many of the audience members who were taking the same course. Throughout the year, only a few groups prepared handouts for their presentations. Additionally, a few students dressed formally in suits for their task performance. After one group’s presentation, Izzat commented:

**Excerpt 6.2**

> Even the way you - dressed up for the occasion - this is one of the things that presenters do at least here - I don’t know how you do things in Japan... Even in class we do - dress up a bit. What that does is that - it tells the audience you are serious about what you’re doing. You’re taking - for instance, in their case, they’re taking their research seriously.

---

68 This task was similar to show and tell in that both speaker-topic and speaker-listener distances were relatively small (Mohan, 1986).
That tells us that we should treat it seriously too. But if you come in slippers and T-shirts - people may think oh if you are not interested in what you’re doing, why should I listen to it. It sends that kind of message? (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

This comment suggests that the teacher valued student attitudes toward the task in addition to critical reflection and interaction with the audience as reported in Chapter 4. In the rest of the present chapter, we will examine the discourse features of students’ oral presentations.

6.2 Ideational Reflection

As we saw in Chapter 2, an act of meaning is constituted of ideational reflection and interpersonal action (Mohan, in press; Wells, 1999a; see also van Lier, 1988 for a relevant discussion). In this section, we will examine the ideational aspects of students’ presentations.

6.2.1 Explaining the Rationale for the Study

Students explained their choice of topics especially in their Semester 1 presentations and stated the purpose of their studies especially in their Semester 2 presentations. Recall that the Semester 1 task required students to report on their experience as volunteers and their learning and discovery from this experience whereas the Semester 2 task required them to report on findings of their research. As such, many students approached the former task primarily as volunteers and learners and the latter task primarily as researchers.69

Excerpt 6.3 shows how Ringo explained the purposes of her group’s research whereas Excerpt 6.4 shows how Yoshino explained her group’s choice of research topic.

69 There were exceptions. For example, as Chapter 7 will report, Otome and her partner Chie made their Semester 1 presentation based on their survey study. Also, Yoshino expressed in her Semester 1 journal her dilemma between the role of an observer and that of a volunteer.
Excerpt 6.3

Ringo: There are three purposes of focusing on First Nations. Firstly (9.5) umm I have wanted to write graduation thesis about First Nations in Canada. Some of you know - umm I mainly study anthropology in Japan. So I wanted- umm I was very- I am very interested in First Nations. Secondly - uh we learned First Nations issues last term. So we know there are some serious issues of First Nations - like discriminations, and land issues. (2.6) Umm Otome and I wanted to confirm uh if such serou- serious issues still exist. (1.5) And thirdly - some Canadians are not interested in First Nations. Actually - I have never talked about First Nations with my Canadian friends. - And one Canadian said - there are no First Nation issues. So we wanted to know the reality. (November 23, 2000)

Excerpt 6.4

Yoshi: Today we’ll- we will introduce (0.7) we’ll talk about (1.2) our research project? (1.3) Our topic is the i- ideal environment - for the food service [in’dAStri] (0.5) from musicians - and customers si- perspective. (0.6) The reason (0.5) why - we chose this topic, - is because - to know - what kind of environment will be ideal and comfortable - for everyone - that is to know - what is the elements - which make people comfortable. (0.8) And (0.6) to suggest - the concept of ideal environment. (Class 3, March 23, 2001)

Excerpt 6.5 was a unique example in that since they could not obtain volunteer positions, the presenter conducted an interview study along with her partner, building on their classmates’ presentations. What is striking about this excerpt is that Haruka does not merely outline the purposes of their talk, but “creates a space” (Swales & Feak, 1994) for their presentation.

Excerpt 6.5

Haru: So like we mentioned, we didn’t volunteer, so we don’t -really have - something to talk about it, (0.6) but we got a question. (0.7) As I heard - your presentation so hard, we found volunteering in Canada and Japan is so different (0.7) in many ways. <Izzat: Uhh-uhh> But - I- we don’t know how different it is. So why you think - it is different - uh: they are different. (0.5) So - to find the reason - we Japanese think that (0.5) volunteering in Japan and Canada is very different, (0.4) we had interviews with - some Canadian and Japanese people, who has volunteering experience before. (Class 2, November 23, 2000)

In this example, Haruka makes several rhetorical moves to create a space. First, she mentions what she (and her partner) found from her classmates’ presentations; that is, volunteering in Canada may differ from that in Japan in many ways. She then states that
they do not know how they might be different, thus posing a further (indirect) question to be dealt with. Finally, she introduces their interview study conducted to address the question. Although it was in the second semester that students systematically learned how to conduct research, they seemed to have learned the importance of explaining their choice of research topic in the first semester. Several key students said that they decided to explain their choice of topic in the Semester 1 presentation because of Izzat’s comments on their field journals. Moreover, a couple of them mentioned Abraham’s model presentation of Margaret Early’s work where he explained the purposes of the study (see, for example, Excerpt 4.23).

6.2.2 Displaying Newly Gained Information and Knowledge

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, learning to communicate knowledge in socially and culturally appropriate manners is deemed as an important part of academic discourse socialization. Student-participants in the present study displayed their academic knowledge in various ways. For instance, many students demonstrated their learning from their fieldwork or research by classifying their newly gained information. In the following excerpt, Shinpei, who volunteered in a branch office of a Japanese travel agency, is explaining types of services that this agency provides.

Excerpt 6.6

Shin: And (1.0) umm ABC has - two: - types of job? (0.6) And one- one is the - the outbound service? (0.9) It is (0.4) to arrange the - traveling, (0.5) uh who people live - uh for people who live in - the Canada, (0.8) so if you want to go traveling to another place of Canada, (0.6) you (0.8) umm this company with- wi- will arrange you about the airline tickets of - uh Canada- in Canada, umm hotels, (0.5) uh: (1.5) umm or hotels? (0.6) This is the out- outbound service. (1.1) And the other one is (0.6) inbound service? (0.5) It is (0.5) the job to (0.8) arrange traveling for people who live in Japan, (0.4) so if you- (0.4) if your parents come here, (0.6) umm (0.4) and they- (0.6) if they will use - ABC, (0.5) umm (0.9) it will be the inbound serv- service. (1.8) And (0.5) ABC (1.2) main- mainly do the (0.8) in- inbound service, (1.0) because (0.5) this is-
As can be seen, Shinpei names and defines two types of services, outbound and inbound, thus constructing the knowledge structure of classification (Mohan, 1986). This information was also presented visually on the blackboard:

1. outbound
2. inbound

Head office—Kyoto

Here, it is important to note that Shinpei’s partner Misa wrote these words as he spoke to the audience. This collaboration received positive feedback from the instructor after the presentation as follows:

Excerpt 6.7

I like the fact that umm - uh they cooperated so well. Once one of them is talking the other one is writing because uh that again caught our attention. Otherwise if you had all the information there already - I guess we would have wondered are we going to look at Shinpei, or are we going to look at the board. So the way they did it was excellent... We knew exactly for instance when Shinpei was talking about outbound. (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

Izzat also commented that Misa’s writing on the board might have been helpful for people who did not know the words. In fact, some audience members looked up these words in their electronic dictionaries as they listened to Shinpei’s talk. Moreover, Izzat said to the class that she too learned how the words are used in the tourism business.

Excerpt 6.8

And then they explained what outbound, inbound means. And honestly I learned two new words. I knew the meaning but uh I didn’t uh hear it in this context, so it’s- it’s really good and I hope that you learned something new too. (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

Some other students displayed their knowledge by quoting word definitions from dictionaries and references. Excerpt 6.9 shows how Ichiro performed this act.
Excerpt 6.9

Ichi: So our topic is uh difference- differences of identities between Canadians and Japanese. (1.1) Uh (0.8) so: uh before uh moving on the topic uh let me uh explain the definition of the- (0.9) of identity.

((several turns later))

Ichi: Okay? (2.2) Uh so according to the (0.6) uh: dictionary (0.5) uh (0.8) “identity- identity is uh qualities and attitudes you have - that makes you feel that you have your own characters and different from other people.” (4.2) Uh (1.0) so that is in short uh: identity means something which makes us feel that (0.6) we have our own character (0.5) and at the same time - we are different from others. Okay? (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

Immediately after the quotation, Ichiro paraphrases the definition, substituting the words “qualities and attitudes” with “something” and the second person pronouns “you” and “your” with the first person pronouns “we” and “our.”

Furthermore, many groups demonstrated their learning by citing credible sources in their presentation, especially in Semester 2. Excerpt 6.10 is an example from Nana, Shinpei, and Azumi’s Semester 2 presentation about the homeless in Maple Tree City.

Shinpei used the United Nations’ data in his Semester 2 presentation.

Excerpt 6.10

Shin: Uh (1.7) it’s very (0.6) difficult to define the (1.1) homeless people, (0.5) because there are many (0.5) categories of people, like (0.5) there are street youth people, (0.7) and also there are hotel visitors. (0.6) So (1.0) it is- (0.8) these categories are not clear, (0.8) so it’s very difficult. But according to (1.3) the definition from the United Sta- umm United Nation, (1.0) there are- (0.7) it’s called- it is called (0.5) there are (0.5) twenty to (3.0) forty (0.5) thousand uh homeless people in Canada. (2.7) And also - in Maple Tree City - there are street youth people, and (0.5) homeless umm - people who stay in hotel (1.1) ah hotel visitors, (0.8) but it’s also - difficult to def- define - how- how many people - are there. (Class 1, March 15, 2001)

In Language Fieldwork, especially in Language Fieldwork B, students had opportunities to listen to the instructor’s talk and have a group discussion about the importance of assessing the credibility of information. Thus, Shinpei’s act of citing the UN’s data was publicly recognized by the instructor as her post-task comments indicate:
Excerpt 6.11

Izzat: Another thing that I - ((clears her throat)) want to mention - it's also a nice comment, - is that umm (1.3) your use of United Nations' definition of homelessness. (0.9) Uh: - the reason why that is good is that - as (0.9) uh you- you have learned this - a lot. We talked about it last term, and talked about it this term. And we (0.5) ((clears her throat)) talked about umm (1.2) which- who do I believe. There are a lot of perspectives out there. There are a lot of definitions out there. Whose definition is the right one. (0.7) Whose uh (0.5) uh statement is the one- the right one to cite. Remember, that I said - “It depends on (1.2) umm uh who is it that you are reading.” You cannot - just cite any book that - you bought…. We have to cite legitimate - important source. Trustworthy source. Okay? And in this case, the good thing about your definition is that yes United Nations. (0.5) And United Nations is a very important organization. People - work there usually do very serious work, (0.5) and they've done their research. They know how to define these things. (0.6) And I think you did excellent work of (0.5) trying to use legitimate important (0.6) uh: trustworthy sources to define your work. Okay? This is- I'm mentioning this because it is important for all of us...when it comes to research we need to - cite someone who knows - what he or she is talking about. Okay? So that's very nice. (Class 1, March 15, 2001)

Here, Izzat not only gives an appraisal of the citation (e.g., “I think you did excellent work,” “that's very nice”), but also provides more explanations as to why this was an important practice. Importantly, the teacher says to the class, “I am mentioning this because it is important for all of us,” thus making her comments relevant to other students. This kind of metadiscourse was one of the attempts that Izzat made to encourage her students to learn from each other.

6.2.3 Reporting Participants’ Voices

Many groups conducted interviews and administered questionnaires as part of their project work, and reported the voices of their research participants in their presentations. In Excerpt 6.12, Yoshino reports the voice of the managers whom she and her partner Maiko interviewed for their semester 2 project:

Excerpt 6.12

And next - we - asked her (1.2) what- ((clears her throat)) what image - do you think (0.6) the manager has (0.6) for- of - your music? She said (0.5) I don't know. (3.9) And (1.1) and next we a- asked - we asked her (0.6) what's image (0.5) do you think - the customers - have for your- your music? And she said - she hoped to become - she hope customers to become alive, - from her music. (Class 3, March 23, 2001)
In this example, she uses both direct speech ("She said - I don’t know.") and indirect speech ("she said...she hope customers to become alive, from her music.") to project the manager’s voice.

6.2.4 Connecting Theory and Practice

As we saw in Chapters 4 and 5, one of the major requirements of the Semester 1 presentation task was for students to draw connections between what they experienced in the field and what they learned about the subject matter from the lectures and textbooks. In other words, students were required to discuss in their presentations how their field experiences might relate to the theory of intercultural communication. Excerpt 6.13 illustrates how Mina creates this intertextual link between her observation at a preschool and the subject matter content.

Excerpt 6.13

Mina: Lastly - we talk about our experience (1.8) umm uh we talk about how to relate- how to our ex- uh how our experience - relate to intercultural communication - from our lecture. (1.0) In Chapter fi- in Chapter 5 of the textbook (0.5) we learned about non-verbal communication (0.9) we can understand (1.5) the importance of - non-verbal communication (1.2) through uh non-verbal communication - throughout - our volunteer experience. (1.5) Because it is difficult for us to (0.6) communicate with children in words, (0.7) so we need to use non-verbal communication. (0.7) And for example (0.5) in my case (0.9) I experience - non-verbal communication by picture. ((Izzat laughs)) Before - you go to the pool, the teacher showed - children - picture - of child- picture of pool (0.8) by one person. (1.0) When she showed them (0.7) picture (0.8) some- then - umm when she showed them (0.6) some children began to cry. (0.7) They didn’t like swimming. <Izzat: Mmm.> I found - showing picture - makes children understand (0.5) they have to go to the ne- go to the pool next (0.8) they could image pool - by picture easily. <Izzat: Mmm.> It could be said - non-verbal communication is held - between - teacher and children. (Class 2, November 16, 2000)

In this example, Mina first recapitulates briefly what they learned from the textbook. She then tells the audience what she observed as the teacher showed a picture of a swimming pool to her pupils, some of whom started to cry. Finally, she tells the
audience what she found from this experience, suggesting that non-verbal communication had taken place between the teacher and pupils.

6.3 Students' Efforts to Self-Regulate Their Performance

Students used several strategies to self-regulate their own task performance. These include using note cards and transparencies, repeating to remember, and using private speech to assist memory and self-correct L2 production.

6.3.1 Use of Notes

Use of notes was one of the most commonly used self-regulating strategies among the Keishin students. Most of the note users reported that they wrote on their cards key words and phrases mainly in English. For example, Yoshino used this strategy in her Semester 1 presentation. Some groups including Kiku, Nana, and Shinya’s group reported that their notes included “performance pointers” (Billingham, 2003) or self-addressed utterances in the form of directives (e.g., “Don’t forget eye contact,” “Stop here,” “Create the flow,” “Ask the audience”), or adverbs and nouns (e.g., clearly, loudly, slowly, eye contact, pause, role play, dramatization). Apparently, the students prepared such notes to self-regulate their own task performance. Another key student, Shinpei, made an interesting use of note cards in his Semester 1 presentation. For example, he stated:

Excerpt 6.14

Shin: I couldn’t - umm make mistake (0.5) because - umm (0.6) they will (0.9) use umm (1.1) the head office will (0.5) use - that list (0.5) for check - the hotels. So - if I make mistake (0.5) it will be very (0.5) disadvantage - for: the company. (Class 2, November 9, 2000)
To produce these utterances, Shinpei put something like this\textsuperscript{70} on one of his cards:

Table 6.2: Shinpei’s Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.2a English-based Japanese word order</th>
<th>6.2b Japanese word order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) deki na ka tta machigai wa</td>
<td>(1) machigai wa deki na ka tta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) naze nara kaisha ga tsukau sono risuto wa hoteru o chekku suru tame</td>
<td>(2) sono risuto wa hoteru o chekku suru tame ni kaisha ga tsukau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) moshi machigai o sure ba totemo futsugoo kaisha ni totte.</td>
<td>(3) moshi machigai o sure ba kaisha ni totte totemo futsugoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Shinpei himself mentioned later, the Japanese in Table 6.2a would look strange to native speakers of Japanese. Because of the SOV and left-branching\textsuperscript{71} structure (Kuno, 1973) of the Japanese language, the same proposition would normally be expressed as in Table 6.2b. After deciding what to say, Shinpei first prepared Japanese sentences to express what he had to say, and then reorganized the words in the English word and clause order so as to make his L2 production easier. In other words, it was a strategy to reduce the cognitive load of the L2 presentation task. Shinpei said that he believed that by translating his “English-looking Japanese,” he could speak more naturally than he would by simply reading notes written in English.

6.3.2 Self-Repetition

Another self-regulating strategy commonly used in the Keishin community was self-repetition. Many students repeated their utterances to correct their errors and to remember the content and form of their speech.

\textsuperscript{70} Unfortunately, Shinpei threw away his note cards. The above notes were reconstructed on the basis of the reflective interview with Shinpei conducted after his Semester 1 presentation.

\textsuperscript{71} This term is often used to refer to genitives, adjectives, and relative clauses that precede the head noun in Japanese (Kuno, 1973). However, it can be used to refer to other clausal constructions (Yamamoto-Wilson, 1997).
6.3.2.1 Repeating to Self-Correct

The first three excerpts illustrate how the speakers used repetition to self-correct their perceived grammatical errors whereas the last one shows how the speaker used repetition to self-correct her perceived pragmatic error. The main point here is that students used repetition for self-regulatory purposes, rather than whether such efforts resulted in accurate and appropriate language. In Excerpt 6.15, Rei is attempting to say, “I don’t have any stuff the children made.”

Excerpt 6.15

Rei: So (0.8) I’m sorry but I have- uh - don’t have (0.9) umm no- no stuff (0.9) children make (0.5) children made but (4.8) but Fumie can join in (0.6) uh some (girls) that made some stuffs, (Class 2, November 9, 2000)

As can be seen, the speaker made two self-corrections, “don’t have” and “children made,” The first attempt resulted in a double negative, which according to Rei was not exactly what she wanted to say because it was “grammatically wrong” (November, 2000). But the second attempt solved the problem with tense agreement by changing the verb from “make” to “made.”

Excerpt 6.16

Mina: Lastly - we talk about our experience (1.8) umm uh we talk about how to relate- how to our ex- uh how our experience - relate to intercultural communication - from our lecture. (Class 2, November 16, 2000)

Excerpt 6.16 illustrates how the speaker struggled with the word order in the subordinate clause following the “how.” After a couple of attempts, she solved this problem although she left the problem in subject-verb agreement (“our experience relate”) unchanged.

Excerpt 6.17 shows a self-regulatory process wherein Ken changes the SVOO word order to the SVO word order by putting the indirect object “them” after the direct object “space,” using the preposition “for.”
Excerpt 6.17

Ken: And then - ((clears his throat)) my job was uh - to help (1.3) stilt performance (1.2) by making them (1.3) space- uh making space for them to walk. (Class 2, November 16, 2000)

In Excerpt 6.18, Yoshino first utters, “not gonna,” to describe the restaurant managers’ action (or inaction in this case). She then changes this to “not going to.”

Excerpt 6.18

Yoshi: And (1.4) managers ((clears her throat)) is not gonna - uh not go- not going to - change (0.5) their i- image for this restaurant. (Class 3, March 23, 2001)

According to Yoshino, her ELI teacher told her class that it is not appropriate to use colloquial forms of English such as “gonna” for “going to” and “wanna” for “want to” in oral presentations (and writing) because they are too informal. Remembering this voice (Bakhtin, 1986), which she had heard three months earlier, Yoshino made the above correction. In short, whereas the first three examples (Excerpts 6.15, 6.16, & 6.17) presented in this section show the speakers’ use of repetition to improve their grammatical accuracy of their speech, Excerpt 6.18 shows the speaker’s use of repetition to improve the appropriacy of her speech, which she had learned from her ESL teacher a few months earlier.

6.3.2.2 Repeating to Remember

Another important use of repetition was made by many of the Keishin students. For example, Kiku commented at his post-task interview that he sometimes repeated his utterances when he forgot what to say next or could not come up with appropriate English expressions.

Excerpt 6.19

Kiku: So - by uh: respecting other persons, (0.7) in our case not to speak Japanese in uh: uh: in front of people from uh: people uh: who are speaking another language - not Japanese. (0.8) That means - “to put ourselves in (2.2) ((looks at the screen)) others’ place.”
As he listened to the audio-recording of his group’s Semester 1 presentation, Kiku mentioned that what was happening in the above excerpt was that since he forgot what to say next after asking the audience if they were following him (“Do you know what I mean?”), he repeated the phrase “someone else’s feeling” so as to “buy time” (interview, November 19, 2000) to remember the content and form of his speech. In other words, Kiku employed the repetition as a “time-creating device” (Bygate, 1987) to cope with the cognitive demand of the presentation task (i.e., on-line planning of planned L2 speech) after coping with the interactional demand (i.e., checking of the audience’s comprehension) of it (see van Lier, 1988).

6.3.3 Use of Private Speech

Several students were observed to use apparently self-addressed speech during their presentations. In the following excerpt, Rei, who did her volunteer work in an after-school childcare program at WPU, is talking about children’s use of computers in Japan:

Excerpt 6.20

1 Rei: And in Japan, (1.0) umm (1.4) maybe ah it’s also my guess, but uh (1.0) uh technical aspect (0.5) maybe government umm promote to use computer, (0.8) and (1.7) as soon as (0.4) as soon as ((softly)) ja nai [no] (1.0) as (0.7) early? (0.4)

2 Izzat: As early as. [Yeah.

3 Rei: [As early as possible.

4 Izzat: Yeah. Yeah. (Class 2, November 9, 2000)

In Line 1, Rei seems to be having difficulty producing utterances as indicated by the frequent occurrence of relatively long pauses. Toward the end of this line, she utters

See Wendel (1997) for a distinction between on-line planning and off-line planning.
the phrase “as soon as” twice, and then says in Japanese “ja nai” a little softly. This seemingly self-addressed Japanese speech seems to have served both cognitive and social functions (see Wells, 1998b, for a relevant discussion). Cognitively, it seems to have helped Rei to regulate her own L2 production. Socially, it simply might have signaled to most of the audience members that it was not “as soon as” which Rei wanted to say.

Following the Japanese utterance, Rei pauses for a second and starts to produce the phrase “as early [as].” This is repeated and confirmed by Izzat in the following line. Hearing Izzat’s repetition of the phrase, Rei produces a complete version of the phrase herself, to which Izzat gives positive feedback in Line 4. After this presentation, Rei commented that since she was talking about early education, she thought that the word “early” would be a more appropriate choice in the context. Interestingly, she reported that although she had given thought to what to say, Rei had not spent much time to plan how to express the content neither with her group members or individually (see Chapter 5).

In Excerpt 6.21, which was taken from her groups’ Semester 2 presentation, Azumi is reflecting on one of the problems that they faced in the process of preparing for their research:

**Excerpt 6.21**

Azum: But (0.6) we have- (1.8) mm (0.6) ((softly and quickly)) **find found found** ((back in regular volume)) We have found (0.4) the problem, - problem - because (1.3) our interest is different. (Class 1, March 15, 2001)

As the first three pauses indicate, Azumi seems to be having trouble remembering the past participle of the verb “find” here. Interestingly, she seems to utter to herself, “find found found.” She reported that like many other students, she was required in junior high school to memorize a list of common irregular English verbs and their conjugations like
the below by chanting aloud across the list, that is, in the order of the basic form, past
tense, and past participle.

**Table 6.3: Irregular Verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Form</th>
<th>Past Tense</th>
<th>Past Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fight</td>
<td>fought</td>
<td>fought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find</td>
<td>found</td>
<td>found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faced with the memory problem, Azumi drew upon this learned knowledge about
English grammar, which seemed to have resurfaced as private speech in the above
excerpt. With this psychological tool, she produced the present perfect construction
successfully. No other students were observed to use this kind of private speech;
however, many of the key students and their partners reported that they made use of the
irregular verb list in their minds when they experienced difficulty remembering the
accurately conjugated form of a verb. In other words, they made use of their inner
resources (van Lier, 1996; Vygotsky, 1987) to accomplish their tasks.

### 6.4 Peer Collaboration in the Task Performance

In Chapter 5, we saw how several key students and their partners collaborated as
they prepared for their oral presentations. In this section, we will examine ways in which
students collaborated while performing this task. Hence, the focus is interpersonal actions
among the presenters. These include (1) use of verbal transitions between speakers, (2)
use of back-stage talk, and (3) joint-construction of utterances.

#### 6.4.1 Transitions between Speakers

One type of peer collaboration has to do with verbal transitions between the
speakers. In the following excerpt, having finished sharing his volunteer job-hunting
experience, Yuji announces that Koyuki will next talk about her volunteer work. Koyuki then responds with an acknowledgement ("Thank you.").

