The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics vol.47 No.2 2004 pp.91～105

Rethinking L2 negotiation: An EFL classroom perspective

Emi KOBAYASHI* and Masaki KOBAYASHI**

Abstract

A growing number of studies have recently revealed the importance of social interaction for second language development (e.g., Long, 1983; Pica & Doughty, 1985). However, Mitchell and Myles (1998) point out that studies to date have been conducted almost entirely within western/anglophone educational settings. This paper therefore examines peer interaction in another context--an adult EFL classroom in Japan. Students were audio-recorded as they talked about English articles in a 12-week communicative grammar course at a private language school. The analysis of classroom discourse showed that students were able to use not only each other as resources, but other cultural tools available in the environment as well, thereby co-constructing knowledge about English articles. This challenges the traditional idea of testing solo performance and highlights the notion of *distributed knowledge* (Berwick, 1999; van Lier, 1998; see also Salomon, 1993). Findings point to the importance of considering L2 research sociocultural contexts.

1. Introduction

In recent years, as researchers have revealed the importance of social interaction for language development, a growing number of language teachers have employed collaborative learning, an approach which involves the use of small group activities in the classroom. With respect to second language acquisition (SLA), Hatch (1978) states in her seminal paper that "one learns how to do conversation, one learns how to interact verbally, and out of this interaction syntactic structures are developed" (p. 404). Sparked by this claim, second language (L2) researchers have examined the role of both teacher-student interactions and peer interactions in SLA. They have also looked at native-speaker versus non-native speaker (NS-NNS) interactions. However, the role of non-native speaker versus non-native speaker (NNS-NNS) interactions has more recently become of interest to researchers.

One major group of researchers interested in the role of social interactions work in the input-

interaction tradition (e.g., Gass & Varonis, 1985; Long, 1983; Pica & Doughty, 1985). Building upon Krashen's (1982) notion of comprehensible input, Long (1983) claims that providing learners with opportunities to negotiate meaning when they fail to understand promotes both comprehension and language acquisition.[1] Another group of L2 researchers stressing the role of social interaction in language acquisition work in the Vygotskian framework (e.g., Brooks, Donato, & McGlone, 1997; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Ohta, 1995; van Lier, 1996, 1998a). Following Vygotsky's (1978) claim, they believe that individual mental functioning including L2 proficiency emerges through the appropriation of social discourse.

As we have seen, SLA researchers working in the input-interaction framework view the negotiation of meaning 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" (Pica, 1992, p. 200). This view, however, has been challenged by several researchers (Ondarra, 1997; van Lier, 1992, 1996). Ondarra (1997) states that in input-interaction and output studies, the term negotiation is restricted to negative negotiation, that is, repair procedures. She then argues that the notion of negotiation be expanded to include positive negotiation, which relate to "creative process of meaning construction" (p. 435). This appears to parallel what Swain and Lapkin (1998) refer to "collaborative dialogues" in which learners talk about their language production--both oral and written. In a similar vein, van Lier (2000) suggests that negotiation of meaning can be examined from both input-interaction and Vygotskian sociocultural perspectives and that if framed in the latter, the notion of negotiation can be broadened by situating it in its natural context.

As Mitchell and Myles (1998) point out, since input-interaction studies to date have been conducted almost entirely within western/anglophone educational settings, extensive cross-cultural studies need to be carried out before the claim can be made that negotiation of meaning is a "universal phenomenon" (p. 142). Of course, the same can be said about Vygotskian learning theory. Developed in former Soviet Union and recently applied within western/anglophone educational settings, this perspective needs to be examined in other settings as well.

Thus the intent of this paper is to examine the two perspectives in one such context--an adult EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom in Japan, where NNS-NNS interaction is a major context for L2 learning. The paper will first discuss a rationale for including communicative activities relying on the negotiation of meaning, paying a particular attention to the role of NNS-NNS interactions. Secondly, the paper will briefly describe the EFL classroom from which data were collected. Thirdly, the paper will attempt to compare the two perspectives by examining actual pieces of classroom discourse. Finally, concluding statements will address the directions of

future research of the role of social interaction in SLA.