**Excerpt 6.22**

1  Yuji: Uh: (0.9) yeah that’s (2.2) uh next, (0.5) uh::: Koyuki’s - explain about (1.0) [her volunteer.]

2  Koyu: [Yeah. (0.5) Thank you. ((operates PowerPoint)) (10.5) Okay. My- my title is what intercultural love gave me. Learning - through intercultural marriage workshops. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

Interestingly, Koyuki reported that she first noticed this exchange in Kiku’s group’s presentation, which she had seen in the previous week (see Excerpt 6.25 below for an example). She thought that it was a good way for the presenters to switch roles, and subsequently suggested to her group members that they “follow Kiku’s group’s example” (Interview, December 1, 2000, original in Japanese). It should be noted in passing that the original word Koyuki used in this Japanese comment was “minarau,” which literally means learning by seeing (Shinmura, 1998).

Excerpt 6.23 shows how Mai handed over the floor to Yoshino in their Semester 1 presentation on their experience helping a local organization prepare for a Halloween event:

**Excerpt 6.23**

1  Mai: ((looking at Yoshino)) So Yoshino, - could you explain what is a Canadian Dream Community? (2.9)

2  Yoshi: ((smiling)) Okay. ((nods)) The Canadian Dream community we worked for is an (1.6) non-profit charitable organization - that creates part- participatory community based performance and festival and (1.9) celebrations. (2.3) (Class 2, November 23, 2000)

---

73 What Yuji means here is volunteer work. The English word “volunteer” has been borrowed into Japanese. It is often used to refer not only to people who work for others voluntarily or free of charge, but also to the work itself.
In Line 1, having finished her part, Mai publicly asks Yoshino to explain what the organization is, to which Yoshino responds with a smile and yes. This exchange is contrasted below with the above-reported one between Yuji and Koyuki:

Table 6.4: Transitions between Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.22</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public statement informing the audience who will talk next about what (Statement)</td>
<td>Request made publicly to the next speaker to explain her part (Command)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds with a thank you (Acknowledgement)</td>
<td>Responds with an okay (Compliance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These collaborative efforts seem to have been highly valued by the instructor. For example, after Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji’s presentation, she said:

**Excerpt 6.24**

Izzat: ((to the presenters)) **Good cooperation!** Yes. Yeah your language was very good too. In the sense that you were able to - say NEXT who’s going to do this, next who’s going. Yeah. It’s- it’s very good that you were able to - even use the appropriate language to cooperate. Sometimes we do corporate but you forget to say - things. Very good! Excellent. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

Furthermore, Sakura, who chose to give a talk about how to make a “good” presentation during the pre-departure orientation for the following group of Keishin students in May 2001, suggested that presenters make smooth speaker changes between the speakers by using transitional words and phrases.

**6.4.2 Use of L1 Backstage Talk**

The following excerpt shows two types of collaboration in which Kiku, Nana, and Shinya engaged during their actual presentation. Firstly, just like Yuji and Koyuki in Excerpt 6.22, they had planned and rehearsed their turn-taking. As mentioned earlier, in fact, it was Kiku’s group that served as a model for Koyuki’s group. In the following excerpt, Nana announces that Shinya is the next speaker and what he is going to talk
about, and Shinya then thanks Nana for introducing him and takes his turn. Kiku and Nana explained in an interview that after observing other groups’ presentations, they decided to do this exchange to make smooth transitions and avoid the “awkward silence” between turns. Kiku also commented that this made the presentation more challenging, for each member had to know well enough to announce what the others would say, but he felt that thanks to the extended discussion they had about the content of the presentation, they were able to execute the plan successfully. The second type of collaboration related to students’ use of Japanese. As can be seen in Excerpt 6.25, Kiku gives two pieces of advice to Nana on her volume of speech (“Speak up”) and behavior (“You should look up”) and Nana accepts them both. This can be considered as a type of “backstage” talk (Goffman, 1959) in that although uttered on stage, it was addressed only to another member of the presenting group, as indicated by Kiku’s use of whispering.

**Excerpt 6.25**

1. Nana: So next Shinya is going to talking about (0.6) more specific detail about when students are (0.6) stop conversation. ((moves backward and stands next to Kiku))

2. Kiku: ((whispering in Japanese)) Ne Nana [Hey Nana] (xxx) *Motto koe dase - motto koe dase - Ue o mita hoo ga ii* [Speak up - Speak up - you should look up.]


4. Shin: Uh: thank you, Nana. ((moves forward)) (Class 3, November 16, 2000)

Although this intra-group exchange might not have been heard by the audience, fortunately, it was captured by a tape-recorder placed close to the presenters. Kiku, Nana, and Shinya reported that they had this type of L1 backstage talk mainly to deliver better performance several times during their presentation. Such efforts seem to have been appreciated by their teacher as these post-task comments indicate:
Excerpt 6.26

Izzat: ((looking at the audience)) The other thing is that uh again for the people who will be presenting - is (0.9) make a conscious effort of making your- yeah your- physically your voice really heard? ...Uh: the point is that - if you pay attention to that - you can control your voice. Then you can decide how loud you should be (0.5) so that everybody can hear you. (0.8) Okay? So ((referring to Kiku, Nana, and Shinya)) they seem to have made uh: a conscious effort of doing that. That’s great. (Class 3, November 16, 2000)

It is important to note that the type of backstage talk reported above was not found in many other presentations; however, several other students reported that their partners gave them encouragements in Japanese from behind or beside themselves when they stumbled over words in their presentations, which “reassured” them and helped them to “come through.”

6.4.3 Joint Production of Utterances

Students sometimes helped their partners to produce L2 utterances. In the following example, Shunsuke (hereafter Shun) is explaining what they consider to be the differences between Easterners and Westerners. In Line 1, Shun is having difficulty coming up with an appropriate English expression as evidenced by the frequent pauses and rising intonation.

Excerpt 6.27

1  Shun: ((referring to the role-playing that they are about to perform)) This is er (0.5) explain the (1.1) difference, between Easterners, - and Westerners. (0.6) Uh: how to (1.5) how to: (1.1) [solve? Solve?

2  Taka: [Cope- cope with.

3  Shun: Cope?

4  Taka: Cope with -

5  Shun: Cope with, uh: - [their negative life event.

6  Taka: [Yeah. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)
In Line 2, Takaaki (hereafter Taka) says to Shun, “cope with,” providing him with an appropriate L2 expression to use (i.e., the verb plus the collocationally appropriate preposition “with”). Shun then repeats the verb with a rising intonation, which results in Taka’s second uttering of the phrasal verb in Line 4. Shun then uses the expression adding an object. This is followed by Taka’s confirmation. In short, Shun produced the utterance in Line 5 with Taka’s assistance.

6.5 Interpersonal Actions and Strategies to Involve the Audience

At the group meetings and interviews, students expressed their wish to make their presentation interesting, interactive, and “participatory.” To this end, they performed a number of interpersonal actions (Mohan, in press; Wells, 1999a) and employed a variety of involvement strategies (Tannen, 1989) in their task performances, which Tannen (1989) defined as linguistic strategies that both reflect and create interpersonal involvement in ordinary conversation as well as in literary discourse. These include (1) using small talk, (2) employing questions directed toward the audience, (3) repetition, (4) role-playing and demonstration, and (5) story-telling.

6.5.1 Using Small Talk

Some groups used the first few seconds of their presentations to make small talk, which was intended to get their audience focused on and interested in what they were about to say. For instance, Hitomi, one of Rei’s partners for the Semester 2 presentation, used this strategy.

Excerpt 6.28

1  Hito:  Okay. Uh: good morning everyone.
2  Ss:  Good morning. ((some look sleepy))
3  Hito:  A-ha-ha. ((laughs))
In this excerpt, Hitomi first greets the audience with “Good morning, everyone,” since it was a first period class. Receiving a somewhat unenergetic response, she expresses her sympathy with her classmates who were probably tired from the many assignments that they had to do for their courses. Notice that she uses the word “right” as a question tag to invite confirmation from the audience (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1983). In Line 7, she tells the audience that they can eat during their presentation, which elicits laughter from many of the audience members. Between Lines 9 and 12, Hitomi elicits laughter and smiles from the audience by asking them to wake up and keep awake. Thus, Hitomi interacted with the audience by performing a series of speech acts mostly through use of imperatives.

After the presentation, Hitomi said, “When I heard their voice, I figured that they were tired due to lack of sleep. We are busy with our assignments and stay up late these days. So I wanted to focus everyone’s attention on us somehow” (interview, March 15, 2001, my translation). As a result, she improvised the talk above. Her performance was
well received at least by Izzat, who later commented at her end-of-semester interview that she thought that this was a good way to start a presentation. In contrast, some students commented that her speech was too casual for an academic presentation.

6.5.2 Employing Questions Directed Toward the Audience

Perhaps the most frequently used strategy among the Keishin students was employing questions directed toward their audience. The following excerpt illustrates how Ringo employed this involvement strategy in the Semester 2 presentation she gave with Otome:

Excerpt 6.29

1 Ringo: Our topic is “I am proud of who I am - socialization of Totem Nations.” Do you have any ideas about our presentation from this topic? (1.5)

2 Ss: ((some smile and nod))

3 Ringo: Are you sure?

4 Ss: ((some smile and nod))

5 Ringo: Umm Totem Nations is one of the band of First Nations in Canada. And Otome will talk about - what is Nations more detail - later. (1.3) And do you know what is socialization?

6 Ss: ((some smile and shake their heads))

7 Ringo: No? (3.5) Okay. (1.8) (Class 1, March 29, 2001)

In this excerpt, Ringo asks the audience several questions to check their understandings. Ringo, along with her partner Otome, decided to use this strategy in their presentation to make their presentation more interactive. Although none of the audience members respond verbally, many respond nonverbally through smiles, nods, and head shakes, thus showing their attentiveness to Ringo’s turns (van Lier, 1992, 1996, 1998a). Students addressed their questions not only to the whole class, but also to individual members. For example, Tomo addressed his questions to classmates and the instructor in
his Semester 1 presentation in which he shared his volunteer job-hunting experiences. To contextualize the following excerpt (6.30), he is showing one of the questions that he was asked by the volunteer coordinator at his interview for a position in the kitchen at a street youth center, which he unfortunately failed:

**Excerpt 6.30**

1 Tomo: The final question was that. ((referring to the OHP)) (0.5) It was very impressive to me. (0.6) Cause (0.9) ((reading from the screen)) “in- in the kitchen you found a street youth - you don’t know - looking at bags of other volunteers.” (1.0) And uh the - my volunteer coordinator asked me uh (0.8) how will you approach him?

2 Izzat: Hmm

3 Tomo: Yeah. (0.7) So Izzat, - what do you think. (0.8) How will you approach him. (1.2)

4 Izzat: If he was looking at the volunteers’ bags? =

5 Tomo: = Yeah. (0.5)

6 Izzat: Uh: (0.6) I- I would - go ask- introduce myself to him, (0.4) and ask who he is, (0.6) and then say how can I help you, to see if he’s in any (need). (1.5)

7 Tomo: Yeah. (1.5) That’s the best answer.

8 Kiku: Oh!: ((laughs))

9 Izzat: Oh [thank you.

10 Ss: [((laugh))]

11 Izzat: Did I get the job? ((laughs))

12 Tomo: Yeah. (1.7) Yeah. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

Surprisingly, some groups called on the researcher in their presentations as well.

Excerpt 6.31 was taken from the Semester 1 presentation made by Koki and his partner Haruka. Koki asks the researcher whether he would like to do volunteer work after his retirement:
Excerpt 6.31

1 Koki: Next, uh: I wan- let’s- (0.6) I want to talk about - proof? Two proof? (0.5) One of them is (0.4) uh: this, ((points at the OHP screen)) (1.1) retired people want to volunteering, or not? (1.2) Uh: (4.5) what do you want to do after retire, (0.9) uh (0.4) what do you want to do after you retire, Masaki? (0.6)

2 Ss: ((laugh))

3 Masa: ((laughing)) After I retire?

4 Koki: Yep.

5 Haru: Yep.

6 Masa: ((laughing)) Well - it’s hard to imagine myself retiring. But -

7 Koki: [((laugh))

8 Izzat: [((laughs))

9 Masa: Me?

10 Koki: Yeah. You wanna have a - volunteering? After you retire?

11 Masa: Hmm (0.8) I’m not sure. But (0.6) maybe not. [I want to -

12 Koki: [Yeah. (0.7) Uh: maybe in general -

13 Ss: ((laugh))

14 Koki: in general in Japan, (0.6) uh: our answer is no, because (0.6) we tend to: (0.4) want to enjoy (0.5) our life, and take a rest? (0.9) ((looking at the researcher)) It’s true? (0.6) For you. (0.5)

15 Masa: Yes.

16 Ss: ((laugh))

17 Masa: Yes.

18 Koki: Umm ((laughs)) And take a rest. (Class 2, November 23, 2000)

In Line 2, many members of the audience, including the instructor and the researcher, laugh. Some students commented that they could not help laughing because they had not expected Koki to ask the researcher a question in their talk. Koki and his partner also said later that they “wanted do something a little different from other groups”
(November 23, 2000). In fact, they were the first group to address a question to the researcher (although another group framed a similar move as a command) in the actual performance of the presentation. In sum, using questions addressed to the audience was one of the strategies that Keishin students employed to make their presentation more interactive and participatory.

6.5.3 Repeating to Emphasize

In addition to the self-regulatory functions reported above, students’ repetition of their own utterances seems to have had an interpersonal function. More specifically, students often repeated points that they wished to emphasize. In Excerpt 6.32, Shun repeatedly states, “Westerner(s) have more positive attitude to negative events than Easterners.”

Excerpt 6.32

Shun: We can say - from (0.6) first research, (0.9) *Westerner have more positive attitude, (0.4) to negative events than (0.6) Easterners*. (1.4) Can you understand? (2.3) *Westerners have more positive attitude - to negative events than Easterners*. (1.2) Can you understand? (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

After the presentation, Shun commented that he made a conscious effort to repeat key words because he believed that one of the most important things in giving a presentation was to get across one’s points to the audience. This is why he offered the repeated use of the comprehension check, “Can you understand?”

Another example comes from the Semester 1 group presentation made by Yoshino’s group about their volunteer experience at a public art festival. In the following excerpt, Yoshino’s partner, Mei, is making her concluding remarks:

Excerpt 6.33

Mei: I can say that (1.4) uh cooperative sprits can be - leading - lead success, (0.6) you know actually - the parade were (0.5) quite big event. More than three thousand people
came there, - and support- were - the parade were supported by (0.5) only local peoples -
as a volunteers (0.5) and also **I can say that (0.5) in Maple Tree City (0.6) the level of**
local people’s cooperation is absolutely high, (0.6) **I can say that again,** - a
cooperative spirits can be leading a great success, - in Maple Tree City the level of
local people’s cooperation is absolutely high. (November 16, 2000)

Interestingly, Mei announces that she would repeat her utterances by using the phrase “I
can say that again.” This was a planned act. She had told her group members at their
rehearsal that she would repeat them to emphasize the point.

As the above examples suggest, most of the repetitions were self-conducted.

Excerpt 6.34 is a unique example where one speaker repeats his partner’s utterance.

**Excerpt 6.34**

1 Shun: Okay. (0.4) So from now, I- want to talk about, (0.4) [pəˈpəːs] - **of our research.**
   (0.5)

2 Taka: **Purpose of our research.**

3 Shun: U:mm - ((attempting to continue his speech)

4 ((audience members laugh))

5 Izzat: ((laughing)) Why? (0.5)

6 Taka: **Just - em- emphasize.** ((laughs))

7 Izzat: Oh okay. ((laughs)) (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

In Line 1, Shun announces what he will discuss. As the transcription shows, he
mispronounced the word “purpose” here. Taka then repeats the last four words of his
partner’s utterance, which makes some of the audience members including Izzat laugh.
Interestingly, Izzat asks Taka why he repeated Shun’s utterance (Line 5). In Line 6, Taka
answers that he did so to emphasize the point, explaining his action. After the class, Taka
commented that as he noticed Shun’s mispronunciation of the word, he was afraid that
the audience might miss it, suggesting that he attempted to correct his partner’s
phonological error. Thus, Taka’s repetition was intended to serve two functions: to emphasize what Shun has said and to implicitly correct his error.

6.5.4 Role-Playing and Demonstration

Role-playing and demonstration were also employed commonly in the Keishin community. According to Crookall and Oxford (1990), “a role-play is always a simulation. The participant in a role-play activity is representing and experiencing some character type known in everyday life, and the interaction between participants is a simulation of a social situation” (p. 19). For the Semester 1 presentation, six out of the 25 groups or pairs performed role-playing while six groups did demonstrations of some sort. For instance, Kiku, Nana, and Shingo decided to incorporate role-playing into their presentation in order to make it easier to follow and more entertaining. In the following excerpt, Kiku and Nana are acting out, and Shingo is explaining what is happening:

Excerpt 6.35

1 Kiku: Uh: I’m a: Keishin student and - uh: she is a: WPU student in Japanese class. (1.3) And uh: um I’m gonna talk - we- we gonna talk in Japanese coz what happened in Japanese.

2 ((several turns later))

3 Shin: And next one is uh: (0.7) character. (1.5) Okay. Let’s go on to the next - example. (0.8)

4 Kiku: Thanks. (1.1) ((in role as a conversation partner)) Watashi wa mukashi wakai toki ni (1.2) ta::kusan shoosetsu o yonda n desuyo.[Wakari masu? [When I was young I read a lot of novels. Do you understand?]

5 Nana: ((in role as a student of Japanese)) [Sho- Shoosetsu tte nan desu ka? [What is shoosetsu?]

6 Kiku: Shoosetsu [Novel] ((writes the Chinese characters for the word.)) (4.0) Shoosetsu wa wakari masu ka? [Do you understand this (shoosetsu)?] ((shows the written characters.))

7 Nana: AH: It’s means it is novel. (1.9)

8 Kiku: Yes. That’s right.
Nana: Okay. Thank you. (1.1)

Shin: Like this. When using characters, (0.7) we can (1.4) make ourselves understood in uh: Japanese. (0.8) Because - character is a: common culture - within uh: (0.8) with China or Taiwan or Japan. Even - pronunciation is different, but (0.6) as meaning (0.6) we have uh: same meaning. (Class 3, November 16, 2001)

The purpose of this particular role-playing was to illustrate the usefulness of Chinese characters in communicating with WPU students taking Japanese lessons as most of them were Chinese speakers. At one of their group meetings, Kiku told the others that he had learned this strategy through his observation of Izzat’s use of Chinese characters in her lectures (see Chapter 4).

In Semester 2, Nana and Shinpei performed role-playing with their partner Azumi in their presentation in which they reflected on their research processes.

**Excerpt 6.36**

Nana: And the (1.7) second parts of our discussion is (0.8) we did role-playing. (2.5) This purpose of this role- purpose of this role-playing is (1.1) to notice what we are going to actually speak unexpectedly. (0.8) Because even we thought “Oh: we have to be flexible, we have to be considerate, we have to thoughtful.” (0.7) We are not really sure what kind of word are we going to speak, are we going to talk, are we going to use, (0.7) in that real situation. (0.9) So we tried to be in a- (0.6) tried to be in a real (0.6) close situation (1.1) as much as we could. (Class 1, March 15, 2001)

As part of their preparation for their fieldwork at a homeless shelter, Nana and Shinpei simulated their conversation and interview with the shelter manager. In this simulation, Nana acted as the shelter manager and Shinpei as a researcher. At one of their meetings, the group decided to demonstrate this practice in their presentation so as to make their talk more vivid and engaging.

**Excerpt 6.37**

Nana: (1.9) So, (1.1) I was playing the (0.5) person who works at the shelter? As a shelter manager? (0.5) Because we already made an appointment to - talk o- talk to- talk with her, (0.6) so we were- (0.7) we were sure we are going to talk with her. (1.0) And then (0.9) I’m going to play (0.6) so shelter manager? (0.5) And the person who come to shelter (0.7) because (1.0) maybe just in case. (1.8) And then Shinpei is
going to be a (0.5) researcher. (0.7) And Shinpei. Ha ((laughs)) So (1.9) that’s what we do- (0.9) that what we di:d? (0.5) in this (0.5) role-playing. (0.5) Okay. (1.2) How- uh okay anyways the shelter manager is - named Carol.

2 ((several turns later))

3 Nana: ((in role as a shelter manager)) Hello. I’m Carol. Nice meeting [you?]

4 Shin: ((in role as a researcher)) [Hello. I’m Shinpei. Nice to meet you too.

5 Nana: I’m really appreciate you guys came here to (0.6) see what we are (0.5) doing (0.6) in this shelter. (1.1) It’s really nice meeting you. (1.2) And umm (0.6) so (0.6) how did you feel our (1.1) facility so far? (0.8)

6 Shin: Oh I didn’t expected that (0.5) umm you have su- so big facility like (0.7) in- internet, - or cafeteria or individual bedroom. (1.2) So I was very surprised.

7 Nana: ((makes faces))

8 Azu: Okay. Please pay attention the Carol’s expressions? He looks - [like uncomfortable.

9 Nana [She -

10 Azu: ((softly) Ah - she. ((back in regular volume)) Why (0.9) umm - why she’s be- she looks like uncomfortable? Can you guess? (2.7) Hitomi.

11 Hito: Hmm?

12 Azu: Can you [guess it?

13 Izzat: [Oh. ((laughs))

14 Azu: Why she looked umm uncomfortable, (0.6) of the - Shinpei’s response?

15 Hito: Because - Shinpei didn’t expect that it’s- (1.9) Shinpei expected that is (0.6) like (0.6) - not high technology or something?

16 Nana: Oh [yeah. (Class 1, March 15, 2001)

As a main speaker in this section, Azumi is responsible for helping the audience understand their role-play. Not only does she direct the audience’s attention to the manager’s facial expressions and describe her feelings, but she also asks the audience why the manager might be offended. Hence, the students used a combination of two involvement strategies, role-playing and question-asking. Many of the audience members provided positive comments about this presentation. For example, one female student
commented: “I liked their demonstration of the simulation. It was easy to understand. They had an awareness of the issue (complexity of conversing with informants in appropriate manners)” (email interview, March 21, 2001).

6.5.5 Story-Reading

Although not commonly employed, story-reading was another strategy that many members of the Keishin community perceived to be instrumental in engaging the audience (see Morita, 2000, for use of this strategy by a graduate student). Two international relations majors, Rie and Kyoko, chose to begin their Semester 2 presentation by reading a story from one of the recent issues of *Time Magazine*:

Excerpt 6.38

1 Rie: Today we’d like to talk about our presentation about - Japanese and Canadian government (0.4) and organization’s assistance to Sub-Saharan African countries’ (0.4) AIDS victims. (1.5) Before - starting with our presentation (0.4) we’d like you to close your eyes - and imagine (0.5)

2 Kyo: Close your eyes?

3 Class: ((some female students laugh. Close their eyes))

4 Kyo: Imagine your life is this way. (1.0) You are a housewife - with three kids. (0.4) One of them has already - been tested positive with AIDS. At first, it’s predicted to die (0.6) t- too soon. (1.2) In his early childhood (0.4) your husband works three hundred kilometers away - from your house and he only comes back twice a year. (0.6) When he does, (0.5) he sleeps between you - and your children...At work (0.8) for every three person there would be - one, only- on- there would be one - who is already fatally ill. (0.9) You would talk about - a friend who admitted that - she have- she was infected AIDS. (0.4) And then she was (torn) to death, (0.4) by her neighbors. Your leisure time, during every Sunday - is occupied with friends’ funerals. (1.1) You go to bed - everyday - believing that an - adult your age will not live - past their forties. (0.7) Sadly everyone (0.5) including your political leaders (0.8) act as if nothing - is happening. (1.2) (These) are - true stories taken from TIME magazine, (0.5) the February 12th 2001 issue. (1.1) Although it is Sub- Saharan countries’ AIDS problem, and it seems to have nothing to do with us, (0.4) it is almost- it is the most fatal problem (0.5) for the human being - in this century. (1.0) We must recognize the reality (0.6) that there’s a place (for now) (0.5) where this nightmare actually happens. (Class 3, March 23, 2001)
Rie and Kyoko both commented that they decided to use this strategy to make their topic more vivid and to engage their audience. Importantly, Rie is not just reading the story here, but also interacting with the audience by performing speech acts. After announcing the title of their presentation, Rie requests the audience to close their eyes in Line 1 by using the declarative form. Kyoko then realizes the same meaning by using the imperative form instead. Then in Line 4, Rie directs the audience to suppose that she is telling a story about their life by saying “Imagine your life is this way.” Here, the word “this” has a cataphoric relationship to the upcoming story taken from *Time Magazine*. As we have seen in Chapter 3, cataphora is one of the proactive resources used to create contingency (van Lier, 1998a). The use of this resource in conjunction with the speech act seems to have helped Rie to set up expectations for what is to come next (van Lier, 1996). After reading the story depicting the seriousness of the AIDS problem, Rie makes her (or her group’s) point that “we must recognize the reality that there’s a place where this nightmare happens.” By using the first person plural pronoun coupled with the modal auxiliary verb “must,” the speaker demands the audience’s attention to the problem. After the presentation, Rie and Kyoko said that they wanted to raise their classmate’s awareness about the serious issue. In sum, many presenters attempted to engage their audience by using a variety of strategies and carrying out a number of interpersonal actions.