2. Rationale

Collaborative learning through small group tasks has focused the attention of L2 researchers on the interaction between NNSs. In general, the presence of other L2 learners may provide more of a non-threatening environment in order for the negotiation of meaning to take place in language classrooms (Di Pietro, 1987). As input-output studies indicate, small group activities which focus on the accomplishment of communicative tasks promote a greater amount of linguistic exposure and production, thus providing learners with opportunities to practice and to negotiate meaning (Long & Porter, 1985). Futaba's (1994) quasi-experimental study conducted in a North American setting showed that Japanese learners of English produced more negotiated interaction in NNS-NNS dyads than in NS-NNS dyads.

At the same time, researchers have expressed concern about the overuse of group activities. Although supportive, Pica and Doughty (1985) state that "a steady diet of group activities may restrict the amount of grammatical input available to the classroom learner, leading perhaps to a stabilized nontarget variety" (p. 132). It should be noted in passing that more and more teachers and researchers are interested in focus-on-form in the L2 classroom, an approach motivated by Long's Interaction Hypothesis cited above (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998). Furthermore, Foster (1998) examined the negotiation of meaning in a naturally occurring classroom setting and found that many students in small groups did not speak at all, nor did they initiate negotiated interactions.

Studies in the Vygotskian sociocultural framework too support the idea of bringing peer collaboration into the L2 classroom. Before turning to these studies, a few remarks should be made concerning Vygotsky's (1981) learning theory. According to Vygotsky,

> 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. (p. 163)

He argues that intrapersonal knowledge and skills originate in interpersonal activity. Perhaps the best known concept of Vygotsky's is Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)--"the distance between the actual development 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). Important in this process is the expert-novice

relationship. Vygotsky argues that children can achieve something which they could not achieve by themselves by working together with adults or more competent members of the community.

More recently, researchers have expanded this notion. Forman and Cazden (1985) point out that not only novices, but the expert also benefits from interaction, because his or her internalization of knowledge is facilitated by explaining. Likewise, van Lier (1996) proposes the notion of *multiple zones of proximal development*, which encompasses not only assistance from experts--teachers and more capable peers, but also interaction with equal peers and less capable peers (see van Lier & Matsuo, 2001, for empirical support) and inner resources that L2 learners themselves possess. Moreover, from a language socialization perspective, Ochs (1990) suggests that the novice can also influence the expert thinking despite their differences in knowledge and power. In brief, researchers in the Vygotskian tradition view development as originating from social interaction and language as the most powerful semiotic tool that allows their transformation of interpersonal processing into intrapersonal processing (van Lier, 1992).

Having discussed some of the Vygotskian principles, let us now turn to the discussion of L2 studies in this tradition. Donato (1994) examined task interaction among three learners of French. Results showed that these three L2 learners 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. More recently, 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 8 students, Kim and Rick, 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 tool both for L2 learning and for communication.

In sum, the use of small group activities in the L2 classroom is supported by the findings of both input-interaction studies and Vygotskian sociocultural studies. From the former perspective, task-based group work, especially that which requires two-way information exchange, is seen to provide learners with more practice, a greater variety of practice, and more opportunities to negotiate meaning. From the latter perspective, group work is seen to provide learners with opportunities to co-construct linguistic knowledge and meaning, which will later result in L2 development on the individual plane. With these points in mind, let us turn to an examination of an EFL classroom in Japan.

3. Methodology

Participants and Settings

The present paper reports evidence of Japanese EFL students' learning in a 12-week seminar on Communicative Grammar, offered at Victory,[2] a private language school in Japan. Eleven students were enrolled in this course. They greatly ranged in age; some of them were in their thirties and others were high school students. Concurrently, they were taking regular conversation courses. Some of them were taking basic courses while others were taking upper-intermediate courses.

Data Collection

Data were collected by the first author primarily through classroom observations, audio-recordings of classroom discourse, and semi-structured interviews with students. The default role of the first author in this class was observer as participant (Merriam, 1998). She would quietly watch and listen to students' interactions; however, she often played more active roles when invited by students. Audio-recorded classroom interactions were transcribed adapting the conventions presented by Duff (1995). All interviews conducted in Japanese[3] were audio-recorded and later transcribed. In what follows, we will examine the interaction that three students (i.e., Atsuko, Keiko, and Naomi) had as they talked about English articles.

4. Negotiation as collaborative dialogue

In the following excerpts, having watched a video clip and completed a fill-in-the-blank task on articles (see Appendix), Atsuko, Keiko and Naomi are comparing their answers. In this class, students were given the chance to check their answers in small groups after completing virtually every task. This is because most students had commented in their needs analysis questionnaire that they would feel far more comfortable speaking English in small groups than in a large class. The fact that students feel more anxious about speaking an L2 in large groups than small groups is nothing new in itself (e.g., Arnold, 1999; Long & Porter, 1985; Tsui, 1996). In fact, congruent with Tsui (1996), the teacher decided to give students the chance to check their answers with their classmates before having them respond to the entire class. Thus, checking answers can be seen as a sociocultural activity of this community (Mohan, 1986; van Lier, 1988).

Excerpt 1

01 N: What did you choose for #2, Atsuko?

02 A: I chose (0.5) A. (1.0) How about you - Keiko?

03 K: Me too.

04 N: Me too. (0.6) By the way - what does (0.5) stroller mean?

05 K: Stroller is (0.5) like a baby car. Remember the video?

06 N: AH: yes. The (0.8) blue one. ((looks up the word in her dictionary)) Stroller. I see.

In this example, Naomi asks for the definition of the word stroller (line 4), which is used in the task sheet. Keiko then explains the word (line 5), and finally Naomi understands its meaning (line 6). This shows how input is modified through negotiated interaction.

Excerpt 2

07 K: Didn't the father umm (1.1) got a bonny?

08 A: Sorry?

09 K: Didn't he um (0.5) get a bonny?

10 N: Bonny?

11 K: I thought father penguin (0.6) got a bonny, (0.5) I mean rabbit for the little penguin? Not

12 a teddy bear.

13 A: Ah yes. (0.8) He bought a bunny (0.5) for the little penguin.

14 K: Yeah - bunny. (0.6) Right.

In the above example, Keiko produces an utterance which has two problems-- morphosyntactical (Didn't...got) and phonological (bonny for bunny). Atsuko then makes a clarification request (Sorry?), which pushes Keiko to modify the morphosyntactical error. But the phonological error remains unchanged. Then Naomi asks for a confirmation check by simply repeating part of Keiko's previous utterance (Bonny?). As a result, Keiko uses the word rabbit, a synonym of bunny in much more elaborated utterance (line 11). Atsuko then *recasts* Keiko's previous utterance, providing a target-like pronunciation of the word bunny (see Long, 1996 for detailed discussion of recasts). And finally, Keiko modifies her pronunciation. In short, Excerpt 1 shows an example of input modification while Excerpt 2 shows output modification. In both of these examples, negative feedback--clarification requests, confirmation checks, and recasts--is deemed essential.

We have so far seen rather simple examples of classroom discourse. The following except shows a much more complex picture.