### 6.6 Managing Presentation Discourse

Many Keishin students mentioned that a “good” presentation is easy to follow, and that to make their presentation audience-friendly, they used a variety of strategies. In this section, we will examine some of the ways in which Keishin students managed and
organized their presentation discourse. In other words, the focus is the textual aspects of the student presentations.

**6.6.1 Outlining the Presentation**

At the beginning of their presentations, some groups chose to give a verbal and/or visual outline for their talk. For example, Sakura’s Semester 1 group provided a written outline on the blackboard as follows:

- Introduction
- Volunteer assist teacher’s work
- Parent joins the activity
- How to play
- Conclusion (Class 2, November 9, 2000)

Interestingly, none of the group members referred to this outline at all in their presentation. Sakura said at her interview that her group had decided that it would be self-explanatory, but she thought that they should have after observing her classmates’ presentations that followed. Since they were the second group to present in the class, they had observed only one presentation.

In Semester 2, many groups gave a verbal outline of their talk showing a written version on the OHP. In Excerpt 6.39, Sakura is providing a verbal outline of the Semester 2 presentation she made with two of her classmates:

**Excerpt 6.39**

Saku: I'll (0.5) show you about (0.5) outline of our - presentation. First is (0.8) introduction and its content - abstract and methods of our research? And second is importance of EL-ESL learning. ((clears her throat)) And this - part have abstract and (0.5) histories about immigrants. ((clears her throat)) And third is - general ideal learning style for ESL learning. (1.0) And - forth (0.7) is about case study and (1.2) these ((clears her throat)) part have- has (1.1) umm in- introduce- introduce (2.0) Smith Secondary School and - questions to teachers and students. And the last part is (1.1) our plan in the future. (Class 3, March 16, 2001)
As the boldface shows, the speaker is using linking words (i.e., first, second, third, forth, and last), thus constructing a temporal sequence. Likewise, Mai, one of Yoshino's partners for the Semester 1 presentation, is outlining the organization of their entire presentation:

**Excerpt 6.40**

Mai: Okay. (0.6) I'm- (0.7) from now, I'm gonna show you the outline of our presentation. (0.4) First - I wanna talk about what is a Halloween? Uh what was our volunteer work? Next Yoshino'll explain what is a Canadian Dream Society's schedule, volunteer opportunities. It means what kind of work did they have? (0.4) After that - I'm gonna look at my work, and also Kenji's work? (0.4) Fina- uh and there- after that I'm gonna - uh show you our feelings through the experience, - and finally I'm talk about the- our conclusion. (0.7) (Class 2, November 16, 2000)

Like Sakura, the speaker is using linking words (i.e., first, next, after that, finally); however, this outline is more detailed in that it provides information as to who is responsible for which part of the presentation. The linking words in Excerpt 6.40 are employed as nouns while those in Excerpt 6.39 are employed as adverbs. Tomo and Koyuki's Semester 1 group gave their audience a written outline of their talk as an advance organizer.

**Excerpt 6.41**

Tomo: Uh: (1.2) what we did in the volunteer all- all different <Izzat: Hmm.> on each o- each other so (1.3) in part of our presentation - we'll give uh (1.0) we'll- each one of us will talk about - our experience separately. (0.8) So our presentation will be a little bit - complicated. (0.5) So we made an (0.7) outline, like this one? ((shows the handout)) (0.6) So please keep it? (0.7) And that will (0.5) follow - that will help you follow our presentation easily. ((distributes the handouts)) (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

According to Heino, Tervonen, and Tommola (2002), these kinds of “announcements of standard reporting structure presumably allow listeners to activate an organizational frame that makes it easier to follow the presentation” (p. 131). My interviews and observations suggest that this was what the Keishin student--both
Presenters and audience members—had in their minds. It is important to note that more groups used this type of metadiscourse in Semester 2 than in Semester 1.

Moreover, many students made use of more micro-level metadiscourse to organize their presentation. For example, each time that turning taking took place, Otome and her partner Noriko announced what they would talk about, signifying movement in points in their speech. Excerpt 6.42 is a list of the first utterance of each speaker’s turn.

**Excerpt 6.42**

3 Nori: *And we’d like to talk about our volunteer work at travel agency.*

8 Nori: Okay. *Uh we’ll start.* *(0.5) I’d like to talk about our company.*

9 Otom: *Next - I will talk about* what we did at [name of the travel agency]. We did - three main things.

10 Nori: *Next I’d like to talk about* our research subject and - intentions.

11 Otom: *Next I will* summarize the result of Japanese speakers’ survey.

12 Nori: Okay. *And I’d like to discuss and make a conclusion,* about our research.

13 Otom: *Next - we will* suggest - how they can remove this barriers at [name of the travel agency], and what it will take for NTA office worker to be a good intercultural communicators?

15 Otom: *And next (1.5) I: next, ((laughs)) (1.8) we will talk about* umm how our volunteer experience is related to our future career. *(Class 1, November 23, 2000)*

These transitions were used to switch roles between the presenters and to prepare the audience for what comes next.

**6.6.2 Defining the Scope of the Presentation**

Some groups defined the scope of their speech. Excerpt 6.43 is one example. As reported in Chapter 5, Tomo obtained a volunteer position at a fair trade coffee business after failing several job interviews. However, he decided to focus on his experience at one of the interviews for the group presentation.
Excerpt 6.43

Tomo: I went to uh three places - to find my position. (1.2) Just like Yuji I had a difficulty to find my position (0.7) too. (1.0) But I have no time today - so - I focus on the most impressive place I went? (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

This kind of metadiscourse seemed to help guide the audience’s attention while giving them an idea about the scope of the presenter’s work.

6.6.3 Referring to Previous Parts

Some students occasionally referred to previous parts of their presentations. In Excerpt 6.44, Sakura makes a reference to what her partner Eiko has said.

Excerpt 6.44

Saku: Umm. (1.3) As Eiko said, (1.2) in our swimming class, there are (2.0) usually there are four or five children and (0.6) one teacher? (1.2) And three or four volunteers? (0.7) But if parent is available for swimming class, - they can take their child into pool, instead of volunteer? (1.8) Umm. It was somewhat surprise for me - because (1.2) umm I’ve never (0.5) thought parent join in class as same (1.1) as us? (Class 2, November 9, 2000)

Likewise, Excerpt 6.45 shows how Hiroki referred to Kiku’s previous utterance:

Excerpt 6.45

Hiro: So - first, - as Kikujiro uh explained before, (0.8) First Nations people didn’t know the drugs or drinks but uh (0.8) European - came. (Class 3, March 16, 2001).

According to Bruning, Schraw, and Ronning (1998), experienced writers “occasionally preface paragraphs with sentences that tie the upcoming content back to the things discussed on previous pages” (p. 307). Similarly, some Keishin students prefaced their speech with utterances that tie the upcoming utterance to previously mentioned ideas. By using these cohesive ties (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), the presenters were able to connect old and new information and create the texture of their presentations.

6.6.4 Referring to Previous Presentations and Events

A few groups referred to previous presentations in their presentations. The following example was taken from the Semester 1 presentation given by Yuka, Kota, and
Shoko, who volunteered in the same Japanese language class as Kiku, Nana, and Shinya.

Excerpt 6.46

1 Yuka: We’d like to talk about experiences. (4.3) First, umm (0.8) I and Shoko are volunteering (2.2) and we go- we: (1.2) we go to - a Japanese class 201 class. And Kota goes Japanese four hundred?

2 Kota: Four- Four hundred. Yes.

3 Yuka: Four hundred and ten. So we: (0.8) yeah we are same class but Kota is different. So first, I’d like to talk about Japanese 201. (1.1) Uh: in this class (1.4) I think you already (0.7) know because Kiku or Nana and Shinya mentioned about the classes 201.

4 Kiku: Yeah. The same.

5 Yuka: Right? And so maybe I- I don’t need to explain.

6 Kiku: Ah sorry about that.

7 Yuka: ((smiling)) That’s okay.

8 Izzat: ((laughs)) Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha.

9 Ss: ((some laugh too))

10 Yuka: Umm (1.1) in short, (0.9) yeah it’s conversation class. (0.9) And uh (1.4) we have four or five stu- WPU students, and uh (0.6) we talk about (0.9) our (2.4) our (0.7) family or hobby or (0.9) my introduction (0.7) kind of introduction. (1.1) And (0.8) introduce ourselves (0.9) and (4.6) yes and Japanese culture and so on. (Class 3, November 16, 2000)

In Line 3, Yuka states that the audience may be familiar with the context in which they did their volunteer work as Kiku’s group has talked about it earlier on the same day. Kiku responds to this statement in Line 4, saying that they went to the same class. In Line 5, Yuka states that maybe it is not necessary for her to explain their volunteer work. What Yuka did here was to draw an intertextual link between Kiku’s group’s presentation and her own. Interestingly, Kiku then responds to Yuka’s utterance by apologizing half humorously, half seriously. This seems to reflect the students’ belief about the oral presentation task that fresh information should be presented to engage an audience. As
we have seen earlier, all of the three presenting groups for the day were to report on their experience as conversation partners in Japanese classes at WPU, and they all wanted to be the first group to present about this volunteer work. This was because they were afraid that if they were the second or third group to present, their content would not be "new" any more, and the audience might lose their interests. In Line 10, Yuka prefaces her speech with the phrase "in short," indicating that she will not spend too much time describing their volunteer work. In other words, Yuka builds on Kiku’s group’s presentation.

In Excerpt 6.47, Haruka first introduces her volunteer opportunity at a conference, which involved a session on re-entry culture shock. She then refers back to the class meeting where one student from the previous group talked about her re-entry culture shock that she experienced at Keishin University after her year-long studies at WPU. As all the class members attended this meeting, all of the audience members might have known exactly what Haruka was referring to.

Excerpt 6.47

Haru: And fortunately I was invited to volunteer at EFG conference, umm EFG conference is a conference for -association of international educators. (0.5) Umm they had (various) sessions for the (x)? (0.5) Umm it was so great - because- it is actually a place to one of cross-cultural communication, just like in this class? (0.6) So (0.8) I had a - very great opportunity to (0.8) learn about it. Actually, there was a session about re-entry culture shock, - I think you remember that - one of the Keishin 9 students come to our class, to talk about her experience about re-entry culture shock. And I- I had (0.7) another chance to think about it. So it is very nice to (0.6) nice to me. (0.6) (Class 2, November 23, 2000)

Excerpt 6.48 illustrates how Kiku made a reference to a previous event in his Semester 1 presentation. Prior to this excerpt, Kiku mentioned the importance of not speaking Japanese in class time, reflecting on his experience working with two WPU students in their Japanese class. He reported having felt left out when these students, both
of whom were from Hong Kong, started to speak Chinese despite the fact that he was the only non-Chinese speaker. In the excerpt, Kiku refers to a previous event in which the instructor of another course started to speak French in her teaching, knowing that few students would understand her speech.

**Excerpt 6.48**

1. Kiku: And uh: I know some of the- uh: - some of the students in this classroom are taking a Ruth's class, - right? Ruth's classes?

2. Ss: Mm-hmm. ((nodding))

3. Kiku: And then - remember? She spoke uh French (1.0) uh: in uh some other classes (0.7) coz we were speaking Japanese at the uh: beginning of each class,

4. Izzat: [((laughs))]

5. Kiku: [and then she was uh getting angry. And- and then she suddenly spoke French (1.2) and then she decided to speak French and then - we were all upset maybe. (0.6) At least some of them. (1.0) So (1.0) what I want to say is that in order to (1.3) respect, (0.8) or something (xx) (0.9) so - we have to uh: (1.1) not to speak - Japanese. (Class 3, November 16, 2000)

As many students' nods in Line 2 suggest, this event was shared by many of the audience members. In fact, about half of Kiku’s classmates were taking the course. What the above excerpts illustrate then is the students’ use of the commonly or semi-commonly shared experience as a resource for their presentation. For example, Haruka invoked her senior’s talk to make it easier for the audience to understand the nature of the learning opportunity that she had at the international conference. Kiku used the “French lesson” as “common knowledge” (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Mercer, 2000) to make their group’s argument that they should not speak Japanese in class time to respect their teachers who did not speak the language (Line 5). As we will see later, this type of intertextual link was often made by Izzat in her classroom talk. Excerpt 6.49 shows Izzat’s evaluation of Kiku’s act:
Excerpt 6.49

Izzat: I'm really - I have been really impressed with all of you that - you have been able to make meaning out of your experience. (05) Again I said in the previous class it's very easy to - to go somewhere (0.6) and do something (0.6) or just look around and uh not being able to make meaning out of it. (0.7) For instance, I'm- I'm really impressed because you - seem to be doing what a researcher usually does. Yes, you go do things and you find out "So what does this mean to me. What does this mean to my class. What does this mean to my country. What am I learning from this experience." And that making meaning part is the most difficult part. And you've been able to do that. And uh also - to be able to connect that - with uh your experience and relating it to other people - such as "if this is how it makes me feel when I hear people speaking Chinese in (x) - in my presence, (0.6) imagine how Ruth must have felt when we all started to speak in Japanese. (0.7) Perhaps yeah even just remembering that's why Ruth started to speak in French (0.6) because she was frustrated that everybody else was speaking Japanese. (0.6) Okay? And that is very good that you could - make meaning. You could relate to things around you. (0.6) And that's what - umm your experience is supposed to be. (0.8) Very good. (Class 3, November 16, 2000)

As this feedback suggests, relating insights from the fieldwork to other experiences was a valued practice of making intertextual connections in this classroom community.

6.7 Audience Contributions to the Task Performance

As we saw in Chapter 2, some previous studies have shown that seemingly monological activities like oral presentations are co-constructed by the presenter(s) and audience members (e.g., Duff, 1995; Morita, 2000). Audience contribution was a major part of the student presentations examined in the present study as well.

6.7.1 Teacher Contributions

Izzat conceived of the oral presentations not only as opportunities for her students to demonstrate what they have already learned, but also as occasions for their further meaning making and learning. As such, she played a number of roles both during and after the students' task performance in addition to her role as an evaluator. These included negotiating meaning, providing appropriate language and additional explanations, and adding humor.
6.7.1.1 Negotiating Meaning

During her students’ presentations, Izzat often asked the presenters questions to clarify their meaning. In Excerpt 6.50, Izzat paraphrases Shun’s question and makes a confirmation check (see Chaudron, 1986) to see if her understanding of his meaning is right.

Excerpt 6.50

1 Shun: There are - good influence, - or - there are - bad influence. (0.8) But important point - is (0.6) how does that - event work to you. And your mind. (2.8) Can you understand? How does - that event work to you. (1.0) To your-

2 Izzat: Or how can you make use of that negative event (0.4) to your benefit. Is that what it means? (0.4) How can you make use of your nega[tive experience -

3 Shun: [Yes.

4 Izzat: to turn things into positive situations. -

5 Shun: = Yes. Exactly. ((smiles)) (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

In the Excerpt 6.51, Rei is reporting what she found while she was working as a volunteer at a daycare center.

Excerpt 6.51

1 Rei: Other piece, (0.5) and (0.6) be- maybe because it’s uh so: so unique (0.7) so and they (0.5) maybe they do - because and (0.9) they can’t- they can’t make such a unique piece, (0.5) so [they

2 Izzat: [Children cannot make uh unique piece in Japan but -

3 Rei: Ah no-no-no-no-no-no-no-no. - I’m sorry. Umm (0.5) some children try to: uh no-no. Some children (0.5) criticize - others’ piece, - [cause

4 Izzat: [if it’s

5 Rei: Ee? [What?]

6 Izzat: If it’s unique?

7 Rei: Ah yeah. Yeah.

8 Izzat: I see. Yes. That’s what I thought. (Class 2, November 9, 2000)
In Line 2, Izzat attempts to paraphrase what Rei has just said. Rei then provides negative feedback (Ellis, 1997) in Line 3, suggesting that there is a gap between her intention and her teacher’s understanding. In the same line, she apologizes for causing the misunderstanding and continues to express the intended meaning. In Line 6, Izzat produced a subordinate clause to complete Rei’s utterance in Line 3. Because of its rising intonation, this utterance serves as a confirmation check, thus inviting Rei to respond. Then, Rei provides positive feedback in Line 7 and Izzat shows understanding in Line 8, thus reaching an agreement.

6.7.1.2 Providing Appropriate Language

Izzat sometimes provided appropriate language for the presenters. In Excerpt 6.52, Shun says that since he and Taka have not finished analyzing data yet, he will report on their “intermediate research.” Hearing this, Izzat first gives a tentative confirmation (“yeah intermediate”), but soon presents an alternative (“in progress research”) in Line 2.

Excerpt 6.52

1 Shun: We couldn’t - umm finish our [əˈnæləsɪz] and compared. (0.8) Compare. So (6.7) I’ll talk about from - intermediate research. (1.3) This means is - not finished - mm (1.4) yet. Ha-ha-ha.((laughs))

2 Izzat: ((softly)) In - umm (0.5) yeah intermediate. **OR you can say in progress research.**

3 Taka: In progress. Yes.

4 Izzat: ((to Shun)) In progress?

5 Shun: In progress. [Yes.

6 Izzat: [Yeah. Yeah. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)
The following is an excerpt from the Semester 1 presentation that Ichiro made with Taichi. Ichiro lists Caucasians along with different ethnic groups such as Chinese and French.

**Excerpt 6.53: Presentation**

Ichiro: uh Canada is a multinational- multicultural - country. So there are many kinds of people uh who have different cultures - from others. - So: for example uh: there are **Caucasians**, uh Japanese, Chinese, uh Indian, uh First Nations, French, and so on. (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

The following exchange (Excerpt 6.54) took place during the question and answer time.

Izzat tells Ichiro that the term Caucasian is a race category, thus correcting his classification of people.

**Excerpt 6.54: Teacher Feedback**

1. Izzat: Uh there was one - uh (x) when you talked about umm these examples about different ethnic groups in- in Canada - you said Caucasians, English, French, Indians, and Japanese [for example.
2. Ichiro: [Uh:
3. Izzat: **Just for your future reference - Caucasians is uh: [supposedly a name for a** -
4. Ichiro: [Yeah. Right.
5. Izzat: **a different - race supposedly.**
7. Izzat: And that can include in a way in East Indians,
8. Ichiro: Yeah.
9. Izzat: French, English, and perhaps some people even from China. Some people in China consider themselves as Caucasians. Okay? **But uh French and English uh in a way - they are not names of- of race. [They’re names**
10. Ichiro: [Mmm.
11. Izzat: [of different -
13. Izzat: nations =
Another role that Izzat played during her students' presentations was that of a provider of additional information and explanation. In the following excerpt, Taka, who has participated in a psychology research project with his classmate Shun, is giving an example to explain what informed consent means:

Excerpt 6.55

1 Taka: The informed consent is (0.7) for example, (1.4) I am a doctor. (0.5) Doctor, and - he is patient, -

2 ((Izzat laughs))

3 Taka: And ((coughs)) he comes to my hospital, and I'll give (0.5) the medicine for you. (0.4) But - before give the medicine, - I explain - about this medicine - effect or ingredients, or something, (0.5) and after explaining about this medicine, and ((to Shun)) do you agree? [This medicine?

4 Shun: [Yes. Yes.

5 Taka: after experience, uh after- after (0.4) experience about this medicine and I'll give you. (1.5) This is informed consent.

6 ((Izzat and some students laugh))

7 Taka: Do you understand? (0.6) Understand?

8 Izzat: Yeah. That's a very good explanation. Remember what Masaki did for his research? ((most students nod)) Yeah. Informed consent - yeah. You inform, you tell people what you are - asking them to consent first - and then ask them to agree or disagree. Okay? That's very good. Informed consent. Yeah. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

In Line 7, Taka asks the audience if they have understood the term consent form. Prompted by this comprehension check, Izzat takes a turn and provides positive feedback to Taka and an appraisal of his explanation. Interestingly, she then refers back to what the
researcher did for the present study, which result in nods of comprehension from most of the audience members. Finally, the teacher explains what the term means. Here, it is important to note that Izzat often referred to previous texts and contexts in her explanations, using the word “remember.” In other words, she drew upon what seemed to be the “common knowledge” of the classroom community in her explanations.

Excerpt 6.56 was taken from the first few minutes of Ichiro’s speech in the Semester 1 presentation that he gave with Taichi. In Line 1, Ichiro explains why he and Taichi could not do their volunteer work and what they did instead for the assignment. In Line 2, Izzat follows up on Ichiro’s account, giving more details about their activities.

Excerpt 6.56

1 Ichi: So: - uh: actually I applied to uh United Nations - but uh so far we haven’t received uh any reply from them. Therefore - uh we couldn’t find a place to uh: - volunteer. So Izzat told umm us to: uh go some events relating to the culture. -

2 Izzat: So in a way they did observational studies. They went to some events, cultural events? And uh: listened to lectures and saw what happened and then now they are trying to make sense of what they found (021) and then going to tell us. Okay? (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

Excerpt 6.57 was taken from Tomo, Koyuki, and Yuji’s Semester 1 presentation. Having reported on his struggle of job-hunting, Yuji states in Line 1 that their group realized how difficult it is for them as international students to find a volunteer job by themselves. He goes on to say that their classmates might not have had difficulty finding their jobs because Sally, the administrative coordinator, helped them. Recall that while most students chose a volunteer job from several options that the coordinator had prepared for them, both Tomo and Yuji looked for jobs on their own after failing their interviews for one of the job options provided by her.
Excerpt 6.57

1 Yuji: Yeah. Uh first one, is uh how difficult- how difficult it is to get a volunteer position by ourselves. Umm maybe- maybe in case of everyone, umm Sally’s uh Sally’d look- look- looked for your volunteer? And I guess uh it- it was uh it was not difficult to find (0.5) uh your volunteer? But uh uh: we- we found uh our volunteer, by ourselves. (0.5) Umm it was- it was difficult, (0.5) umm I- I- we didn't know that where- where we: where we: can- where we can find uh (0.5) information, - of volunteer, (0.7) So it was difficult. (0.8)

2 Izzat: Umm while you’re on this topic umm let me say that it’s difficult even for Sally - to find umm people? Like you said that they don’t call you back. <Yuji: Mm.> I mean call anybody. It doesn’t matter it’s Sally calling or it was you calling. <Yuji: Umm.> And she has to call again and again and uh she- and she did excellent job and I- I thanked her. I gave her some flowers to say thank you. Because she worked for us <Yuji: Huh-hmm.> for the class. <Yuji: Mm.> So- so it really is a difficult job to find a place for people...

3 Tomo: Okay. Uh anyway (0.5) uh: (0.6) after we went to uh St. Paul’s Hospital, <Izzat: Hmm.> we started uh looking for our next volunteer position - by ourselves. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

In Line 2, Izzat makes comments on what Yuji has just said. While understanding Yuji’s point, she tells the class that finding volunteer jobs for the Keishin students was a very difficult task for Sally, too, and later suggests that they send a card to show their appreciation for the hard work that the coordinator did for them behind the scenes.

The group’s plan was that immediately after finishing his part, Yuji was going to hand over the floor to Tomo by announcing what the next speaker would discuss (see Excerpt 6.22 for an example). However, because of the unexpected contribution from the instructor, Yuji was not able to perform this handover. In Line 3, Tomo starts to speak by saying “Okay” followed by “anyway.” At the playback session, Tomo commented that this speech sounded “rude,” but he did not know how to respond to the teacher’s unexpected comments because he was busy remembering what to say next. Koyuki also reported a similar problem that she had in her Semester 1 presentation.
Furthermore, Izzat sometimes reminded her students of presentations given previously or told them about presentation given in other classes. Excerpt 6.58 is part of the answer and question time after Otome and Ringo’s Semester 2 presentation on the socialization in a First Nations community. The teacher tells the class about Kiku and Hiro’s presentation, which was given in a different class.

Excerpt 6.58

Izzat: Kikujiro and Hiroki did uh their presentation -their research on First Nations people also. And they talked about how - uh: they were language socialized into uh the mainstream Canadian culture. (Class 1, March 29, 2001)

The teacher’s intent here was to help the class better understand the issue at hand by providing an additional example. However, there seems to have been at least one other consequence of the teacher’s act. Since the Keishin group is a relatively small and close-knit community, well networked electronically, news spread quickly across classes and dorms. In fact, Otome and Ringo later told Kiku that Izzat had told them about their presentation. Kiku commented that he was glad to hear that the teacher had referred to their work. Thus, one consequence was that Izzat’s act seems to have helped the students see themselves as legitimate contributors to the teaching and learning process of the class (O’Connor & Michaels, 1996).

6.7.1.4 Adding Humor

Adding humor seems to have been another important role that teacher played in students’ presentations. In Excerpt 6.59, Otome asks the audience in Line 2 to be patient since they are the final presenters of the class. Izzat responds to this request with the comment, “So you’d better do the best job.” The humorous nature of this utterance is evidenced by Izzat’s tone of voice and the audience’s laughter (see Eggins & Slade, 1997, for a relevant discussion).
Excerpt 6.59

1 Nori: And we’d like to talk about our volunteer work at travel agency.
2 Otom: We are last pre- the last presenters so please [be patient.
3 Izzat: [So you’d better do the best job!]
4 Ss: ((laugh)) (Class 1, November 23, 2000)

In Excerpt 6.60, Ichiro first tells the audience that he and his partner will not be able to report on their volunteer experience since they did not have a chance to work at the United Nations-related office to which they had applied.

Excerpt 6.60

1 Ichi: Uh today we are supposed to uh talk about our volunteering ex- experience. However we can’t uh:: talk about it - because we didn’t have any volunteering in this term. So:
2 Ss: ((laugh))
3 Ichi: So - yes. Unfortunately not. -
4 Izzat: So it’s uh you’re going to talk about not having volunteering to do.
5 Ichi: Uh: [((laughs))]
6 Ss: [((laugh))] (Class 1, November 9, 2000)

In Line 4, Izzat paraphrases Ichiro’s utterance, emphasizing the negative marker “not.” This elicits laughter from the presenter as well as from some members of the audience. Several students commented that they appreciate Izzat’s humor and attentiveness during their presentations. Hence, the teacher seemed to have contributed to the construction of friendly and relaxed atmospheres for the student presentations, which might have been a major source of anxiety for many of her students.

6.7.1.5 Re-explaining the Purpose of the Task

As reported in Chapter 4, strongly believing that teachers are accountable for their students’ understanding and performance of tasks, Izzat explained the purposes and
values of the oral presentation tasks on many occasions in all of her classes. As the
following excerpts show, she continued to do this after her students started their
presentations.

Excerpt 6.61

Izzat: I hope that you are learning from all the presentations. The point of the presentation is
that - because - many people did many things - if everybody tell us what they did - we
can learn much more - than otherwise. Okay? We- we can’t learn everything and
do everything by ourselves. But when other people tell us this is what I did - and this is
what I learned - that - works or doesn’t work. We should learn from their experience.
(Class 3, November 23, 2000)

The above explanation (Excerpt 6.61) was given to the class on the final day of the
Semester 1 presentations whereas the explanation below (Excerpt 6.62) was given on the
first day of the Semester 2 presentations.

Excerpt 6.62

Izzat: One thing I hope you do - is that uh you realize the importance of how much you are
going to learn, as a result of - this presentation? What I mean is that if I told you
something or said in front of the classroom, I could have taught you only one thing, about
one - area? For instance, homeless in Maple Tree City [the topic of the presentation just
seen]. But now we’re going to do - five six presentations - you’re going to learn about six
seven - perhaps even ten - new different things - as a result of people’s presentations and
research. Okay? I hope you - understand that - the value of this kind of work. (Class 1,
March 15, 2001)

6.7.2 Students’ Contributions to the Task Performance

As reported earlier, audience members were often asked questions by the
presenters. However, their role was not confined to answering the presenter’s questions.
As the following examples show, some students asked questions of the presenters during
the question and answer time.

Excerpt 6.63

1 Misa: Do you have any question about our (0.6) presentation? (4.0)

2 Kumi: Actually you worked- at travel agency. Do you think do you want to work there
after you go back to Japan, (0.4) after you did the (0.7) job hunting?
3  ((several turns later))

4  Misa: Umm (1.8) yeah. Actually I want to: (0.9) do: - the works related to the travel. (1.0)
    Yeah. So (0.6) I think (1.6) it is (1.1) good opportunity (0.9) for me. (Class 2,
    November 9, 2000)

In Excerpt 6.63, Misa first opens the floor for discussion. In Line 2, Kumi asks whether
Misa and Shinpei want to pursue their careers as travel agents. Misa then answers that she
wants to because she is interested in traveling and that it was a good opportunity for her.

Excerpt 6.64

1  Ichi: Do you have uh any questions? ((Mei raises her hand)) Yes.

2  Mei: I'm going to ask uh (0.6) what do you think about the (0.9) identity as a
    Japanese (0.6) not general thinking - but your opinion or thinking.

3  Ichi: Uh I see. Uh so: (2.0) uh: (0.8) you know so: (1.1) I think uh (1.4) you have to think
    about more what is (0.5) Japanese (identity). Uh (1.3) cause you know (0.9) so - I
    think so: (0.7) maybe - after I come here to Canada (0.5) many people (0.7) think
    (0.6) uh (1.2) who- who they are (0.5) so I'm a Japanese so what is a difference
    between Japanese culture and Canadian culture. Uh -

4  Mei: If you have a certain (0.7) identity of Japanese?

5  Ichi: Oh Yeah. It's okay I think. Yeah. It's-

6  Mei: No. What- what do you think -

7  Ichi: Yes? (1.7)

8  Mei: What's the identity of (0.6) of your Japanese- as a Japanese?

9  Ichi: Uh: so (0.5) ((clears his throat)) (1.1) it's very complicated.

10 Class: ((laughs))

11 Ichi: Yeah. It's- I think it's very good question (0.4) but (0.9) uh to be honest I
    can't answer (1.2) exactly. (1.7) Yeah so (2.5) Yeah. I know (1.1) in a way I
    belong to Japanese culture but (1.1) how (2.5) how Japanese - uh I am (0.5)
    I'm not sure. (0.6) [So -

12 Mei: [So (1.7) for example (1.3) as a Japanese, (0.8) do you have any (0.6) pride- pride
    of (0.8) (being x)

13 Ichi: Uh yeah. (Class 1, November 9, 2000)
Similarly, in Excerpt 6.64, Ichiro first opens the floor for discussion. In Line 2, Mei, one of the most active members of the class, asks him what he thinks of being Japanese, which resulted in a series of negotiation that lasted several minutes. Excerpt 6.64 took place during the first few minutes of this extended talk. For example, in Line 4, Mei asks Ichiro if he has a certain Japanese identity. Ichiro’s answer in Line 5 does not seem to satisfy Mei, as indicated by her negative feedback “No” in Line 6. Having found that her question was not understood, Mei then asks Ichiro what kind of Japanese identity he has. In Lines 9 and 11, Ichiro answers that although he is a member of the Japanese culture, he is not sure how Japanese he is. Mei then asks if he is proud of being Japanese, to which Ichiro answers “Yeah.”

The above excerpts show that student-audience members contributed to their peers’ presentations especially during the response time. Since students’ presentation discourse was mostly planned (see Chapter 5), the response period after the presentation seemed to have provided them with opportunities to engage in unplanned conversations about the presented materials. However, not all students participated as actively (or overtly) as Kumi and Mei. In Semester 1, only a few students asked the presenters questions or gave them comments. For example, at her interview, Sakura said:

> It’s difficult to ask questions about others’ presentations because you need not only to understand content you’re not familiar with, but also to think quickly what to ask and formulate sentences in English. (original in Japanese, interview, December 3, 2000)

Students’ participation was not limited to overt questioning and commenting (see Erickson, 1996; Kramsch, 2002; Liu, 2001; Morita, 2002; Pon, Goldstein, & Schecter, 2003; Saville-Troike, 1988; van Lier, 1988, for relevant discussions). According to van Lier (1988), “attention, and indeed participation, need not necessarily be overt at all times. Participation may consist in ‘eavesdropping,’ thinking about what is going on,
internal repetition, etc.” (p. 93). Other forms of participation observed by the researcher and/or reported by students in the present study included laughing, smiling, taking notes, looking up words in a dictionary, and responding to the speaker in mind. Importantly, several students including Koyuki, Otome, Ringo, Sakura, Shinpei, and Yoshino, said after their Semester 1 presentations that their audience’s nodding, smiling, and backchannelling greatly helped reduce their anxiety and made them feel more confident about themselves and that they realized the importance of audience members using non-verbal cues to signal their attentiveness and support for the presenter(s). Interestingly, Koyuki, Otome, and Ringo said that the researcher’s presence also helped them feel more relaxed as he was familiar with their task performance.

Although a few students asked the presenters questions or gave them comments, most students commented about their classmates’ task performances at their interviews or during causal conversations. For example, some said that they admired Mei’s participation reported above for being “active.” One of them said that she thought that “That’s how I should participate in class.” In contrast, there were some others who were critical of Mei’s questioning, having perceived it to be “one-way” and “aggressive.” One student said that “Her questioning was not something which I wanted to imitate” (original in Japanese, interview, December 3, 2000). Thus, the question and answer time seemed to have provided non-presenting students with opportunities to observe each other’s participation and consider what it meant to be a good audience member.

6.8 Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, we have examined the actual performance of Keishin students’ oral presentations. As a research report, the oral presentation was an opportunity for the
presenters to critically reflect on their fieldwork. Major sub-activities included explaining the rationale for the study, displaying newly gained information and knowledge, reporting participants' voices, and connecting theory to practice. In these processes, students made various efforts to self-regulate their performance, including use of notes, self-repetition, and use of private speech. For example, Kiku, Nana, and Shinya used group notes that contained self-addressed utterances. To facilitate his own L2 production, Shinpei reorganized his Japanese utterances in an order that corresponded roughly with English word order.

In addition, many students collaborated with their peers during their presentations. One type of peer collaboration had to do with turn taking. The most commonly used pattern was that before finishing his or her turn, the current speaker would announce who would talk next about what, and then the new speaker would thank the previous speaker for this introduction. Some groups used L1 backstage talk during their presentations. For instance, Kiku used this talk to covertly give his partners advice about their performance. Some students helped their partners' utterance production when signs of difficulties were exhibited.

Another important aspect of the presentation was interpersonal action. Given the real-time, face-to-face nature of the activity, many groups had audience involvement as a main goal. To this end, they performed a number of speech acts and used a variety of strategies, which included use of small talk, use of questions directed at the audience, repetition to emphasize important points, role-playing and demonstration, and storytelling.
A third salient aspect had to do with the organization and management of presentation discourse. Many groups used metadiscourse at both macro- and micro-levels to direct their audience's attention. For one thing, many groups gave a verbal and/or written outline of their presentations at the beginning of their talk. Moreover, many students referred to previous parts of their groups' presentations and previous classroom events. In Semester 1, one group even referred to a previous presentation on a similar topic. In other words, presenters drew connections between texts and events and between the familiar and the new (van Lier, 1996), which seemed to have helped guide their audience's attention.

Finally, we examined audience contributions to students' task performance. As a major socializing agent, the instructor played a variety of roles both during and after the presentations. These included a negotiator of meaning, a provider of appropriate language and additional explanations, an explainer of task purpose, and a source of humor. Student-members of the audience also contributed to the task performance. Some members asked the presenters questions and gave them comments while others participated less overtly by smiling, laughing, looking up unknown words in their dictionaries, and responding to the presenters in their minds. Furthermore, students' questions seemed to have served as models for their peers in learning how to and how not to respond to classmates' presentations. To sum up, students' oral presentations were not only products of group project work, but also jointly constructed processes of negotiation and meaning making.
Chapter 7

STUDENTS’ LEARNING ACROSS_TASKS AND CONTEXTS

7.0 Introduction

Chapter 5 examined learning opportunities that the four original students and their partners jointly constructed as they collaborated to accomplish their Semester 1 presentation tasks. In other words, the chapter looked at students’ learning experiences within one particular task, focusing on their out-of-class group work. Chapter 6 mostly examined students’ public performances of the Semester 1 and 2 presentations. Although it looked at various features of the two presentations, the chapter did not trace learning pathways taken by particular students across tasks. Recall that language socialization is claimed to take place through repeated experiences in assuming various social roles in recurrent activities that promote particular language use and communicative behaviors associated with those roles (Duff, 1993a, 2003; Heath, 1998, 1999; Ochs, 1988, 2002; Rogoff, 1990; Schieffelin, 1990; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; see also Lave & Wenger, 1991; van Lier, 1996). Because of this, it is vital that language socialization research like the present study goes beyond the confines of a single task, focusing on the activities of particular individuals.

The present chapter therefore examines key students’ learning across academic tasks and contexts with the goal of providing a detailed description of their participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 1990, 1993, 1995) with regard to the presentation tasks. In other words, the chapter foregrounds the personal transformations of Keishin students through their participation in their oral presentations over time. Again, because of limitations of space, I will here focus on the task-related experiences of the original key students,
Tomo, Nana, Kiku, and Otome. Their emic perspectives, which were gained through in-depth interviews, casual conversations, and audio-journal entries, helped me identify “critical incidents” (Flanagan, 1954; Woods, 1993) or personally meaningful experiences related to their learning across tasks and contexts.

As we have seen in earlier chapters, all Keishin students enrolled in Izzat’s course performed three presentations during the academic year: the poster sessions, the Semester 1 presentations, and the Semester 2 presentations. The original key students performed an additional presentation during their studies at ELI. Before we examine their learning, a few remarks should be made concerning the ELI assignments. On the first day of the ELI course, Jamal, the instructor, gave the class a chance to discuss what assignments they wished to do for the course, explaining that he wanted them to do something which they considered meaningful for their own learning. The class then decided that they would individually write two independent papers and make an eight-minute presentation either individually or in pairs. As Excerpt 7.1 suggests, topics and the relative weighting for these assignments were for the students to decide.

Excerpt 7.1

Jamal: As we can see, from the way we’ve been doing this class, there’s a lot of responsibilities on the students. Okay? In terms of making decisions, choosing the topic, it would be easy for the teacher to give you a topic. All right? But then you have to decide, that means you have to think about it, you have to explore. What am I interested in - what should I talk about or write about - what do I want to say. Yeah. Then you have to think about these questions. Rather than - the teacher saying okay here you go. This topic. Please write. (August 14, 2000)

For the oral presentation, many students collected data by interviewing people and/or conducting questionnaires. Tomo and Kiku chose to work individually whereas Nana and Otome each chose to work with another student. Since the ELI presentations took place less than two weeks after the students’ arrival in Canada, they provided the
students with important information about their task performance before being socialized into the social practices of Izzat’s classes.

7.1 Tomo’s Learning across Tasks

In the second semester, in part inspired by his Language Fieldwork A course, Tomo chose to take a regular course offered in the Department of Anthropology instead of Language Fieldwork B. Because of this agency on his part, his Semester 2 activities were not observed. However, an examination of his activities during the first five months yields some valuable insights about his learning across tasks.

7.1.1 ELI Presentation

Tomo made his first presentation during his studies at ELI in August. For this task, he chose to investigate the medical services plans of Canada. After this presentation, Tomo commented that he could not speak as fluently as he had wished to as he could not remember what he wanted to say. This perception seems to be supported by an examination of the transcript.

Excerpt 7.2

Because (1.4) uh: welfare system in Canada is really sufficient. Somebody - uh: has (0.9) (x) uh: in Canada, (0.7) we- people in Canada always pay very high tax? (0.5) But - welfare is really sufficient. (0.8) You know in Ontario, (0.6) uh: (1.0) m (0.6) there’s no (0.5) no fee of the - in uh medical insurance. Even in other (0.8) uh: states, uh: people (1.0) yeah it’s only less than 40 dollars per month we- people have to pay for the - medical insurance - service. (5.9)

As Excerpt 7.2 suggests, Tomo’s speech contained a number of disfluency markers such as fillers, repetitions, and false starts, as well as frequent long pauses. Attributing this “failure” to his lack of practice, he said that he had realized the importance of taking time to know his content and rehearse his speech (August 10, 2000). According to Tomo, this realization had shaped his willingness to spend time preparing with his group members.
for their Semester 1 presentation (see Chapter 5). However, this is not to suggest that Tomo used more disfluency markers than his peers. In fact, my observations and conversations with students and the teacher suggested that he was considered by most of his classmates to be one of the most fluent presenters in the class. It then follows that it was Tomo’s dissatisfaction with his own task performance that seemed to have influenced how he would approach the subsequent task.

7.1.2 Poster Project

For the poster project, Tomo met with his group members Kiku and Yuji several days to produce a poster comparing non-verbal communication in Canada and that in Japan. Interestingly, only Kiku spoke at the poster session although both Tomo and Yuji contributed as much to the project. Tomo and Yuji simply held their poster as Kiku explained its meaning to the audience. This was because they were not prepared to talk about their poster since they had not looked at the course outline and thought that all they had to do was to submit their poster to the teacher. Tomo later said that he regretted not having said a word and that if they had known about the oral presentation component of the poster project, his group would perhaps have decided what role each member would play. He also said that he learned the importance of looking at the course outline from this experience.

7.1.3 Semester 1 Presentation

Tomo seem to have benefited from his interaction with the teacher during his presentation. Excerpt 7.3 was taken from Tomo’s Semester 1 presentation in which he shared his experience at the job interview that he took for a position in the kitchen at a street youth resource center. At this interview, the volunteer coordinator asked him what
he would do in three hypothetical but very realistic situations. One of these situations was as follows:

A woman comes to you, according to her she was raped before, and now she is pregnant, she will take abortion tomorrow. (PowerPoint document, November 23, 2000)

In Excerpt 7.3, Tomo first tells the class that he responded to the coordinator that he would talk with the woman, and then explains why this answer was wrong.

Excerpt 7.3
1 Tomo: The interview was- interview star- oh my- (0.5) my volunteer coordinator started - interview suddenly. <Izzat: Hmm.> Uh: (1.3) she didn't look at any my résumé. Nothing. <Izzat: Hmm.> ((several utterances later)) Okay. I answered. Uh I'll talk with woman. (1.3) But my answer was totally wrong. (1.6) Here uh: (0.5) all the volunteer are supposed to do is uh just tell the staff, and what happened to her. And leave - all- leave all to - the staff. <Izzat: Hmm.> The volunteer should not - uh: touch the (0.7) should not care about the what happened to women - because it's not- it will be uh dangerous to <Izzat: Hmm.> get involved in a - such an accident? <Izzat: Hmm.> Cause it's a very serious and uh - delicate.

2 Izzat: So the volunteers are not qualified [to
3 Tomo: [Yeah. ((nods))
4 Izzat: uh to umm counsel or advice - the woman.
5 Tomo: Yes. ((nods))
6 Izzat: I see. (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

As her use of so indicates, Izzat summarizes Tomo's explanation and states her inference (Schiffrin, 1987; van Lier, 1998a) in Lines 2 and 4. Note the conciseness of this contribution (see Mohan & Beckett, 2001, for relevant discussion). On the other hand, Tomo responds to this utterance with two simple yeses and nods. The first yes and nod occur immediately after Izzat's uttering of the word "qualify" (Line 2) and the second yes and nod occur after the second half (Line 4). Thus, there is no indication here of the repair of ill-formed utterances, which is claimed to facilitate SLA (see Chapter 1). However, this seemingly simple exchange seems to have provided Tomo with an
opportunity for learning. Excerpt 7.4 comes from a subsequent section of the same presentation where Tomo discussed volunteering in Canada.

**Excerpt 7.4**

If you have a good experience in volunteering - which is what- which is closely connected to a job, (0.8) the company will let you work without giving you a - any education. (0.7) Because you are already qualified to work. <Izzat: Hmm.>

Right? (Class 3, November 23, 2000)

In Excerpt 7.4, Tomo is using the same expression as the one that Izzat used in Excerpt 7.3. Examinations of Tomo’s rehearsal discourse indicate that this was not part of his plan, suggesting that he might have appropriated Izzat’s utterance.

**Table 7.1: Comparison of Tomo’s Writings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Journal 2</th>
<th>Final Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suddenly she started interview test to make sure if I am an appropriate person to work there, or my way of thinking fits rules of this center. I answered that I would just listen to her to relieve her, then I will hitch staff to give her better advice. My answer was wrong, volunteer is not supposed to listen to her in that situation, because it is too serious. All we have to do is just to ask staff there. (October 19, 2000)</td>
<td>Suddenly she started an interview test to make sure I am qualified to work there, and ensure my way of thinking fit the rules of this center...I answered that I would just listen to her to relieve her, and I will fetch staff to give her better advice. My answer was totally wrong. There, a volunteer is not qualified to listen to her in that situation, because this case is too serious and delicate. Moreover there is even the possibility I might be involved in an incident. All the volunteer would have to do is just tell staff what has happened to her, and leave the rest to them. (December 1, 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1 compares Tomo’s second field journal and final paper, both of which report on his interview experience presented above. The journal was written prior to the oral presentation while the final paper was written after the presentation. As the table shows, although he used other linguistic resources in the journal to realize the same meaning, Tomo used in his final paper the phrase “be qualified to,” which he had heard Izzat use in his presentation. This indicates that Tomo appropriated the phrase from his teacher. He later reported that although he knew the word “qualify,” he learned from
Izzat’s modeling how to use it in that particular context. However, the story does not end here. After the presentation, Tomo consulted his bilingual dictionary for its usage and used it in his final paper. In short, Tomo noticed Izzat’s use of the phrase in the presentation and checked the usage before using it in the paper. Thus, Tomo’s appropriation of the linguistic resource in his writing seems to have resulted from his attentiveness to Izzat’s turn (van Lier, 1992) and subsequent engagement with the uptake, displaying not only contingency across utterances and interlocutors (van Lier, 1992, 1996, 1998), but also contingency across texts and tasks (i.e., intertextuality between the oral presentation and the written report).

7.2 Nana’s Learning across Tasks and Contexts

7.2.1 ELI Presentation

As reported in Chapter 6, in their presentation, Nana, Kiku, and Shingo acknowledged the previous speaker and introduced the next speaker in order to avoid “awkward” silences between turns. It was Nana who suggested that they do this intra-group exchange. She reported that she had first noticed the exchange when her partner, Kumi, used it in their ELI presentation in August. This is evidenced by the following excerpt:

Excerpt 7.5

1 Nana:  [Uh-huh (0.7) Uh-huh. (3.4) Good morning everyone, (1.3) Now - we’d like to talk about our presentation. (0.8) Our presentation is about (0.5) what the: ELI is. (0.7) Uh: (0.7) we - would like to uh: (0.5) find are there- whether there are any problems or not. (0.7) We are also uh (0.6) ELI students right? And uh (1.0) uh: we’d like to know about - where they come from or (0.9) the nationality, (0.5) or the self satisfaction, or their (0.7) so all about the: (1.1) ELI students - ELI - teachers - ELI facility-es. So let’s start. (2.9) This is presented by Kumi, and Nana. So: first I’d like to talk about how to do research. (1.9) ...So - next - Kumi will talk about more information about we’re- our research. (2.3)

2 Kumi:  Thanks, Nana. Now look at this graph please. (Class 3, August 11, 2000)
As Nana’s greeting ("Good morning everyone") indicates, this is the very beginning of their presentation. At the end of her turn, Nana informs the audience that Kumi will next talk about their research, which is followed by Kumi’s acknowledgement ("Thanks, Nana"). Three months later, Nana still remembered this exchange and suggested to Kiku and Shingo that they incorporate it into their presentation on their experience as volunteers for Japanese classes. Like Tomo’s case reported above, this can be taken as evidence for Nana’s attentiveness to Kumi’s utterance in Line 2. Here, it is important to note that Kumi was an experienced English teacher from Japan who was as old as Nana’s mother. Nana reported that although she contributed her ideas to the construction of the presentation, she chose to use mostly the language that Kumi provided her. To quote Nana, Kumi was “a very good model to imitate” [original in Japanese] (interview, August 11, 2000). Thus, Nana mostly played the role of a relative novice.

7.2.2 Semester 1 and 2 Presentations

Nana’s major transformation seems to relate to her emergent role as a group leader. As we saw in Chapter 5, Nana worked with Kiku on the Semester 1 presentation task. This experience seemed to have helped her become prepared for her roles in the Semester 2 task in several important ways. For one thing, Nana suggested to her new group members, Shinpei and Azumi, that they should first look at the course outline to consider what they were required to do. As reported in Chapter 5, this was exactly what Kiku did for the Semester 1 task (see Excerpts 5.3 & 5.4). Another thing was that Nana came to better appreciate the importance of the performance aspect of the presentation. As she reflected upon her group work for the Semester 1 task, she commented that initially she did not understand clearly why Kiku put so much emphasis on things like

74 Also, Kumi had taken Jamal’s courses previous summers.
gestures, postures, and tones of voice although she certainly saw the importance of
making eye contact, but she came to understand the reason after she saw how the
audience responded to their presentation. She said in her audio-journal, "I learned from
Kiku how important it is for presenters to present themselves confidently and

7.2.2.1 Becoming a Group Leader

In the group work that she did with Shinpei and Azumi for their presentation on
homeless issues in Maple Tree City, Nana appeared to play a leadership role most of the
time. Excerpt 7.5 took place the night before her group’s presentation. Nana is giving
advice to Shinpei.

Excerpt 7.6

1 Nana: *Ja de koko de Shinpei komakaku setsumei shite ne. Minna no kao o mi nagara. Ne?* [Now please give a detailed explanation here. Looking at everyone’s face. Okay?]

2 Shin: *Un.* [Yeah.]

3 Nana: *Okki na koe de hakkiri to. Koko ga taisetsu nan da yo tte iu koto o minna ni wakatte mora eru yoo ni.* Human dignity are guaranteed in this shelter. *De food toka bathroom toka laundry dake ya naku te konna mono mo aru n yo tte toothpaste toka shaving toka - [Loudly and clearly. So that everyone will see this is particularly important.] Human dignity are guaranteed in this shelter. And they not only provide people with food, access to bathrooms and laundry facilities, and what not, but also toothpaste and razors and -]*

4 Shin: *Aa soo ka.* [Oh: you’re right.] (Class 1, March 14, 2001)

In Line 1, Nana asks Shinpei to look at the audience and give a detailed
description of the service provided for people who stay at the homeless shelter that the
group visited for observations and interviews. As her utterances in Line 3 suggest,
Shinpei is to support the groups’ claim that human dignity was maintained and valued in
the shelter. Nana then asks Shinpei, whose voice tended to be soft, to speak “loudly and
clearly” so that their audience will understand the important part of the presentation.

Moreover, Nana reported that she advised Shinpei during their task performance to make eye contact and speak more loudly. Importantly, these roles are reminiscent of those performed by Kiku in their Semester 1 group work (see Chapter 5). Moreover, Nana chose to be responsible for the conclusion of the Semester 2 presentation, which lasted several minutes. Excerpt 7.7 is the final part of it.

Excerpt 7.7

1  Nana: And then (0.7) last one? (0.9) We have to (1.2) we decided to understand the whole structure of (1.4) homeless (2.9) issue (2.8) by analyzing the small factor. (4.1) ((pointing to the diagram on overhead.) Here is a homeless issue? (1.5) And the small factor means - what we found from our experience. What we found from the data analysis. (0.6) Even in a small words. Even (1.1) even what felt (0.5) in small things (1.5) we can see (0.6) we have to - understand the homeless issue - by analyze these small factors (0.8) to the understanding (0.6) whole structure of homeless issue (0.5) from here. ((pointing to the diagram on overhead.) (1.5) Un. [Yeah.] (0.9) So: (0.6) that is about- all about our presentation. (0.5) So - thank you for listening to us.

2  Class: [((clap hands))]

3  Nana: [Does somebody have questions? (Class 1, March 9, 2001)]

As her question in Line 3 indicates, Nana started to take questions from the audience. She said, “Last time, Kiku did the conclusion for us, but this time, I’ll do it” (March 6, 2001), which suggests that she was more or less aware that she was taking on the leading role that she had seen Kiku play in their Semester 1 project work.

7.2.2.2 Becoming a Critical Language User

Nana demonstrated another type of learning in her group’s Semester 2 presentation. In Excerpt 7.8, she is explaining why their group decided not to use the term “homeless” in their fieldwork and presentation.

Excerpt 7.8

In this (0.6) presentation, we never say (1.4) about (1.0) the person who come to the shelter (0.5) call ((using a quoting gesture)) “homeless.” (1.0) Because (0.9) once we call
In this example, Nana holds up and moves her index fingers and middle fingers virtually every time she utters the word “homeless.” In their fieldwork, Nana and her partners had opportunities to talk with a man staying at the shelter that they visited. After hearing him say that he wanted to “go home,” Nana realized that the word “homeless” might be a misnomer to describe people who stay in shelters. She subsequently suggested to her group members at one of their meetings that they should be careful in using the term as the notion of “home” might vary from people to people. As a result, Nana decided to put the word in a quote to signal that her group was not committed to the commonly held idea that shelter stayers do not have a “home.” This seems to be an example of what Maybin (2003, building on the work of Bakhtin, 1984) refers to as *parody*, where “the evaluative perspective of the speaker and the parodied voice are in opposition” (p. 161). Thus, Nana’s use of the quoting gesture here reflects her (and her partners’) critical attitude toward the term.

After the presentation, Nana commented that she did not know what such a gesture meant when she arrived in Canada, but she came to understand it as she observed her classmates, dorm mates, and teachers use it in conversations and lectures. In short, the above example seems to suggest Nana’s expanded repertoire of meaning-making resources as well as her (and her partner’s) developing critical thinking skills, which were highly valued in the classroom culture (see Chapter 4).
7.3 Kiku’s Learning Across Tasks and Contexts

7.3.1 ELI Presentation

As an experienced performer of comic dialogues and a former member of an English club at Keishin University, Kiku liked the idea of giving an oral presentation from the beginning of his studies in Canada. He valued interaction with his audience and made efforts to make his presentation interactive and participatory. This is indicated by his use of questions in the following excerpts from his ELI presentation in which he reported on people’s perceptions of services provided by Airline A and other airline companies:

Excerpt 7.9

1 Kiku: Have you ever tried this one? (1.0) Airline B? (1.9)
2 ((two people raise their hands))
3 Kiku Oh: two people. (0.7) Jack - uh where’s - the best airline (0.6) in the - world - for you.
4 Jack: Best airline? =
5 Kiku: = Yeah. (1.4)
6 Jack: Umm. (1.5) Maybe I would choose the (1.2) the Airline C -
7 Kiku: Airline C. AH: thanks. Actually number two is Airline C. (Class C, August 15, 2000)

In Excerpt 7.9, Kiku asks two questions: the first one is directed to all the members of the audience (Line 1) and the second one to a particular student (Line 3). These questions result in the audience’s behavioral and verbal contributions in Lines 2, 4, and 7. Excerpt 7.10 shows how Kiku made use of humor in his presentation.
Excerpt 7.10

1 Kiku: And uh (1.2) I think there’s enough to complain- to bring some complaints into (0.6) Airline A agency like Satomi, (0.9) or like Jamal?

2 Ss: ((laugh)) (Class C, August 15, 2000)

Kiku elicited laughter from the audience by mentioning the names of a classmate and the teacher, both of whom had had a negative experience with Airline A. These experiences were part of the “common knowledge” (Edwards & Mercer, 1987) of the class as they had been shared previously in class discussion. Thus, Kiku said that he considered building on the knowledge of one’s audience to be fundamental to making one’s speech humorous. In short, as the above excerpts suggest, Kiku demonstrated his skill of involving his audience in his first oral presentation made in Canada. Interestingly, however, Kiku commented at his interview that he seemed to have failed to actively engage his audience. This self-assessment seemed to be in sharp contrast with those of his classmates, most of whom expressed their appreciation for Kiku’s skills to relate to the audience and hold their attention.

However, as Kiku himself said later, his ELI presentation seemed to have room for improvement. For one thing, Kiku said that the content of the presentation lacked “depth” (interview, December 3, 2000) or critical reflection. Excerpts 7.11 and 7.12 were taken from the body and conclusion of Kiku’s ELI presentation, respectively.

Excerpt 7.11

And FIRST, UH: (0.5) I asked uh: fourteen Canadians (0.6) I just- I was focusing on Canadians (0.7) coz (1.1) I wanted to know - why uh how (0.5) how Canadians uh: think about (1.5) uh toward Airline A. (1.3) And then the first question is “Do you like Airline A? Yes or No.” I asked them directly. (0.9) And the answer is (1.0) s- uh: surprisingly (1.2) seven people answered “Yes” and (0.9) on the other hand - seven people - answered “No.” (0.5) And then some of them are really (0.6) it - seemed (0.5) they hated Airline A. (0.8) Some of them are seemed to hate Airline A. (0.9) And then uh: as I told you before (0.7) uh one person (0.7) who is a Canadian boy (0.7) you know
he said that - “you- you have to go to Airline A- Airline A agency (0.5) or Travel Agency A to say (0.8) complaints (1.0) or something.” (Class C, August 15, 2001)

Although he justified his decision to focus on Canadian people in his study, Kiku mostly informed the audience of his questions and his participants’ answers (Staab, 1986).

Moreover, Kiku mentioned that his ELI presentation had no conclusion.

**Excerpt 7.12**

And uh conclusion is I’d- (0.6) uh we’d - rather fly with airlines that has - better service than Airline A. (1.3) So Canadian people are hoping - better service airline than Airline A. I really felt (0.6) from the heart (0.6) my body. (Class C, August 15, 2001)

For the ELI presentation task, Kiku, like some other students, chose to work by himself. He said that while at WPU, he wanted to put himself in a sink-or-swim situation in order to learn most from his experience.

**7.3.2 Poster Project**

As we have seen in Section 7.1.2, Kiku and Tomo worked together on the poster project; however, they were not aware of the oral presentation component of the project and thus did not do anything to prepare. As a result, Kiku was the only member that spoke at the poster session. Kiku commented in his audio-journal as follows:

**Excerpt 7.13**

Well, I didn’t know until the class that we were doing a presentation. When I heard this, I was very puzzled. Well, I guess I managed to do it somehow and I think I can give myself 80 points (for the task performance). But I’m not satisfied at all. That’s because there’re some parts that I feel I should have cut. I thought so because my goal is always to draw my audience’s attention without making them bored...well another thing is that I was not sure whether I should speak solo or let Tomo and Yuji speak, but I ended up doing it all by myself. [original in Japanese] (October 6, 2000)

At his retrospective interview, Kiku said, like Tomo, that if his group had known about it, they would certainly have at least decided on their roles, and that he regretted not having checked the course outline. As reported in Chapter 5, Kiku suggested to his partners for
the Semester 1 project that they first look at the course outline, which seems to be informed by his experience with the poster project.

Moreover, Kiku said that he had learned from this experience the value of deciding what to accomplish at the beginning of each group meeting. At virtually every group meeting, Tomo almost always initiated a group discussion to set an agenda for the meeting, which Kiku felt helped the group stay on task and work efficiently.

7.3.3 Semester 1 Presentation

As reported in Chapter 5, for the Semester 1 project, Kiku decided to make a group presentation with Nana and Shingo, both of whom volunteered in the same Japanese class at WPU.

Excerpt 7.14

So - by uh: respecting other persons, (0.7) in our case not to speak Japanese in uh: uh: in front of people from uh: people uh: who are speaking another language - not Japanese. (0.8) That means - “to put ourselves in” ((looks at the screen)) others’ place.” ((looking back at the audience)) Do you know uh: what I mean? (0.7) So someone else’s feeling. (1.1) Someone else’s feeling. So (0.8) “wha- what- what- what is she - thinking about if I speak Japanese here.” (Class 3, November 16, 2000)

As we have seen in Chapter 4, one important goal of Language Fieldwork was to help students develop critical thinking skills, which Izzat considered to be abilities to think beyond what one sees and reads. Excerpt 7.14 shows how Kiku went beyond what he had experienced by “projecting into the feelings...of others” (Staab, 1986, p. 114). To use Izzat’s words, he was able to “make meaning” out of his field experience. Importantly, as sociocultural theories of learning (Bruner, 1996; Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1995; Wertsch et al., 1993) suggest, this was not a solo accomplishment by Kiku, but a joint accomplishment of his group. As we have seen in Chapter 5, although it was Kiku who felt uncomfortable when the two JSL students
started to speak in Chinese and subsequently shared this experience with his group members, it was the series of negotiations that he had with his partners at their group meetings that provided him with opportunities for further reflection and which thus shaped his task performance in Excerpt 7.14.

Similarly, in Excerpt 7.15, which is part of the conclusion of the group presentation, Kiku argues that it is important for their classmates to be conscious about Japanese culture in learning to become intercultural communicators. As we saw in Chapter 5 (see Excerpt 5.13), this lesson was drawn from Kiku and his partners’ experiences of not being able to answer their JSL students’ questions about the culture of Japan.

**Excerpt 7.15**

So umm...just be more - conscious about Japanese (0.7) things once again. (0.6) Then, (0.5) I think you can get uh (0.5) umm many perspectives many perspectives. (1.0) And uh: (0.6) I think um I- we put uh international, the word international ((referring to the screen)) here. Coz - when you go to another country - probably you explain- you’ll be able to explain (0.8) a lot of things about Japan. Coz you know much about Japan. If you be conscious about many things - then even a (1.4) uh: (0.7) normal thing is not normal. (1.6) Umm so (0.7) think about it - in that way. (November 16, 2000)

Moreover, Kiku explains consequences of people becoming conscious about their own culture (“you can get uh umm many perspectives” and “even a uh: normal thing is not normal”), thereby demonstrating his group’s reasoning about their own experience. In other words, Kiku again went beyond mere descriptions of their activities and observations. At his post-task interview, Kiku commented that he had learned from the Semester 1 project work that it was important to spend time reflecting upon his experiences and observations and that it helped to engage in this reflection with his peers.

---

75 As Kiku’s use of the second person pronoun and imperatives (“Just be conscious...” and “think about it...”) suggests, Kiku realizes his (or his group’s) meaning as advice to the audience.
7.3.4 Semester 2 Presentation

For the Semester 2 project, Kiku explored the culture of First Nations people with Hiroki. Although they were in different departments at Keishin University, they had known each other relatively well before their arrivals in Canada. As part of this investigation, Kiku and Hiroki interviewed a female participant, to whom Izzat introduced them.

7.3.4.1 Organizing Discourse

In the Semester 2 presentation, Kiku gave a verbal outline of their talk, explaining who would talk about what in what order.

Excerpt 7.16

Kiku: Today uh ((pointing to the outline written on the board)) today’s uh table (1.2) and next Hiroki is going to talk about - umm - concept of the First Nation - uh: which is uh totally different - totally different from our (0.6) uh: sense of value. (0.5) So it’s gonna be uh interesting I think. (0.5) And also next uh::: history of (0.6) uh be- brief history - uh: mainly regarding umm school (0.9) First Nations’ school history. (0.6) And next uh: - discriminations uh including umm (0.5) different factors umm some factors. (1.2) And then umm (1.0) story umm about (0.8) uh First Nation person- the: first - interview (1.2) out of - the two, we got. (0.8) And finally we are - going to conclude our presentations. (Class 3, March 9, 2001)

As reported in Chapter 6, this kind of metadiscourse was employed by fewer groups in Semester 1 than in Semester 2. In fact, this was the first time that Kiku used such discourse. At the final group meeting before their presentation (but not the last before completing their written report), Kiku suggested to Hiroki that they give a verbal outline, referring to some of the “good” Semester 1 presentations that he observed.

7.3.4.2 Learning to Improvise

As he reviewed his Semester 2 presentation, Kiku said that another thing that he had become able to do was to speak more naturally than he did at the beginning of the academic year, referring to Excerpt 7.15. This example comes from the conclusion
section of their presentation. Responsible for the first half of it, Hiroki starts to talk in Line 1; however, as his use of the fillers *uh* and *so* as well as the relatively long pause suggest, he seems to have trouble executing his speech plan and, indeed, later said that he was so nervous that he forgot what to say and that he appreciated Kiku’s improvisation. In Line 4, Kiku elaborates on Hiroki’s statements by using a relevant metaphor. As such, this long turn was not part of the pair’s plan.

Excerpt 7.17

1 Hiro: So: (1.5) in conclusion - next, uh: through our survey (0.8) we recognized uh (1.5) it-(0.6) we want to know about the First Nations people. (0.8) It’s (2.2) uh: it’s not good to - pretend to understand their culture. <Izzat: Hmm> I mean the - they don’t like the person who talks about the (0.5) First Nations with (x) knowledge. (1.1) So (0.6) it’s a First Nations true feeling. (2.3) Uh: (1.8) so ((clears his throat. Kiku smiles and some students laugh)) (3.8)

4 Kiku: Uh - so: it’s like a same kind of idea. If- (0.5) if it happens in our - u:mm daily conversation some- (0.5) some people are in a talk about things (0.5) umm as if they understood (0.5) everything and (xx) baseball - even if they don’t know (0.8) about (0.8) much about it. (1.1) So (0.5) and also especially in a field of publications one of the - interviewees said uh (0.8) a lot of - uh: authors, (0.9) who write about - First Nations (0.8) but they don’t know much about it. (0.6) It- - some of the contents are (0.7) u:mm absolutely different from (0.5) what they are doing or what their - culture - is. So - they - get really umm angry of course. (2.8)

5 Hiro: Yeah. So (0.8) it’s not good to behave the - as if (0.6) we understand the culture very well, (Class 3, March 9, 2001)

Interestingly, Kiku commented after this presentation that while considering himself to be a better presenter in many respects than he was when he did his ELI presentation, he believed that there was one thing that his “current self” should learn from his “past self” (April 14, 2001): namely, to speak clearly.

7.3.4.3 Learning to Comment Like a Teacher

After Koyuki and Fuyumi’s Semester 2 presentation, Kiku gave them comments about their task performance on their class bulletin board.
Subject: re: well done!

Hi, Fuyumi and Koyuki,

Your presentation was very very well done, I think. Although there is quite a bit differential between your amount of time for presentation preparation and ours (since we accidentally chose the first week to do presentation in the lottery), the contents of your presentation was very coherent and organized. Apart from that, I was thinking during the presentation that the way you speak is just like a teacher or so because you were really calm down and you speak with great conviction, which perhaps comes from the tone of your voice or so...

Anyhow, the presentation was worthwhile, including plenty (plenty) of information I had never known, and that will be a great help next time when I think about new Japanese immigration system and policy.

Bye,

Kikujiro (Bulletin board communication, March 31, 2001)

In this message, Kiku uses a variety of attitudinal resources (see Table 7.2) to express his appreciation (Eggins & Slade, 1997; Mohan, 1986). According to Eggins and Slade (1997), “Appreciation can be probed by the question: ‘what do/did you think of that?’ Grammatically, lexical items of Appreciation tend to fit into cognitive mental process structures such as: I think/know/understand/believe that it was” (p. 126). Kiku’s first utterance following the greeting (“Your presentation was very very well done, I think.”) fits this pattern nicely.

Table 7.2: Kiku’s Use of Appreciation Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>Very very well done, very coherent and organized, really calm down [sic], worthwhile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Just like a teacher, with great conviction, a prenty [sic] of information, a great help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is striking about the above message is that Kiku’s language is reminiscent of Izzat’s. In fact, Kiku commented that he had picked up words like “coherent” and
“organized” as he observed the teacher give comments to her students on numerous occasions. What this suggests is that he not only learned how to use L2 resources for evaluation, but also developed a theoretical understanding of the oral presentation task (Mohan, 1986), namely, what it meant to do a “good” oral presentation in the classroom community.

7.3.5 Model Presentation

One week after arriving in Japan, Kiku volunteered to give a presentation on how to do a “good” academic presentation with another Keishin 10 student, Wataru, for a group of Keishin 11 students preparing to go to Canada. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold. First, it was intended to inform the Keishin 11 students what it takes to do a “good” presentation at WPU. Second, it was intended as an opportunity for the new students to observe a model performance. Thus, Kiku and Wataru’s task was to help their koohai or juniors (see Chapter 3) understand the theory and practice of the academic oral presentation (Mohan, 1986).

Excerpt 7.19

First uh: I’m gonna tell you uh: the reason why we’re going to do presentation - for today. Umm - at in WPU - uh: presentation is basically occupy and - from twenty percent to:: sixty percent aprox- approximately - of all your marks. So - presentations are really important so - you should probably uh: put effort into it. And umm - uh - some- one of the classes that ((referring to Wataru)) he was taking in term 1 at WPU - uh actually presentation occupied uh ninety percent of all - the mark. So - umm you had definitely be better - uh good at presentation. A:nd - and also uh ((referring to their own presentation)) this is uh - for preparation - for your presentation at WPU. Okay? (May 7, 2001)

In this excerpt, Kiku explains the values attached to the oral presentation in courses offered at WPU just as Abraham did before giving his model presentation several months earlier (see Chapter 4). Excerpt 7.20 is the final section of Kiku and Wataru’s presentation.
Kiku: U:mm - the first uh: suggestion - uh basically in academic presentations - like uh
presentations you are going to do - at WPU, u:mm it is quite natural to follow the
strategy we - showed you - today. Introduction, body parts, - conclusion, uh: this
is a kind of rule - umm principle that you have to follow. Uh: - in any situations
like where you do uh when you do presentations. At least you have to - uh follow the
presentation. And teachers and professors - uh like mark you - being based on these
uh: - rules. Yeah. ((looks at Wataru))

Wata: ((looks at Kiku and nods)) Uh: - so in addition - we suggest you that - taking
advantage of tactics of presentation as we suggested before, - and then (use those)
to make your presentation - more attractive and more organized.

Kiku: And most importantly - following the uh: - strategy, - the most important thing is -
to - show express your original - type of presentation. Put something original - to
your presentation. This is the most important part. Uh - despite following the
strategy - everyone can do it probably. So to make your presentation original - and
better ones - then add up some - original elements - to your presentation. Yes.
Okay. This is the end of presentation.

Wata: Yeah.

Kiku: Thank you very much. (May 7, 2001)

Kiku and Wataru discuss the importance of following the introduction-body-conclusion
format, using the strategies that they mentioned in the presentation, and incorporating
original elements. Thus, as experienced members of the Keishin program, Kiku and
Wataru demonstrated their understanding of the task that they had developed during their
year-long studies at WPU, which might have remained unnoticed had it not been for this
occasion (Wenger, 1998). To adapt Wenger’s (1998) terms, last year’s newcomers
became this year’s old-timers.

However, as Kiku and Wataru themselves admitted, their task performance did
not go as well as they had expected. For one thing, they seemed to have failed to practice
what they preached. In fact, during the post-presentation discussion, the Program
Director, while agreeing with the content of the presentation, pointed out that although
Kiku and Wataru stressed the importance of interacting with the audience by asking
questions, they did not demonstrate this act in their modeling. Kiku later said to me that there were two possible reasons for this “failure” (May 7, 2001). He said that one reason was that he was under pressure: “I was thinking I could not blow it for the life of me, because I would speak as a representative of the Keishin 10 group, as it were” [original in Japanese] (Interview, May 7, 2001). The other possible reason was that Kiku found it difficult to ask questions of the audience because he hardly knew them, which made him even more nervous. Nevertheless, this presentation showed how Kiku played the role of a relative old-timer in his role of socializing newcomers.

7.4 Otome’s Learning across Tasks and Contexts

Perhaps it was Otome who made the most dramatic personal transformation among all the key students. As we will see later, one major challenge that she faced in doing presentation was not to read her manuscripts in order to interact with her audience. While Kiku liked the oral presentation from the beginning, Otome was not too excited about the idea of speaking in public. In these respects, Otome’s experience stood in clear contrast with that of Kiku as reported above.

7.4.1 Poster Presentation

For the poster project, Otome decided to work with Ringo and Ichiro, both of whom were good friends of hers, living in the same dorm. While many other groups presented in their posters their own ideas about and understanding of non-verbal communication, this group went further and incorporated into their poster the results of a questionnaire they administered to study people’s perceptions of major characters in a Japanese cartoon (Appendix K). In other words, they presented findings of their primary research on the academic topic (Appendix L).
The following exchange between Otome and Ringo took place right before their group started their poster presentation in October. They covertly reconfirm their task procedure in Japanese.

**Excerpt 7.21**

1. Otome: *Yomu de. Yomu dake ya ro?* ((whispering)) [*I will read from my notes. We will only read right?]*

2. Ringo: *Un. Demo namae yuwana akan.* ((whispering)) [*Yeah. But we should tell them what our names are.*] (Class 1, October 5, 2000)

As this backstage talk suggests, Otome chose to read out her manuscripts for this task. Here, it is important to note that while the instructor intended the poster session to be an informal occasion for her students to share their work, this group took it more seriously than other groups and prepared a formal presentation. The following is an excerpt from Otome’s speech:

**Excerpt 7.22**

((holding a manuscript)) *Nonverbal communication can be seen in a variety of situation.* (1.0) One of the example is cartoon. In every cartoon - the author - use nonverbal communication in order to help reader understand characters unconsciously. Such as appearance of characters, their expression, and so on. (0.6) To examine - how- how it influence readers impression of characters (0.7) 10 WPU students were answered- uh asked - what kind of personality they - guesses each character have. (0.8) And what made them think so. We showed (0.6) them, - the picture, exactly the same (0.6) as this picture? (1.3) None of WPU students know these picture - well. Each character was picked up from *Doraemon - you know.* ((laughs)) It is one of the most popular - cartoon in Japan. (1.3) The result of survey - is shown under the picture, - to show how subject guesses are different from or similar to - the author’s intention. - The personality of those characters exhibited to- next to the- next to the result of the survey. So this graph- this graph shows - the survey of (0.7) - uh the re- survey of - WPU students’ guesses. And this shows (0.5) each personality which also intented- intended. (Classroom discourse, October 5, 2000)

Here, boldface is used to signify unscripted parts of Otome’s speech. As can be seen, her unscripted language production appears to have been limited to the use of fillers (“uh,” “you know”) and self-correction of misread words. In short, what Otome did for this task was a *manuscript delivery* because she mostly read her speech from her manuscript.
(Beebe & Beebe, 2000). As such, eye contact appeared to be sacrificed. In the following audio-journal entry, Otome expressed her satisfaction with Ringo’s task performance and her own:

**Excerpt 7.23**

As for the presentation, Ringo and I planned and rehearsed what to say. But Ichiro didn’t ((laughs)), so he spent too much time doing his part... Some people weren’t prepared, and I was glad that our group spent some time preparing for the presentation. Also, our presentation had solid content. Many groups simply talked about their posters. But we reported our research findings as well. (October 5, 2000, original in Japanese)

Also, Otome commented in the reflective interview that she was satisfied with her own task performance as well as with their poster. These comments together seem to suggest that Otome was primarily concerned with presenting their research findings in a timely manner. In other words, her (and Ringo’s) focus seems to have been on ideational reflection, rather than on interpersonal action (Mohan, in press; Wells, 1999a).

### 7.4.2 Semester 1 Presentation

For the Semester 1 presentation, Otome chose to work with Chie, who volunteered at the same travel agency. As we saw in Chapter 4, students were required to report orally on their experience as volunteers and their discovery and learning from this experience. Furthermore, they were required to connect the theory (i.e., what they learned from their lectures and textbooks) and practice (i.e., what they experienced and/or observed during their fieldwork) of intercultural communication. However, having found it difficult to make a presentation involving in-depth discussion based solely on their experiences and observations, Otome and Chie jointly decided to conduct questionnaires to examine the possible communication barriers between Japanese employees and non-Japanese employees at the travel agency. Otome explained this decision in her term paper as follows:
As I described, I could not find what I was interested in because I did only chores (at the travel agency). Therefore, I could not relate my work to the Inter-Cultural Communication that I was learning about in my class. When I considered my chores and the way that my work could be related to my class subject, I noticed that there are 3 English speakers in the office. I was interested in how they managed with a lot of Japanese speakers. However, since they were all doing their personal jobs and Japanese speakers spoke to English speakers in English, I could not find a big communication barrier between them. I supposed that Japanese speakers felt a little anxious when they spoke in English and English speakers found them (themselves) being a little isolated. As I was interested in finding their real feelings, I did research on Japanese and English speakers after my work finished. (term paper, 2000, pp. 2-3, emphasis added)

Otome and Chie incorporated findings from this study into their presentation. Thus, as active agents, Otome and Chie acted beyond the structure of their task (Heath, 2000a).

7.4.2.1 Otome’s Apprehension

Several days before her Semester 1 presentation, Otome expressed in her audio-journal her apprehension about the end-of-semester presentation.

Well, I’m not confident (about my task performance). You know, everyone was remembering very well what he or she was supposed to say, right? They were not reading from their notes. But I feel nervous about doing it (speaking without reading from my notes) in front of the class. Well, I will do whatever I can do anyway. I am extremely busy now; for example, I have to do the assignment for Cary’s class. But I will do my best anyway. That’s all I have to report now. Bye. [original in Japanese] (audio-journal, November 18, 2000)

By this time, Otome had seen most groups’ presentations since her group’s presentation was scheduled for the final day. As the above excerpt suggests, having noticed that many of her classmates did not read their notes in their presentations, she felt under pressure, wondering if she had to give her speech without looking at her notes. Otome then started to practice reading her manuscripts in order to learn them by heart.

After serious consideration, Otome chose to do a combination of memorized and manuscript delivery (Beebe & Beebe, 2000) so as to “tell the audience as accurately as
possible” about her groups’ activities and thoughts (interview, November 23, 2000).

During her task performance, Otome occasionally looked down to read her manuscript.

When she was not looking at her manuscript, she appeared to be looking at one point in
the air, trying to remember her lines. However, this strategy was not free from cost.

Excerpt 7.26 is an example taken from Otome’s presentation.

Excerpt 7.26

Otom: On the other hand, (0.6) English speakers should - inform, (0.6) Japanese speakers of
their feelings, - and discuss (2.3) discuss sorry, ((smiles and looks at her manuscript))
(0.6) discuss - ((laughing bashfully)) in- in order to (0.8) change office con:
circumstances better to- better for work. (1.6) And then, they - will be interested in each
other, (1.5) uh - ((laughing)) interested in parts, ((back in her regular voice)) (0.5) where
they didn’t know before, and “recognize and value each other.” (Class 1, November 23,
2000)

In this example, Otome was giving her speech from her memory. As her
repetition of the word *discuss* suggests, she forgot her lines and looked at her script;
however, she could not figure out soon where she was on the manuscript. She had this
kind of memory problem several times during her presentation. In her audio-journal, she
reflected as follows:

Excerpt 7.27

Well, I was nervous. I couldn’t help speaking very fast. When I forgot what to say and
stopped, my mind went blank. And I was like, “What was the word? Yeah this is it.” It
was like I spoke again and stopped again. The presentation was not a speech I made in
English while thinking (how to say what I had to say). It seems that I only said what I had
remembered, rather than thinking about the content in English. It was rather delivering
what I had remembered. [original in Japanese] (November 23, 2000)

Thus, what Otome did for the Semester 1 task was similar to the recitation and reading of
a written text. Importantly, her partner Chie approached the task in a similar way.

7.4.2.2 Connecting Theory and Practice

As mentioned earlier, Otome and Chie’s primary concern was to draw
connections between their observations and the content of the textbook. In Excerpt 7.28,
which is part of the discussion section of their presentation, they make a number of references to the textbook content. For example, Chie quotes the author Jandt (1998) ("Textbook said - mentioned...") to provide a definition of the cultural dominance model. Both Chie and Otome appropriate this definition in their subsequent speech. Moreover, their use of terms such as communication barriers, cultural diversity, and intercultural communicators, indicates intertextual links to content of the textbook.

Excerpt 7.28

1 Chie: As we mentioned (1.2) we researched if Japanese speakers find any - communication barriers because they are working in a different culture. (0.9) But (2.0) but (1.7) most of them (1.2) didn't find any communication barriers. And only uh minority of- uh minority English speakers do. (3.0) We think it's same to the uh: type of culture dominance model. Textbook said- mentioned that (1.9) the culture dominance model "neither recognize nor values - about values culture diversity." [an excerpt from Jandt's (1998, p. 447) book.] Look at this diagram. ((showing a diagram on OHP)) Bi- the biggest circle (1.3) shows uh majority of a culture. And small circle shows subgroup of a- of the culture. And - if they - "neither recognize nor - value the other's culture diversity," it can be said that there is- there is culture's dominance model between them. And in the case of XYZ, (2.0) umm we found- find that - Japanese speakers didn't recognize that there're- there're cultural diversity, in their office. So: we think - the case of XYZ can be said - a type of culture dominance model. (4.6)

2 Otom: Next, - we will suggest (0.6) how they can - remove this barriers at XYZ, and what it will take for XYZ office worker to be a good intercultural communicators? (0.6) [Izzat: Mm-hmm.] First of all, they should remove the type of that dominance- uh cultural dominance model, (0.5) and "recognize and value them- value each other." (1.2) And Japanese speakers should (0.5) put themselves in English speakers' place, (0.5) and consider removing (0.4) their isolation. (1.1) (Class 1, November 23, 2000)

As the following feedback suggests, Otome and Chie's discussion was well received by their teacher. As a matter of fact, the students received an A+ for their presentation.

Excerpt 7.29

Izzat: Most importantly I liked the way that you're able to umm connect (0.8) w- what you learned in the text - to what you learned in your volunteering experiences. And uh to the degree that you're even able to uh suggest - a model. You're able to interpret uh the:
situation at umm XYZ to understand that as a cultural dominance model. And also able to suggest a better model for them to have so that they can improve the situation there. Umm that’s very good. (Class 1, November 23, 2000)

Likewise, Otome commented on the presentation in her audio-journal as follows:

**Excerpt 7.30**

I think our presentation was perhaps good because the content was connected to intercultural communication. As I had expected, I felt nervous while presenting. I [inadvertently] skipped some parts. Yeah. But I know that we got about 90 [for the task] and ([using polite register jokingly]) it seems to me that our presentation was fine...((back in regular register)) Well, maybe it was not a kind of presentation that a regular Canadian or fluent speaker of English is capable of giving. But ((using polite register jokingly)) I am happy that it turned out to be a good piece of research, nonetheless. (audio-journal, November 2000)

In sum, Otome was aware of the importance of not depending heavily on her notes in order to make strong eye contact with her audience. But apprehensive about not reading and missing important information, she chose to do a combination of manuscript and memorized delivery. She was satisfied with the research but dissatisfied with her task performance.

**7.4.3 Semester 2 Presentation**

For the Semester 2 project, Otome chose to work with Ringo again. Because of Ringo’s strong interest in anthropology, the students decided to investigate the socialization of children in a First Nations community. Their focus was on a particular practice, namely, the practice of people saying, “I’m proud of who I am,” before finishing their speech in a talking circle.

As reported earlier, Otome was dissatisfied with the way in which she delivered her speech for the Semester 1 presentation. To improve her interaction with the audience, Otome did not write a manuscript this time. Instead, she prepared transparencies and did
a combination of talking and reading delivery. Table 7.3 juxtaposes Otome’s spoken utterances with her sentences shown on the transparencies. Again, boldface is used to signify relatively spontaneous parts of her speech. Obviously, there is a greater amount of spontaneous speech here than in the last three presentations. Otome said that she did not think that she could have done this even if she had tried, appreciating her own L2 development.

Table 7.3: Comparison of Written and Spoken Utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OHP</th>
<th>Spoken Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC children who live on reserve gather to the community center on every Tuesdays and they dance, sing and listen to the story.</td>
<td>So we could see ABC Nations, (2.2) and - ABC children who live on reserve (0.9) gather [[to]] the- the community center [[on]] every Tuesdays. [[and]] - They dance, sing, like traditional dancing, and singing uh son- songs, and listen to the story - like ABC Nation original stories or fairy tales. (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They make a circle and each child has to say something like “What is my name,” “where I come from” and “how I feel now”.</td>
<td>And - in the meeting - they made a circle - like circle. And uh which is called talking circle. And - each - children has to say something like - what is my name - where I come from - and how I feel now. I will give you example (0.6) umm the girl- one- the girls of - the one girl of uh, one - children- chau77 [no] - one child of - them uh the name is whatever. And - she said - she come from ABC. And - she talk about weather. Like - this- today is nice weather. And she talk about - umm today’s - today I had a good time at school or something like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We heard all of them said “I am proud of who I am” at the end of their speech.</td>
<td>And - at that- that time - we heard all of them said - I’m proud of who I am. Umm at the end of their speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We both got curious about the phase and decided to focus on “socialization” of ABC Nations.</td>
<td>So - we got both curious - about the phrase - and wondered do they chose to say - I’m proud of who I am? Or the adult - the ABC adult - made them do so. So we decided to - focus on - socialization of ABC Nations. (2.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another noticeable change to Otome’s task performance was that she employed questions to interact with the audience for the first time. In Excerpt 7.31, Otome shows

---

76 Ringo did not write her speech this time, either, although she depended heavily on her manuscripts for the poster and Semester 1 presentations.

77 This seems to be private speech that Otome used to regulate her own L2 production.
the name of the community center that they visited, which consisted only of several
numbers and alphabets. In Line 1, Otome asks Wataru to read the name. In Line 4,
Wataru indicates that he does not know how to read it. Otome then prompts him to give it
a try.

Excerpt 7.31

1 Otom: Okay. Thank you Ringo. (3.4) So next I will talk about (1.0) what we did for our
research. (2.3) After we decided umm research about First Nations - we coul- we
couldn’t narrow down our topics. (1.2) But fortunately (0.6) umm we - when we talk
about (1.2) umm First Nations to Mr. Yamamoto (0.8) Mr. Yamamoto invited us to
go to see ABC Nations. (1.1) Se we could have a chance to go to ABC Nations
community center in [[City A]]. (1.6) And this is the - community center’s name.
Wataru - can you pronounce it?

2 Rin: ((smiles))

3 Izzat: ((laughs)) Ha-ha-ha.

4 Wata: ((laughs)) It’s impossible.

5 Otom: Try it.

6 Wata: Mm - I know the - yeah it seems uh alphabet, but the pronunciation is totally
different.

7 Izzat: [(x) -

8 Otom: [Oh don’t worry. We can’t pronounce it either.

9 Class: ((laugh))

10 Wata: Ah: ((laughs)) (Class 1, March 29, 2001)

As her utterances in Line 8 indicate, neither Otome nor Ringo knew how to read
the name. As it was only a few minutes before their group presentation that Otome and
Ringo realized this, they did not have a chance to check with the contact person of the
community. Hearing Ringo say, “Someone might know,” Otome decided to first ask the
audience if anyone knew how to read the name. At that time, she saw it a chance to
interact with her audience. Otome later said, “I thought that I should ask questions like
other groups to make our presentation interesting” [original in Japanese] (interview, March 29, 2001).

Interestingly, as the above excerpt shows, Otome changed her plan and asked Wataru, a particular individual, rather than addressing the question to the entire audience. After the presentation, Otome said that she thought that Wataru would not mind even if he did not know how to read it. Wataru was one of the most active students in the Keishin community, and served the group as a class representative throughout the year. He was very social and likeable, and often played the role of a “clown.” According to Dörnyei and Murphey (2003), clowns are needed in a classroom community because they “bring in humour, which helps the group relax and attend to the task” (p. 116). Otome was familiar with Wataru’s characters and roles in the Keishin community since they had known each other since their ELI studies in the summer. What is intriguing about the above excerpt then is that Otome made an informed choice as to whom to ask her question so as to make her speech more interactive and enjoyable.

At the final class meeting of Language Fieldwork B, Izzat asked her students to reflect on their learning. In this reflection session, each student had a chance to share with the class what they had learned from the course. Excerpt 7.32 is an excerpt from Otome’s reflection.

**Excerpt 7.32**

1 Otom: Umm I - learned a lot of things from this course like others. But I want- can I - umm can I tell you about what I learned from the - two presentation?

2 Izzat: Yes, yes. [Definitely!]

3 Otom: Umm - when I did - presentation last term, I - I thought - I was thinking - umm what is the mo- one of - the most uh, most one of the most important - things to attract - listeners is - eye contact. I thought. <Izzat: H:mm.> So I - like made a
This excerpt seems to summarize Otome's learning across presentations. Initially, she was primarily concerned to report on her groups' research findings and thinking processes. In other words, her major focus was on ideational reflection. As such, she tried to reconstruct her written speech as accurately as possible, depending heavily on her manuscripts. However, as she listened to her teacher's explanations of the task and observed others' (especially her classmates') task performances, she became increasingly aware of the importance of interacting with the audience. To improve her interactional aspects of her task performance, Otome made up her mind to give her Semester 2 presentation, depending less on the help of written language. Here, it is important to note that Otome chose to talk about her learning through the oral presentations in the reflection session above. In other words, her engagement in these tasks seemed to have been one of her most meaningful learning experiences during her studies at WPU.
7.5 Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, we have examined the learning pathways taken by the four original key students across tasks and contexts. More specifically, we have studied their learning about and learning from oral academic presentations over time. Relevant to this examination was Rogoff’s (1990, 1993, 1995) notion of participatory appropriation. According to Rogoff (1995), “A person who participate in events changes in ways that makes a difference in subsequent events” (p. 156). An analysis of the data, including their task-related discourse, interviews, and audio-journal entries, has suggested that the students changed in many ways through their engagement in their presentations and related activities. For example, Tomo noticed Izzat’s use of a particular L2 expression (i.e., “be qualified to”) in his interaction with her during his group’s Semester 1 presentation. He then looked it up in his dictionary and used it in his term paper. Similarly, Nana noticed that her partner thanked her for informing the audience of her content. Three months later, she remembered this practice and suggested to her new partners that they adopt it in their Semester 1 presentation. Thus, both Tomo and Nana, as active agents, perceived and acted upon particular properties of their environment that were relevant to them as habitants in that environment (van Lier, 2000). Importantly, these critical incidents were identified with the help of the students’ retrospections.

Another important change had to do with their emergent roles as relative old-timers. For example, Nana initially did not see why Kiku put a great emphasis on the performance aspects of the oral presentation task; however, she came to see its value over time, and took leadership especially in rehearsing her group’s Semester 2 presentation, thus assuming the peer-coaching role performed by Kiku in their Semester 1 project.
work. As his model presentation and written comments on his classmates’ task performance suggest, Kiku seemed to have developed a theoretical understanding of the task and ways of speaking and writing as a relative old-timer as he repeatedly observed his teacher give feedback on his classmates’ task performances and his own.

Otome’s transformation was even more dramatic. She chose to participate differently in the oral presentations as her understanding of the task changed over time. Like many other students, she constructed and reconstructed her understanding of what it meant to do a “good” oral presentation as she observed others’ presentations, prepared and performed presentations with her partners, and reflected on her own performances by herself through her audio and written journals, as well as with others in class and at her group meetings and at the interviews for the present study. In addition, Otome learned to make intertextual connections between her observations and references including the course textbook, which was a valued practice in the classroom community (Bloom & Bailey, 1992).

Furthermore, students seemed to have learned other cultural aspects of task preparation. For example, from their experience with the poster session, both Kiku and Tomo learned that it was vital for them to make sure that they knew what they were required to do by looking at their course outlines. Having observed her partner’s task performance, Otome realized the importance of spending time rehearsing her speech. From his experience of working with Tomo, Kiku found that setting an agenda at the beginning of a group meeting was instrumental in staying on task and work efficiently.
Chapter 8

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

8.0 Introduction

Drawing upon sociocultural perspectives, this dissertation explored undergraduate ESL students’ discourse socialization through group project work during their year-long studies in a study abroad program at a Canadian university. More specifically, by using a longitudinal, ethnographic case study approach, the study attempted to yield a holistic understanding of the academic project work in which Japanese university students engaged both in and out of class time to undertake their public, in-class, oral presentation tasks as required by their sheltered content course. The study also attempted to uncover the learning opportunities that this participation made available for the students and the personal transformations that resulted by providing snapshots of their activities and records of their voices at different stages. The research did not seek to interpret Japanese students’ behaviors by imposing a predetermined metacultural perspective that might have essentialized Japanese culture or Canadian culture in ways that were not made explicit by participants, Keishin staff, or other sources of data.

This qualitative investigation was guided by the following questions:

(1) What is the nature of the institutional and classroom culture in which ESL undergraduate students perform their oral academic presentations? How is this task environment organized?

(2) What are some of the features of a valued (or “good”) academic oral presentation as perceived by the teachers and students?

(3) How do students exercise their agency to undertake their presentation tasks? What are the consequences of these agentive acts?

(4) How do students, through their participation in an academic oral presentation, become prepared for their subsequent participation in similar or related activities?
The major purpose of this chapter is to synthesize the findings of the study as presented in the last four chapters. I will first summarize the major findings of the study and relate them to the theoretical and research literature on learning and socialization. I will then discuss implications for L2 theory and pedagogy, and suggest possible directions for future studies.

8.1 Summary and Discussion of Major Findings

8.1.1 Teachers as Organizers of the Task Environment

As we have seen in Chapter 4, one important feature of the Language Fieldwork course was its careful organization of tasks and projects. With the goal of gradually initiating her students into the academic culture of WPU and possibly other universities, the instructor carefully sequenced the projects in such a way that students’ choices and responsibilities increased over time (Rogoff, 1984; van Lier, 1988, 1996, 2004). As discussed in Chapter 2, this is the principle of handover on which the notion of scaffolding is based. According to van Lier (2004), handover can take place not only at the micro-level of social interaction, but also at more macro-levels of task sequencing. This indeed was clearly demonstrated by Izzat in her teaching practice. For the poster project, students had a relatively limited choice about their tasks as the medium (i.e., poster) and topic (i.e., nonverbal communication) of the task were pre-determined by the instructor. For the Semester 1 project, students were required to make presentations based on their volunteer work and relate their observations to topics and issues from lectures and readings although they were relatively free to decide which aspects of the subject to focus on and to choose what medium to use for their presentation. For the Semester 2 presentation, they had the freedom to investigate any topic in social science and
education in any way deemed appropriate. Hence, it was up to the students to decide how to collect data and what roles to play in their fieldwork.

Also, at a more micro-level, the tasks within a project were sequenced in such a way that earlier tasks helped build a context for later ones (Mohan, 1990, 2001; see also Collins & Green, 1992; Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992). For example, for the Semester 1 project, students were required for the course to keep field journals, to which the instructor provided written feedback. As reported in Chapter 5, Kiku, Nana, Koyuki, and Tomo and their partners made use of these records to undertake their oral presentations—and some subsequently also listened to their research-related audio-journals to help them write their fieldwork journals and reports. Many other groups likewise reported on their use of the field journals and comments from the teacher in their preparation of their presentations. Thus, students’ completion of the journal-writing task for the teacher and the researcher seems to have been instrumental in their undertaking of the oral presentation task. Importantly, the students’ use of the written feedback suggests that the instructor played a vital role in helping create a ZPD in their learning activities outside the classroom in which she was not physically present (what Rogoff 1995 calls a “distal” arrangement). Moreover, the instructor and TA assisted their students with their oral presentations in many other ways. For instance, Izzat explained the purposes and requirements of the tasks on a number of occasions, drawing the students’ attention to the course outline. Abraham gave a model presentation and gave the students advice about how to give a “good” oral presentation. In sum, the instructor considered the goal of the course to apprentice Keishin students into the academic culture of the university by providing them with scaffolded experiences engaging in the valued activities of this
culture. As such, together with the TA, she attempted to guide her students' participation in the oral presentations by designing the course based on the principle of handover (van Lier, 1988, after Bruner, 1983) as well as by providing various kinds of assistance (e.g., giving models and explicit explanations of the task).

8.1.2 Features of a Valued Oral Presentation

The examination of the data, including interviews with students and teachers, their classroom and non-classroom discourse, and the course outlines, has indicated that the participants considered that a “good” oral presentation had the features captured in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: Features of a “Good” Oral Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Critical reflection</td>
<td>Go beyond the mere description of experiences and observations. Explain reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevance to the course</td>
<td>Draw explicit connections to topics and issues from the lectures and course materials and demonstrate learning from the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• References</td>
<td>Use relevant, credible information to support ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New information</td>
<td>Present something new to the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audience engagement and involvement</td>
<td>Speak from notes, rather than reading from notes. Interact with the audience by making eye contact, asking questions, role-playing, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance</td>
<td>Speak clearly and confidently to present the self positively. Vary tone of voice (intonation) and rate of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity of speech</td>
<td>Avoid expressions that might cause confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organization</td>
<td>Present information in a logical progression. Present an outline of the talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation aids</td>
<td>Use appropriate presentation materials and tools (e.g., OHP, PowerPoint, handouts, posters, photographs, drawings, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transitions between speakers</td>
<td>Make smooth transitions between speakers (e.g., introduce the next speaker and acknowledge the previous speaking for the introduction).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By the end of the academic year, the information presented in Table 8.1 seemed to have become part of the “common knowledge” (Edwards & Mercer, 1987) of the Language Fieldwork community; however, not all participants valued these features to the same degree (see Morita, 2000, for a similar finding). For example, the instructor often emphasized in class the importance of presentations, including critical reflection, relevance to the course, and speaking (as opposed to reading) delivery. Many students commented on the importance of presenting something new to the audience in a unique fashion to draw and engage their attention as well as on the need to speak clearly and loudly to get across their points to the audience. Interestingly, Izzat commented in her reflective interview that she was pleasantly surprised to see some groups make creative and effective use of role playing to communicate their messages, suggesting students’ contribution to the teacher’s perception of a “good” oral presentation.

8.1.3 Student Agency and Collaboration in Task Preparation and Performance

The present study has shown that to accomplish their presentation tasks, students made use of a variety of tools and resources, including L1/L2 oral discourse and L2 written texts (e.g., the course outline, field journals, textbooks), electronic bilingual dictionaries, the PowerPoint Program, each other’s ideas and knowledge, and even the presence of the researcher. This indicates the interdependence of spoken and written language in the groups’ task preparation. Morita (2000) argues that since the oral presentations observed in her study were based on written material, they can be considered as literacy events or “occasions in which written language is integral to the nature of the participants’ interactions and their interpretive processes and strategies”
(Heath, 1986, p. 98). A similar argument can be made about the task-preparatory activities as well as the actual presentation observed in the present study since the key students and their partners made use of various written texts as discussed above. Their task preparation can thus be viewed as a series of speech and literacy events in which they jointly constructed the language, content, and performance of their presentation. Such a view seems to provide an important window on the complex nature of the interrelationships between spoken and written language in classroom and non-classroom task-related interactions, but “has yet to be more than minimally reflected” in applied linguistics research (Poole, 2002, p. 77).

Most groups used Japanese as a major tool for their group discussion (cf., Futaba, 1994). This seems natural given that they all speak Japanese as an L1. As some previous studies (e.g., Duff, 2001; Liang, 1999) have shown, even in class time, students often opt to use their L1 when they all speak the same first language and may also be encouraged to do so by teachers. This may be even more likely when same-L1 students work together out of the classroom in the absence of the teacher. In fact, most of the student participants in the present study (23 pairs or groups out of 25 for Semester 1 tasks) reported that they used Japanese in their group meetings for similar reasons to those given by Liang’s Chinese participants. For example, many students said that they would “feel weird” about speaking English to their peers knowing that they also speak Japanese. Likewise, Otome and Ringo both commented that they could not imagine speaking to each other in English when working out of class time on their projects because they did not see it as part of their relationship. Ringo said, “We have been friends long (five months) before we came to Canada and have always spoken to each other in Japanese especially when there are
only two of us. For us, speaking English is just out of the question” [original in Japanese] (interview, April 18, 2001). Hence, their choice of language was shaped by their established relationship and shared history of communication.

Another major reason for students’ use of L1 was that under tremendous time pressure, they wanted to move group work forward as efficiently as possible and accomplish tasks with less frustration and in a cognitively more complex manner than they would if they spoke only English. While there was a tacit agreement about use of L1 among members of most groups, a few groups seem to have negotiated which language to use for their group meetings.

Like other groups, Kiku and Nana’s group and Koyuki and Tomo’s group used Japanese in all phases of their task preparation. In the first several hours of the preparation, they negotiated task definitions and shared their field experiences to find common themes, looking at the course outline and their own field journals with the teacher’s comments, respectively. In other words, they negotiated the definitions of the tasks, teacher expectations, and possible content of their speech primarily in their L1 to develop a shared understanding of the task and build common ground for subsequent group activities. Here, one may wonder why they spent so much time in this phase of their preparation. One possible explanation is that unlike other tasks used in many previous studies (see, for example, Futaba, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 2000), the presentation tasks examined in the present study did not provide the students with pre-made texts, written passages, or pictures. For instance, as each student did at least ten hours of fieldwork for the Semester 1 presentation, a group of three had at least thirty hours of experience to make sense of. As well, the tasks seemed to be cognitively more
demanding since they required students to go beyond mere descriptions of their field experiences and observations and relate them to the academic content of the course.

After hours of experience sharing and meaning negotiation, Kiku and Nana's and Koyuki and Tomo's groups started to make a PowerPoint document and talked about the language of their presentation. This is congruent with Swain and Lapkin's (2000) view that a key to focus-on-form is a writing component (see also Wells, 1999a, 2000). In a similar vein, Scribner (1997) states:

Writing separates our language from us and sets it in the outer world, making it available for inspection and contemplation by its creator as well as by others. In this way language itself becomes an object upon which we work, not merely an instrumentality through which we work to gain other (non-language) ends. (p. 166)

Furthermore, Mercer, Philips, and Somekh (1991) state with respect to the potential values of the computer as an educational resource that "the screen presentation facilitates a sharing of information and provides a source of contextual reference for shared knowledge and activity in a way that written texts cannot" (cited in Lockwood, 2001, p. 134). Thus, the PowerPoint program seems to have served as a tool for establishing and sustaining a shared focus among the students and made available their L2 production for joint inspection and contemplation by themselves. The importance of writing is also evidenced by the collaborative dialogue that Koyuki had with her partners about how to make a conditional using the word however. In that example, the students communicated primarily through L1 oral discourse to solve the problem; however, without recourse to a written text, they failed to create intersubjectivity, thus leaving Koyuki's question unsolved. According to Wells (1999a), it is in this type of situation in

---

78 Here, Mercer et al. (1991) apparently use the term written text to refer to writing on paper as opposed to computer-assisted writing. However, I use the term to refer to both.
which writing can provide “such a powerful mediating technology, enabling the group as well as the individual writer to make real progress in knowledge building” (p. 151). In other words, a written text can serve as the “improvable object” that both gives the focus for the knowledge-building dialogue and concretizes the progress being made (Wells, 1999a, 2000).

As research reports, the oral presentations required students to critically reflect on their fieldwork. Major sub-activities included explaining the rationale for the study, displaying newly gained information and knowledge, reporting participants’ voices, and connecting theory to practice. During these processes, students made various efforts to self-regulate their performance, including the use of notes (both individual and group), self-repetition, and the use of private speech. For example, Kiku and Nana’s group used group notes that included not only the outline of the talk, but also self-addressed utterances to remind themselves of what to pay attention to.

Also, as we have seen mainly in Chapter 6, students collaborated in a variety of ways in their actual presentations. For one thing, many students made use of transitions to hand over the floor to their peers scheduled to speak next. The teacher’s and students’ comments suggest that these transitions help to not only organize the presentations, but also demonstrate to the audience that they actually collaborated. In addition to this overt collaboration, some groups employed L1 backstage talk. Interestingly, Kiku made use of this talk to covertly give his group members advice on their performance. Otome and Ringo covertly reconfirmed their task procedure in Japanese immediately before they started their poster presentation (Chapter 7). These data provide more evidence of how use of L1 assists students’ accomplishment of L2 tasks. Another type of collaboration
was the joint production of utterances. When a member of a presenting group had difficulty producing L2 utterances, other members sometimes provided assistance, thus jointly constructing the speech.

In their presentations, students employed a variety of verbal and behavioral strategies to involve their audience and organize their talk. Their use of involvement strategies included the use of small talk, questions directed toward the audience, role-playing, demonstration, and story reading, many of which were accompanied by the use of interactive resources such as imperatives and interrogatives that helped create contingency. To organize their talk, more groups gave a verbal and/or written outline at the beginning of their presentation in Semester 2 than in Semester 1. Furthermore, some students referred to previous events, trying to build on the common ground that their audience might have shared with them. Importantly, such use of intertextuality was often made by the teacher in her teaching, and thus seemed to be a valued discursive practice of the classroom community.

Furthermore, the analysis of the data has shown that the students' oral presentations were not only end products of group project work, but also jointly constructed processes of negotiation and meaning making between the presenters and audience members. For instance, the instructor, as a major socializing agent, played a variety of roles both during and after the presentations. These included a negotiator of meaning, a provider of appropriate language and explanations, and a source of humor. Student-members of the audience also contributed to the task performance. Some members asked the presenters questions and gave them comments while others participated less overtly by smiling, laughing, looking up unknown words in their
dictionaries, and responding to the presenters in their minds. Data analysis has suggested that students’ questions might have served as models for their peers in learning both how to and how not to respond to classmates’ presentations.

8.1.4 Student Appropriation and Transformation

In Chapter 7, we examined the learning pathways taken by the four original key students across tasks and contexts by framing them in terms of the notion of participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 1993, 1995, 2003). This examination has yielded some principal findings. The first has to do with contingency across contexts. For example, the analysis of the data has shown how Tomo made use of his cognitive uptake from his Semester 1 presentation for his written report. He noticed Izzat’s use of a particular L2 expression (i.e., “be qualified to”) in his interaction with her during his group presentation. He later consulted his dictionary for the usage of the expression and used it in his term paper. Similarly, Nana noticed that her partner thanked her for informing the audience of her content. Still remembering this three months later, she suggested to Kiku and Shingo that they adopt it in their Semester 1 presentation, and the students agreed that this would be a good way to avoid “awkward” silence between turns. Thus, both Tomo and Nana, as active agents, acted upon linguistic properties of their environment that they had perceived (van Lier, 1997, 2000), suggesting a high degree of attentiveness to their interlocutors’ turns (van Lier, 1992, 1996). However, in this case, contingency was realized not within the interaction, but across contexts since neither of the students’ actions took place immediately after their perceptions of the linguistic features.

According to Bakhtin (1986),

an utterance is not always followed immediately by an articulated response. An actively responsive understanding of what is heard…can remain, for the time
being, a silent responsive understanding... but this is, so to speak, responsive understanding with a delayed reaction. Sooner or later what is heard and actively understood will find its response in the subsequent speech or behavior of the listener (pp. 68-69).

In this view, both Tomo’s and Nana’s actions can be seen as delayed reactions that represented their responsive understanding of previously heard utterances. It then follows that researchers may need to trace participants’ task-related actions and interactions across contexts.

Secondly, students’ understanding of and participation in the oral presentations changed over time. For instance, Nana initially did not see why Kiku put a great emphasis on the performance aspects of the oral presentation task; however, she came to see its value over time, and took leadership especially in rehearsing her group’s Semester 2 presentation, thus assuming the peer-coaching role performed by Kiku in their Semester 1 project work. As his model presentation and written comments on his classmates’ task performance suggest, Kiku seemed to have developed a theoretical understanding of the task and ways of speaking and writing as a relative old-timer, based on repeated observations of his teacher’s feedback on his classmates’ task performances and his own.

Otome chose to participate differently in oral presentations as her understanding of the task changed over time. Like many other students, she constructed and reconstructed her understanding of what it meant to do a “good” oral presentation as she observed others’ task performances, prepared and performed presentations with her partners, and reflected on her own performances on a number of occasions. In her final presentation, she was less dependent upon written language and demonstrated a higher degree of self-regulation. However, this is not to say that Otome would not give speech

79 A similar argument can be made about Yoshino’s self-correction reported in Chapter 6.
from memory or manuscripts again. In fact, as the principle of continuing access (Frawley & Lantolf, 1985) suggests, she might use her old strategies when faced with a more challenging presentation task even in the same context or if she had another chance to give the same presentation in a different context. She had simply expanded her repertoire of delivery methods. Therefore, the ultimate challenge for her and other presenters, for that matter, would be to select and use a delivery method that is deemed most appropriate to the context in which they are to give a talk. In addition, Otome learned to make intertextual connections between her observations and references including the course textbook, which was one of the socioculturally valued practices of the classroom community. Otome’s learning through her repeated engagement involved learning to make intertextual connections between her observations and references, understanding what the valued methods are for orally presenting her experiences, ideas and herself, and understanding what counts as credible sources of information (see Bloom & Bailey, 1992, for a relevant discussion).

These findings indicate that while all the students learned from their observation of and participation in oral presentations, they benefited differently from their respective experiences. Relevant to this point is Gibson’s (1979) notion of affordance. According to van Lier (2000), an affordance refers to “a particular property of the environment that is relevant--for good or for ill--to an active, perceiving organism in that environment” (p. 252); as such, what becomes an affordance depends on what each agent does, what she desires, what is useful and relevant for her (van Lier, 2000). Following this view, it can be argued that different students, as active agents, perceived, acted upon, and interacted with different properties of their environment relevant to them.
8.2 Major Theoretical Contributions

The present study offers important contributions to the theories of L2 learning and socialization. As we have seen in Chapters 1 and 2, many task-based studies to date have isolated different demands of tasks to examine the L2 use and cognitive processing in which individuals engaged as they performed different tasks under different conditions. While these studies have contributed greatly to our knowledge about the microprocesses of L2 users' discourse within tasks, they have not had much to say about the macroprocesses weaving together these tasks (Mohan & Marshall Smith, 1992). To yield a holistic understanding of Keishin students' L2 academic discourse socialization through group project work, I adopted Rogoff's (1995, 1998, 2003) three-plane analysis of activity as a major conceptual framework in the present study. As discussed in Chapter 2, Rogoff views learning and development as a dynamic process of changing participation in the sociocultural activities of a given community. This dissertation has documented the process of student participation in the literacy event of project development and project presentation, thus going beyond the micro-level of a brief task (the focus of many previous task-based studies). Also, Rogoff suggests that such participation takes places on three planes that are inseparable: personal, interpersonal, and community. The personal plane analysis (mainly reported in Chapter 7) allowed the present study to trace learning pathways taken across presentation tasks and related events by some of the key students; the interpersonal plane analysis (mainly reported in Chapters 5 & 6) allowed the study to focus on the interpersonal collaboration among different participants in the Keishin program; and the community plane analysis (reported mainly in Chapter 4) shed useful light on the beliefs, values, and practices of the focal classroom community. These
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analyses together allowed us to produce rich, multi-layered accounts of students' learning and socialization through their oral academic tasks as sociohistorically situated amidst classroom and non-classroom discourse and other activities that constituted the ecology of the community. Nothing along this line has previously been attempted in such detail.

Moreover, the present study has two important implications for the theory of language socialization. The first has to do with the ecology of tasks. As discussed earlier, language socialization is claimed to take place through repeated experiences in assuming various social roles in recurrent activities that promote particular language use and communicative behaviors associated with those roles. As such, many previous studies have examined newcomers' repeated engagement in particular activities such as oral presentations. Undoubtedly, such participation was an important locus for the discourse socialization of the students in the present study (Chapter 7); however, my analysis of contingency and intertextuality has shown that their participation in oral presentations was also shaped by their previous and future activities, including observations of model task performance and writing of journals and research reports. To borrow Rogoff's (1995) words, "Any event in the present is an extension of previous events and is directed toward goals that have not yet been accomplished. As such, the present extends through the past and future and cannot be separated from them" (p. 155). Thus, studies of language socialization would benefit from an ecological perspective that considers the relationships between tasks and between student participation in one activity and in another.

Secondly, while many socialization accounts have tended to equate learning and development with the transmissions of and adaptation to the values and practices of a
target community (see Packer, 2001; Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996), the personal and interpersonal plane analyses of the present study have shown how students both individually and jointly shaped their activities by making decisions and taking actions with respect to their tasks, or, conversely, by not engaging with particular components of their tasks, thus highlighting the selective nature of student agency in language socialization (see also Duff, 2002b; Morita, 2002). Furthermore, based on this finding, one could call into question the metaphor of apprenticeship proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991) if one sees this process as apprentices' complete and precise reproduction of their masters' models. Apprentices in traditional fields such as tailoring are presumably expected to perform as their masters expect them to, and not much variation is tolerated in this participation or in the ultimate outcome of the activities. The goal is for the apprentices to achieve the status of masters (or competent practitioners), emulating the skills of their masters, not transforming past practices into new ones (J. P. Lantolf, personal communication, September 15, 2004). In contrast, while guided by their teachers, students in the present study exercised their agency in a variety of ways to undertake their tasks, and this variation in participation and outcomes was in fact encouraged by their teacher. This observation suggests that students' activities in educational settings like the present one may be more dynamic and unpredictable than those of apprentices in other more traditional technical or manual work settings. The issue of whether apprenticeship has historically been a rigid reproduction of masters' skills or is, as this study has documented in one contemporary setting, a more creative and dynamic process of negotiation and transformation requires further empirical investigation.
8.3 Implications for Pedagogy

This study offers several main implications for L2 pedagogy. The first has to do with students’ use of L1 and L2. Data have shown that students used Japanese especially in early phases of their task preparation where they shared experiences and negotiated the content of their presentations. This suggests that the L1 might have served as a major tool for communication and joint thinking about the L2 task. For this reason, I believe, like Swain and Lapkin (2000), that students should not, in general, be prohibited from using their L1 even in classrooms. However, it would be ideal that given their goals to take non-sheltered courses with English-speaking peers, students expand their linguistic repertoire to learn to carry out discussions in English since doing group project work would probably mean working with peers of diverse cultural backgrounds, which would in turn require them to conduct negotiations and make a variety of decisions about their tasks and projects in English (see also Heath, 1998). As Excerpt 5.1 suggests, many students tended to speak more English in class than they did outside of class. Thus, it would seem beneficial to provide students with an opportunity to work on their projects in class time on a regular basis even for a brief period of time as well as an opportunity to discuss as a class both merits and demerits of using the L1 and L2, although it would still be up to the students to choose which language to use, even in classrooms.

The second implication relates to students’ task preparation. As reported earlier, not all groups worked as collaboratively and closely as Kiku and Nana’s and Koyuki and Tomo’s groups to prepare for their presentations. According to Chang-Wells and Wells (1994), “the strategies necessary for working collaboratively in a group, do not emerge spontaneously” (p. 73). At the same time, as the stories of Ichiro’s and Rei’s groups
clearly indicate, students’ group processes seemed to be shaped by the choices that they made as active agents with unique personal histories and beliefs as well as by the socio-educational context in which they were situated. However, as mentioned earlier, the findings of the present study point to the benefits of preparation for the oral presentation task. Because the oral presentations assigned to the students in the present study were intended to be group tasks rather than individual tasks, it seemed vital for members of a group to spend considerable time working together to jointly construct and reconstruct their task program if they wish to satisfy both their audience (i.e., teachers and peers) and themselves and to make the most out of the task.

Here, one might wonder how students could be encouraged to undertake such group tasks in the ways that Kiku and Nana’s and Koyuki and Tomo’s groups did, so that student learning gets maximum benefit. For one thing, teachers could give students opportunities to discuss what they appreciated about their classmates’ task performance and their own, including language, content, and delivery, and to share with other groups how they worked together to accomplish their task. Through such inter-group experience sharing and reflective discussions, students may be able to learn from each other’s experiences and may thus be in a better position to make informed choices for their future presentations.

Another way, which is perhaps specific to the present research context, is to give students a chance to make a group presentation with more experienced students. As reported in Chapters 4, 5, and 7, Keishin students were required to attend a series of pre-departure orientation sessions that were organized by the program director, a student advisor, and voluntary members of the previous group. During this orientation, students
had opportunities to observe a model presentation given by their senpai or seniors, to investigate different aspects of university life in Canada in groups, and make an oral presentation. If there are a sufficient number of volunteers from the previous group, it might be beneficial to assign a “senior” to each presentation group. By working side by side with a more experienced member, students may be in a better position to learn the valued practices of the community associated with oral presentations.

A third implication concerns the nature of students’ language use during presentations. As documented in Chapter 5 and earlier in this chapter, one feature of a valued presentation in the Keishin classroom community was the avoidance of difficult L2 expressions. One may argue that, although facilitating the audience’s comprehension, this practice might have prevented student members of the audience from being exposed to and thus learning more complex language (e.g., selfish vs. self-centered). What could be done to deal with this trade-off? One way would be to encourage students to approach their oral presentations as peer-teaching tasks (see Ellis, 2003) in which they could teach their peers language deemed new or difficult in the context of their presentations by providing synonyms, paraphrases, and so on. However, learning to speak plainly is not necessarily less valuable than peer-teaching about language forms; rather, as van Lier and Matsuo’s (2000) study suggests, these activities would afford different types of learning opportunities to students, both as presenters and audience members. Thus, it is up to teachers to decide if and when to foreground linguistic or metalinguistic aspects of tasks in the context of oral presentations and other instructional activities, depending on their overall objectives.
A fourth implication has to do students' use of intertextuality. The analysis of the data showed that many students made a variety of links to other texts and events, such as their textbooks, participants' interviews, and previous classroom events. However, only a few groups referred to other groups' presentations despite the fact that several groups talked about similar topics. For example, for the Semester 1 project, there were several groups who presented on their experience at a travel agency, but they never referred to each other's talk. This may be because many students were concerned about the "freshness" of information. In fact, many of these groups expressed their desire to give their presentations before the others because they were afraid that there might be nothing important and interesting left for them to say (see also Excerpt 6.46). However, if learning involves understanding the new in terms of the old (van Lier, 1996), then making intertextual links to ideas and issues from other presentations would be just as valuable as referring to the textbook content. Perhaps teachers could explain this and encourage students to respond to and act on what their classmates have said in their presentations. In this case, the teacher's job would be to help create contingency across presentations.

A fifth implication concerns presenters' awareness of their own language. This study has shown that by thinking together, the students were able to solve problems sometimes, but at other times, problems remained unsolved or even unnoticed. Swain (1998; see also Swain & Lapkin, 1998) has argued, "Teachers' availability during collaborative activities and their attention to the accuracy of the 'final' product subsequent to the completion of collaborative activities are potentially critical aspects of student learning" (p. 80). However, in the present case, since students' group work
occurred mainly outside the classroom, the teacher could not have been expected to make herself available. What, then, can be done to promote students’ language awareness? One possible way to encourage students’ focus-on-form would be to have them transcribe part of their own presentations or at least review videos of themselves (see also Morita, 2000) and discuss their own language production before they write their final papers. In fact, all of the key students commented that they had found reviewing their own task performance and verifying the transcripts while listening to their audio-recorded performance to be useful since these activities helped them notice their own problems, both verbal and nonverbal. Interestingly, while acknowledging the value of the former activity, especially in reflecting on their use of non-verbal resources, some students said that they had found the latter to be more helpful in identifying their grammatical and phonological problems because they were able to focus more attention on what they heard without being distracted by visual information.

Moreover, giving students a chance to listen to their audio-recorded performance or to review their video-recorded performance would have another benefit. As reported in Chapter 4, in Language Fieldwork, the oral presentation was intended to be an end product and, simultaneously, a step toward the written research report. As such, Izzat often encouraged her students to incorporate her comments into their final papers (Chapter 5). However, several students, including Koyuki, Otome, Ringo, and Sakura, said that standing in front of the entire class, they were very nervous and not sure if they had fully understood some of their teacher’s post-task comments. In fact, Ringo checked with me her understanding of what Izzat had said about her group’s Semester 1 presentation so that she could make use of the feedback in writing her term paper. Use of
audio- and video-recording could offer students a second chance to listen to their audience’s feedback and reactions as well as their own task performance.

8.4 Directions for Future Research

The present study investigated the activities of a particular group of students (i.e., Japanese undergraduate students) related to the oral presentation tasks. Therefore, studies with other groups of students doing similar types of tasks would provide us with further insights about L2 academic discourse socialization through oral presentations. Ethnographic case studies focusing on other types of tasks, including the co-authoring of a research report would make a valuable contribution to the literature on L2 learning and socialization. These data include audio and video-recorded group meetings, on-line interactions (i.e., email and instant messages), and field notes as well as drafts. Furthermore, as discussed earlier, the oral presentation tasks examined in the present study indeed required not only speaking and listening skills, but also a variety of literacies including reading, writing, and computer skills. However, many task-based L2 studies to date have focused on oral language production without paying much attention to links to literacy. Future studies could examine more closely how one’s participation in oral activities might contribute to one’s subsequent participation in writing/reading activities.

In addition, the present study only examined students’ participation in one course; however, the students were simultaneously taking other courses that required oral presentations. My data have shown that some students carried over practices that they learned from another course to the Language Fieldwork and, in some cases, received negative comments from their audience. For example, in their Semester 1 presentation,
Haru and Koki used handwritten transparencies. Recall that both Izzat and Abraham made it a custom to use computer-printed transparencies in their lessons (see Chapter 4). Haru said at the beginning of their talk that they regretted not having prepared computer-printed transparencies since they did not have enough time. Smiling, she added that this was what the teacher of another course did in her teaching. This remark provoked laughter and smiles in the audience including the instructor; however, several students commented at their email interviews that they would not do it themselves because handwritten transparencies were hard to read and did not look nice. Carrying over the writing practice of another classroom community, coupled with the former student's remark, was not particularly well received since the approach selected was perceived to be inferior to the ones being used in this course.

Nana was observed to share a similar experience with her partners for Semester 1 presentation. As we have seen in Chapters 5 and 6, students made use of repetition to stress their main points in their presentations. At one of their group meetings, Nana told her partners about her presentation for another course in which she had been told by the teacher that she sounded repetitive when she tried to repeat to emphasize her main points. These data suggest that there is a need to examine more closely how students' learning of tasks in one course may facilitate or hinder their learning of similar tasks in another course. Another important line of future research would be to examine how what students learned about oral presentations during their studies in their study-abroad contexts might shape their participation in similar activities in their home countries (e.g., Japan). Case studies examining students' preparation for and performance of particular tasks across
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80 This can be taken as an agentive act that Haru performed to legitimize her group's action which might otherwise be perceived to be "illegitimate" in the classroom culture.
courses and contexts would help us better understand the complex relationships among student agency, learning, and the classroom environments (see Morita, 2002, for an example).

What is more, most previous studies on contingency have focused primarily on synchronous, face-to-face communication (see Kinginger, 1994, for an examination of contingency in asynchronous written communication). However, as the present study has shown, students can act upon their cognitive uptake from interactions that they have previously had with their teachers and partners (Chapters 5 & 7), suggesting that their learning might have been produced as a result of cumulative effects of a number of activities and interactions in which they participate (van Lier, 1988; see also Mercer, 2000), rather than from their participation in one specific event or two. Such learning processes may not be directly observable or easily identifiable because they can take place in the absence of the researcher and/or privately as inner dialogues (Volosinov, 1973; see also Linell, 1998; Vygotsky, 1987). For this reason, future studies should continue to take a behind-the-scenes look at contingency across tasks and contexts by using a variety of methods including detailed analysis of discourse, interviews, and journal entries that would together allow for a consideration of both etic and emic perspectives.

Finally, the present study has documented how the instructor as a socializing agent organized the task environment in order to scaffold her students' participation. Another important line of future research, as van Lier (1988) suggests, is to continue to closely examine the ways in which tasks and classroom activities are structured based on the principle of handover. As Ellis (2000, 2003) suggests, whereas psycholinguistic task-
based L2 studies can contribute to the planning aspects of curriculum, sociocultural studies like the present one can contribute to the improvising (or implementing) aspects of the curriculum (van Lier, 1991, 1996). The latter type of research can enrich our understanding of L2 learning and socialization by continuing to examine the relationship between task ecology (Mohan, 1990, 2001) and students' guided participation (Rogoff, 1990, 1993, 1995).

8.5 Final Remarks

To conclude, I would like to state that conducting this study has made a great contribution to my growth as an L2 researcher and teacher. I hope that despite the small number of participants involved and the unique nature of the research context (i.e., a sheltered content course for Japanese undergraduate students), the present case study contributes meaningfully to our understanding of L2 socialization through group project work by providing for readers a rich, participant-informed description of the complex interactions among students, their teachers, their peers, their tasks, and the wider academic environment in which they were all embedded. It is these dynamic interactions that shape students' learning (van Lier, 1988, 2000) and which therefore merit more research attention. My hope is that the present study helps pave the way for further understanding of L2 students' learning and socialization in socio-educational contexts.
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Appendix D

KEY STUDENTS’ PROFILES

Original Key Students (from Summer 2000)

Kikujiro Oto (Kiku) was a 20-year old sophomore who was majoring in environmental system engineering. He used to listen to English conversation programs on the radio in his high schools days. Kiku decided to participate in the Keishin-WPU joint program, thinking, “I would gain a certain level of English in terms of writing, reading, and especially communicating (speaking and listening)” (e-mail interview, June 19, 2001). His TOEFL score was 517 at the time of his arrival in Canada.

Kiku was active both in and out of the classroom. In virtually every class, he contributed to class discussion by airing his opinions or asking questions. Kiku was chosen as the representative of his class for the first semester, and participated actively in class discussions and extracurricular activities such as Keishin Open House by sharing his ideas and opinions. He enjoyed traveling and sports, including baseball, volleyball and tennis, and socialized not only with other Keishin students, but also with Canadian and other international students studying at WPU. Kiku had a good sense of humor and often made his friends laugh. In high school, he enjoyed performing manzai⁸² or Japanese comic stage dialogues (Singleton, 1998) with his friends. According to Kiku, this experience made him realize the importance of observing people’s actions and reactions.

At the end of their nine-month studies, Keishin students compiled a yearbook. For this project, they took a vote to select individuals who represented the group in different

---

⁸² According to Sugiura and Gillespie (1993), manzai is “a kind of vaudeville performance in which two comedians as a team make spectators laugh by their humorous verbal exchanges” (p. 25). In this performance, “the two comedians divide their comic roles and entertain the spectators with the skillfulness of their humorous, adlibbed exchanges” (p. 25)
ways. Kiku was chosen as “Mr. Keishin,” the most “Canadianized” and confident member of the Keishin program, all of which attest to his popularity. Kiku participated in the Intensive University Preparation Program at ELI in August. He chose Dorm A because of his desire to immerse himself in the Canadian environment and because of its location close to Keishin House.

Nana Kitamura, a 19-year-old, was also in her second year at Keishin University. She was majoring in sociology with a special interest in city planning. Nana went to a Japanese high school in the United States where the medium of instruction was Japanese:

Because my senior high school was almost all conducted in Japanese and I did not have some opportunities to go out from school, my English ability did not grow up...when I found the Keishin program, I decided to study English again and wanted to be a great speaker because I did not make much effort to study English in senior high. (e-mail interview, June 27, 2001)

Thus, one major reason for Nana to participate in the exchange program was to improve her English. Because of this, she chose to stay in Dorm B, which was known as a residence that had the smallest population of Japanese students. Her TOEFL score was 510. Like Kiku, Nana was outgoing, sociable, and likeable, and was often teased by her close friends. She enjoyed intellectual challenges and would often tell me about her academic interests in city planning. Nana considered herself optimistic. In her words, “I just tried my best to study, make friends, go around, see different culture in Canada, and having lots of fun!!” (e-mail interview, June 27, 2001). In the yearbook, Nana was selected as the person most likely to have an international marriage. Like Kiku, Nana studied in the Intensive University Preparation Program at ELI during the summer.
Otome Saotome was 19 years old and a second year student in American and British literature. As a high school student, she participated in her school’s one-year study-abroad program in New Zealand. She attributed her English development to this experience. Otome decided to participate in the Keishin program for two major reasons. For one thing, she wanted to improve her English ability, which she felt plummeted after going back to Japan. As someone who had previously studied in an English-speaking country, she thought that it would be embarrassing not to speak English fluently. The other reason was that she found her university life in Japan boring and “wanted to get out of it” (interview, August 15, 2000). Her TOEFL score was 533.

In August, 2000, Otome was enrolled in the same ELI class with Kiku and Nana. During this period, she developed a strong friendship with Kiku and several other Keishin students. Otome did not very much enjoy group activities that were too large. In fact, her participation in the Keishin Open House was very limited. Otome spent most of her free time with her close friends. Some of her close friends, including Kiku, would often describe her as a “bad girl” jokingly. Although selective about whom to socialize with, Otome was a likeable individual and natural leader whose opinions were valued by other students. She was self-righteous and outspoken. Although she was a relatively good speaker of English, Otome did not talk very much in whole-class situations. She liked listening to music. She chose to live in Dorm B to avoid the “hassle of having to live with others” (interview, August 11, 2000).

Tomotaka Kaneshiro (Tomo), a 19-year old, was a sophomore who was majoring in policy science. He was enrolled in the same class with Kiku, Nana, and Otome at ELI. While in high school, Tomo passed the Pre-1st Grade of the STEP
(Society for Testing English Proficiency) Test in Practical English Proficiency, which is claimed to require the level of proficiency of university sophomores. Prior to his arrival in Canada, he had obtained 587 on the TOEFL, one of the highest scores among all the students in the Keishin program. Tomo described his reason to participate in the joint program as follows:

When I was a freshman, I was doing volunteer activity in the center for multicultural... There I was in a medical treatment project, and made medical guidebooks in multi languages and held a free medial consulting program for foreigners living in [city]. Through those activities, I thought it is really hard to understand what they are concerned about and what kind of service or support they really want. And I thought those are mostly because we, volunteers, could not make up ideal relationships with foreigners and let them trust us so that they can tell us any kinds of concerns and needs (e-mail interview, October 15, 2001)

In addition to the content-based ESL courses, Tomo took regular courses in Spanish and anthropology during the academic year. He did not talk as much as Kiku and Nana in class, but if necessary, he would exercise leadership in doing group work. Tomo was a critical thinker, a fluent speaker of English, and a serious yet humorous individual.

In the Yearbook, Tomo was chosen by female students to be one of the most popular male members of the Keishin program. He enjoyed playing pool, listening to music, and traveling by himself. Tomo decided to live in Keishin House to cultivate his ability to get along with others harmoniously.

**Other Key Students (from Fall, 2000)**

Ichiro Hakamada was a 20-year old junior who belonged to the Department of International Relations. Like Tomo, Ichiro demonstrated a strong knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. He went to a high school affiliated with Keishin University and did not have to sit for entrance examination to universities, of which English components
required a detailed knowledge of grammar. Because of this, Ichiro felt that his grammar needed to be improved. He was also a fluent writer of academic English. His use of sophisticated vocabulary in class often seemed to impress his classmates and teachers.

Yet Ichiro wanted to improve his English further. According to Ichiro,

> Compared to English skills of the people (Japanese) who are thought to be good at English, mine seemed poorer in terms of whatever skill much... it has been my desire to be able to use English very well for a long time. Although it is difficult to translate “good English ability” into substantial, it would be, if I tried to define, 600 points or 900 points on TOEFL or TOEIC, respectively.

Ichiro’s on-arrival TOEFL score was 543, but he scored more than 600 on the TOEFL during Semester 1 and took regular courses in economics in Semester 2. He was very serious about his studies. In fact, he was planning to pursue his master’s studies in international economics in North America, which was one of the principal reasons why he participated in the joint program. Ichiro would often engage in serious conversations about his major studies with his friends. At the same time, Ichiro had a good sense of humor. Like Kiku, he was a natural leader who, in his friends’ words, was “smart,” “funny,” and “thoughtful.” He was an articulate speaker and a critical thinker. He participated in class discussions very actively. Ichiro was selected as the representative for Class A during the first semester. He was one of the two male Keishin students who chose to stay in Dorm B.

**Koyuki Asakura**, a 19-year old, was a sophomore majoring in law at Keishin University. Her major reason for choosing to participate in the joint program had to do with her strong desire to improve her English. She wrote, “the best basic reason as that it

---

83 Grammar and vocabulary have been considered to be important part of entrance examinations to Japanese colleges and universities, which usually include sections requiring examinees to translate English passages into Japanese, to answer questions about the content of L2 passages and discrete grammar points, and to choose the “correct” word to fill in blanks (Brown & Yamashita, 1995; Kitao & Kitao, 1995).
had been my dream to study abroad for about one year in school days. I wanted to improve English skill, to live in somewhere nobody knows me and to become [emotionally and intellectually] strong” (e-mail interview, July 5, 2001). Her initial TOEFL score was 497. Unlike many other Keishin students, Koyuki entered a private junior high school, which was affiliated with Keishin University, and then chose to move on to one of their senior high schools. Thus she did not take entrance examinations for her high school or university. Like Ichiro, Koyuki perceived this choice as having a negative consequence on her English learning:

Since no exams were required to get in both my senior high school and university, I never forced myself to cram knowledge of English into my head excepting for [midterm and final] exam periods. Therefore, comparing to other average students, I’m not good at grammar and vocabulary and this is one thing I’ve felt inferior complex all the time so far. (e-mail interview, August, 5, 2001)

Koyuki was a hard worker and an active participant in class discussions. In February, 2001, the quality of her academic performance during the first semester was recognized by the faculty members of the joint program, and she was selected to be one of the ten recipients of the joint program’s scholarship. Koyuki considered herself to be “competitive and meticulous” (interview, December 9, 2000). She was an affable person and a “stylish” dresser. She lived in Keishin House.

**Rei Takagi**, 20 years old, was a junior majoring in international relations. Back in Japan, unlike many other students, Rei lived in a different area and commuted to Keishin University, spending about three hours each way. In elementary school, Rei had opportunities to learn English games and songs from a native speaker of British English. Despite her small English vocabulary, Rei was able to communicate with her by guessing the meaning of her utterances. Rei says, “This experience told me that there is much more
important thing to learn English than studying English grammar and structure” (e-mail interview, August 15, 2001).

Rei explained her decision to participate in the Keishin Program as follows: “I wanted to be in the situation where I really have to use what I have learned to communicate with people, otherwise I would lose the reason why I have learned English so hard in school” (e-mail interview, August 15, 2001). Rei’s decision was also motivated by her cousin who, as a former participant in the joint program, told her how much he had learned from the experience. Rei actively participated in class discussions by sharing her opinions and asking questions. She said that she was often conscious about her own language production. Rei considered herself to be “strange” (interview, October 14, 2000) because she wanted to try something not many others do. She was cheerful and approachable. Rei wanted to share the Japanese culture with people from other countries and chose to stay in Keishin House, where there was a large population of students interested particularly in Japan. She studied at ELI during the summer. Her initial TOEFL was 493.

**Ringo Kanda** was 20 years old and a sophomore in an interdisciplinary program in human science at Keishin University. She was particularly interested in anthropology. As a first grader, she started taking lessons at a private language school in Japan, to which she felt she was forced to go by her father. She did not feel that it helped her learn English very much and thus switched to another school when she was a fifth grader. She took two lessons per week. Ringo wrote, “I came to like speaking English because of my teacher who taught me when I was in the Grades 5 and 6” (e-mail interview, July 20,
This experience, she felt, had the greatest impact on her learning of English. Her on-arrival TOEFL score was 483.

As a high school student, Ringo wanted to study abroad and knew that there were several programs available through Keishin University. She wrote,

To participate in the exchange program was the last chance for me to study abroad with my parents’ help. I desired to be able to speak like a native speaker. I strongly wanted to get English skills and make new friends as many as possible. Moreover, I expected to keep making efforts to get English skills. (e-mail interview, July 20, 2001)

Ringo was a hard-working and studious student. Like Koyuki, she was selected as one of the recipients of the joint program scholarship in February. She was honest and straightforward. Like Otome, Ringo chose to live in Dorm B to preserve her privacy. She also preferred a same-gender building. She did not study in the ELI program during the summer.

Sakura Kinoshita, 21 years old, was a third-year student in the Department of International Relations at Keishin University. In her junior and senior high school days, Sakura went to private English language schools to learn both language and culture. In her second year at high school, she did a three-week home-stay in San Francisco. She recalled, “It was great experience to me. I had a great time there; however, I could not communicate with young people like my age. It made me study more hard” (email interview, September 8, 2001). Sakura participated in the joint program mainly because she thought that studying abroad would make her a “more flexible person” by providing with her opportunities to meet people from different cultures. Another reason was that Sakura wanted to see other cultures to become broader-minded.
Sakura considered herself to be “optimistic, peaceful, and unmeticulous.” She was amiable, thoughtful, and mild-mannered. Although she did not talk as much as some others in and out of class, she was an attentive listener. Sakura enjoyed playing and watching sports. In particular, she belonged to a volleyball team organized by her dorm floor members and took part in several games during her stay in Canada. She studied at ELI during the summer. Her initial TOEFL score was 480. Like Kiku, Sakura lived in Dorm A.

Nineteen-year old Shinpei Kusano was a second-year student in the Department of American and British Literature who was particularly interested in English linguistics. As is characteristic of students in Japan (see, for example, Kitao & Kitao, 1995), Shinpei took up English when he entered junior high school. Following his parents’ path, Shinpei enjoyed traveling and had been to many countries. Like other Keishin students, he decided to participate in the joint program because he wanted to experience other cultures. Because of his major field of study, he was especially interested in English-speaking countries. As a university freshman, he participated in a one-month intercultural program in Great Britain. But he felt, “One-month was not enough because of my English ability and time” (e-mail interview, September 7, 2001). He also wanted to experience other cultures “not just from point of traveling, or English-learning course, but from point of actual life of university or family life” (e-mail interview, September 7, 2001). In other words, he wanted to live other cultures not only as a traveler or English learner, but also as a university student or family member. Another reason was that he wanted to live away from his family. This is because in Japan he lived with his family as his house was within a commuting distance of Keishin University.
Shinpei was relatively quiet in class, but he often shared his thoughts on class content with his peers after class. He was very familiar with computers, and constructed and ran an on-line bulletin board for the whole group of Keishin students. As such, he was a major computer person in the Keishin community to whom many peers would run to ask for help. He was resourceful and reliable. He was the other male student staying in Dorm B. Like Nana, he chose this residence to immerse himself in an English-speaking environment. His initial TOEFL score was 477.

**Yoshino Fujiwara**, a 20-year-old, was a sophomore majoring in arts management in the Department of Sociology. Unlike many of her classmates, she was born and raised in Eastern Japan. Yoshino loved singing to her own piano accompaniment and was the singer of the Keishin Band. During her sojourn in Canada, she gave a number of live concerts at on- and off-campus locations in collaboration with band members as well as on her own. As such, Yoshino was regarded as the musician of the Keishin program; in the Yearbook, she was selected to be “the individual who is most likely to become famous in the future.” Unsurprisingly, music was a major if not the major reason behind her decision to participate in the joint program. Yoshino wrote:

> People in Canada are from all over the world. So I thought that I can meet many people who have own backgrounds and many music based on many background. If I know them, I guess I would come to know who I am and what my music (sound) is. (e-mail interview, June 18, 2001)

Yoshino was likeable, “cool,” and popular among the Keishin students and Keishin House residents. She was serious not only about music, but also about academic studies. She participated actively in class discussions and enjoyed reflecting on her own actions. She was both observant and thoughtful. In August, Yoshino was in the same class with
Ichiro at ELI. Her initial TOEFL score was 490. She chose to live in Keishin House because of its relatively clean facilities.
Appendix E

STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

Sample Questions about Student Background

• What is your major? Please describe your program of study.
• Why did you decide to participate in the Keishin-WPU exchange program?
• Do you have any concerns about your studies at WPU?
• What is your background in learning English?
• Have you ever had any overseas experience?
• What are your future plans and aspirations after graduating from Keishin University?

Sample Questions about Tasks

• What do you think are some of the characteristics of a good oral presentation?
• Who do you think is a good presenter? Please give reasons.
• What do you need to do in order to make a good presentation?
• What makes a presentation academic?
• Why do you think your teacher gave you this assignment? (What do you think is the purpose of doing group project work?)
• How did you choose your topic?
• How did you choose your partners?

Sample Questions about Task Preparation

• How did you prepare for the presentation?
• What did you do that was particularly effective or ineffective? What was the outcome of this action?
• Who was your intended audience?
• What were some of the challenges that you faced in preparing for the presentation?

• What, if anything, did you learn from this experience?

• Is there anything that you wish you had done to prepare for the presentation?

• Would you do anything different next time you make a group presentation?

Sample Questions about Task Performance

• What aspects of the presentation did you focus on?

• What do you think of your presentation? How would you evaluate it?

• Do you think you are a good presenter? Please explain.

• What, if anything, did you learn from this experience?

• Would you do anything different next time you make a group presentation?

• What are your overall impressions of your classmates' oral presentations?

• What, if anything, did you learn from your classmates' presentations?

Sample Questions about Teacher Roles

• Did your teachers (i.e., instructor and TA) help you undertake the task in any way? If so, how?

• Did you find any of the classroom activities helpful for your undertaking of the presentation task? How did they contribute to your task accomplishment?

• Is there anything that you wish your teachers had done to help you undertake your tasks? Please explain.

Sample Questions about Learning across Tasks

• How did this presentation compare to the previous ones?

• Did your previous experience contribute to your task performance in any way? If so, how?

• How do you think this experience might contribute to your next task performance?
Sample Questions from the Final Interview

- What abilities/skills do you think have improved over the academic year?
- What are some of the most important/meaningful experiences that you have had since you came to Canada?
- How would you explain your project experience to the next group of Keishin students? What were its rewards and challenges?
- What advice would you give to the next group of Keishin students?
- Is there anything else that you think I should know about your learning through your group project work and your academic studies?
Appendix F

TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Sample Questions about the Course

• What kind of course is this? Please describe the goals and content of the course.

• How is the course organized?

• What assignments are students required to do for the course?

• How would you describe Keishin 10 students? How would you compare them with the previous group (i.e., Keishin 9 students)?

• Is this course different in any way from the course that you taught last year? Did you make any changes to the course in terms of content, format, classroom activities, and assignments? If so, please explain how and why.

Sample Questions about Teacher Expectations

• What do you think are some of the characteristics of a good oral presentation?

• Who do you think is a good presenter? Please name some of your students and explain why.

• What do you need to do to make a good presentation?

• What makes a presentation academic?

• What is the purpose of requiring students to do group project work?

• What do you consider to be rewards and challenges of group project work?

• What do you consider to be the purpose(s) of student presentations in undergraduate courses like this?

Sample Questions about Teacher Roles

• What roles do you think you play in students’ oral presentations?

• How did you help students accomplish their presentation tasks?

• How did you evaluate students’ presentations?
Sample Questions about Students’ Task Performance

- What are your overall impressions of your students’ oral presentations?
- What are some of the presentations that impressed you in any way? Please explain.
- What did you think of the key students’ task performance?
- Did you learn anything from your students’ presentations?

Questions about Students’ Change

- Do you think your students’ participation in class activities has changed over the academic year? If so, please describe how?

Other Questions

- Is there anything else that I should know about this course, your students, and the exchange program?
Appendix G

QUESTIONS FOR KEY STUDENT AUDIO-JOURNALS

Questions about Field Work and Task Preparation

• What did you do today? (Please state when and where you worked with whom and for how long.)

• What was your (and/or your group’s) goal?

• How much did you accomplish?

• What, if anything, did you learn from today’s work (English, culture, subject matter, etc.)?

• What challenges, if any, did you face in today’s work?

• Do you have any other thoughts?

Question about Task Performance

• What do you think of your group’s performance of the oral presentation?

• How would you evaluate your own task performance?
Appendix H

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

= speech that comes immediately after another person’s (i.e., latched utterances), shown for both speakers

(words) words not clearly heard, (x), an unclear word; (xx), two unclear words; (xxx), three or more unclear words

((comments)) comments or relevant details pertaining to interaction

[translation] approximate translation

[[phonetic transcription]] phonetic transcription

<back channels> back channels

: unusually lengthened sound or syllable

. terminal falling intonation

, rising, continuing intonation

? high rising intonation, not necessarily at the end of a sentence

! an enthusiastic tone, not necessarily an explanation

- (unattached) brief, untimed pause (i.e., less than 0.4 seconds)

x- (attached on one side) cutoff often accompanied by a glottal stop (e.g., a self-correction)

"utterances/sentences" attempts to reconstruct others’ language (oral or written)

underlining spoken with emphasis

---

84 Like Moder and Halleck (1998), I use the term “backchannel” to refer to utterances that do not “interrupt the current speaker’s discourse or cause the speaking turn to shift” (p. 123).

85 This was the shortest pause that I felt I could time reliably with a stopwatch.
bold-faced focal utterance of point of discussion for analytical purposes
CAPITAL LETTERS loud speech
italicizing Japanese utterances

Adapted from Duff (1995, 2000)
Appendix I

TASK DESCRIPTION 1

1. Poster-project

This assignment requires you to come up with a poster on non-verbal communication. Be creative and imaginative with this assignment. For example, you may use picture from magazines or draw your own, you may use manageable artifacts (e.g., chopsticks, paper fans, etc.) to make your points. In any case, make sure that your poster is attractive, interesting, and to the point. We will display the posters. You are required to acts as facilitators (i.e., you will explain the meaning of your poster to people when they come to see it). You are strongly encouraged to do this assignment in pairs or in groups of three. Try it even if you don’t like working with other people. Cooperative working skills are something we all need to acquire. We will discuss the details of this assignment in class. I will show you some posters so that you know what I mean by a poster project.

(Taken from the Semester 1 course outline)
Appendix J

TASK DESCRIPTION 2

3. Presentation (Starts Week 10)

The students will share their research findings with their classmates and instructor through a 40-minute oral presentation. This will be a presentation of the research project conducted in pairs. So the presentations will also be done in pairs. The presentations must be well organized and interesting. Students are encouraged to use audio-visual and graphic materials in their presentation and to speak from them (i.e., students are encouraged not to read from notes).
Appendix K

POSTER PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

Hello. Now we are working for poster-project, which is about NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION. Non-verbal communication means ‘communication without words’ such as gesture, sign, and so on. Among many kinds of non-verbal communication, we chose to deal with how the author of certain cartoon uses non-verbal communication in order to help readers understand characters unconsciously. For that reason, what we would like you to do is to guess, from the picture, the personalities of these characters. Your assistance will help us know how effectively this sort of non-verbal communication works in cartoon. The title of this cartoon is “Doraemon”, which is one of the most popular cartoons in Japan. Our project-team consists of Otome Saotome, Ringo Kanda, and Ichiro Hakamada, all of whom came to WPU as exchange students from Keishin University, Japan.

Please answer following questions, looking at a picture.
Question: What do you think of the personality of each character?
What made you think so?

Character 1

Character 2

Character 3

Character 4

Character 5

Thank you for your cooperation!
Appendix L

Schedule for Academic Year 2000-2001

- **Poster Session**<br>  Oct. 5, 2000

- **TA Model Presentation**<br>  Oct. 26, 2000

- **Semester 1 Presentation**<br>  Nov. 2000

- **Semester 2 Presentation**<br>  March 2001

- **Pre-departure orientation in Japan**<br>  April to June 2000

- **ELI Presentation**<br>  Aug. 2000

- **Language Fieldwork A:** Intercultural communication<br>  Sept. to Dec. 2000

- **Language Fieldwork B:** Research methods in social science and education<br>  Jan. to April 2001

- **Pre-departure orientation in Japan for the next group**<br>  April to June 2001

- **Back to Japan**<br>  April 25, 2001
<Summary>
While subjects' impressions on character 2 were almost totally different from author's intention, they guessed the personality of the others as the author had intended. Hence it is reasonable to say that the author approximately succeeds in using non-verbal communication, in order to help readers understand these characters unconsciously.

The personality of character 1 that subjects guessed was 'nice', 'friendly', 'goody-goody', 'hopeful', 'intelligent', 'polite', 'sweet' and so on, which corresponds to her real personality in cartoon. Character 3 is drawn cute in order to be loved by a number of people. As the author had aimed, the answer was about same as author's intention, for the answer includes 'nice', 'cute' and 'friendly'. Subjects imagined that character 4 was 'bully', 'athlete', 'quite' and so on. As a whole, his personality was guessed not good. In fact he is bully and sporty in the cartoon, and therefore the answers of subjects almost entirely coincide with author's aim. Subjects guessed character 5 was 'bully', 'naughty', 'mean', 'weak' and so forth. He often bullies character 2 with character 4, and is mean and weak in the cartoon; hence, the answers are similar to his real personality in the cartoon. The only one of whom personality in cartoon is entirely different from subjects' guess is character 2. Many subjects regarded him as 'smart', which is totally opposite of that character in the cartoon. It may be necessary to research why there is big difference between subjects' guess and real character in the cartoon.

Although subject's answers about the personality of character 2 were totally different from him in the cartoon, those about others almost corresponded with author's intention. Therefore, it is no exaggeration to say that the author was successful in using non-verbal communication effectively. Thus non-verbal communication, such as how characters were drawn, plays important role in cartoons.

(taken from Otome, Ringo, and Ichiro's poster)