Excerpt 3

15 K: What did you get for #39, Naomi?

16 N: Well, - I chose THE, (0.6) I mean - THE front door.

17 A: THE. Yeah. Me too.

18 K: Oh, really? I got A front door (0.6) because it's um (0.5) first mention?

19 N: AH: Yes. – [First mention, yes, but –

20 A: [That's right. (0.7) I see what you mean.

21 K: Could you tell me your reason, (0.6) for THE?

22 N: Umm because (0.5) *nan te i tta ra ii n da ro* 'How can I say'? *Ee to* 'Well' – I thought it's

23 specific information. Umm. (1.1) There is one door of? [Of the house? *Chigau yo ne*

24 'Maybe wrong'. ((whispers))

25 K: [One door? - What do you mean?

26 A: Yes. I think (0.5) that's because um (0.6) there is only one front door (0.6) to the house or

27 any house, - right Naomi?

28 N: Yeah. There is only - only one door- one front door to the house? [TO the house, of

29 *ja naku te* 'not of'.

30 K: [You mean the house

31 has only one front door? (0.6) So (0.5) like we have only one sun?

32 A: Yes. So it's ((looks at the textbook)) it's =

33 N: = Specific. (0.6) Not non-specific.

34 A: [Yes. Yes. Yes. Exactly. – Here. ((points to the text.))

35 K: [Ah, okay.

36 A: Because we know - which door? The front door is specific information. So we need

37 (0.7) THE – here. [*Sugoi* 'Great', Naomi.

38 K: [Oh – I see. – It's first mention (0.7) but also – the only one. Thanks.

39 N: Yes. Sure. ((smiles))

Let us first look at the data from an input-interactionist's perspective. Recall that researchers in this tradition are interested in studying if the negotiation of meaning results in input and output modifications, which in turn may facilitate SLA. From this perspective, Keiko's utterances in lines 25 and 30-31 are very important, because they function as negative feedback, indicating that she has not sufficiently understood Naomi's previous message. "One door?" and "You mean...?", are confirmation checks whereas the second one, "What do you mean?", is a clarification request. Although it is not Naomi herself who first answers these questions, she manages to elaborate on her previous utterance in collaboration with Atsuko (lines 26-29 and 32-33). As a result, Keiko shows her understanding (lines 35 and 38). From an input-interactionist perspective, this whole sequence can be considered as input modification, which is claimed to promote SLA.

However, we notice that much more is happening in the excerpt. As mentioned earlier, students are communicating about the article system in the target language. Mohan (1986) argues that

language learning and content learning co-occur. In the case of L2 learning, as Swain (1999) points out, language is both a major medium for and the object of learning. More attention should therefore be given to the process of how learners acquire subject knowledge or cultural knowledge, as well as linguistic knowledge, through discourse (Berwick, 1999). As we have seen earlier, Vygotsky (1978) claims that children build the tools of thinking and learning through social interaction with more capable members of the community (see also Lave & Wenger, 1991). Is it only less competent members who benefit from social interaction? Let us look at Excerpt 3 again, this time from a Vygotskian perspective.

Perhaps we can begin by attempting to identify who is the "expert" in the group. We soon realize, however, that labeling a particular individual as the expert is no easy task. In line 15, Keiko, who might be considered as the most active learner of the three, takes the initiative and starts the answer-checking activity. She soon finds that her answer is different from her peers', so she explains her choice, but Naomi and Atsuko indirectly disagree. Keiko then asks Atsuko and Naomi to explain their choice (line 21). Here we can see Keiko's transition from expert to novice. In lines 22-24, Naomi attempts to provide an explanation for her choice. Her utterance, "I thought it's specific information," indicates her familiarity with the definite-indefinite article distinction. However, Naomi finds it difficult to explain it in English. In lines 26-27, Atsuko, who is a more fluent speaker of English than Naomi, makes a confirmation check, thereby assisting Naomi's communicative effort. Naomi repeats Atsuko's utterance, and Keiko shows her understanding in the next turn. Here it can be argued that without Atsuko's assistance, Naomi, despite her knowledge about the article system, might not have been able to make the utterance in line 28, which contributes to Keiko's subsequent learning in line 31. Also in line 28, Naomi notices that the word *door* takes the preposition *to* after it rather than *of* in this context by listening to Atsuko's previous utterance. This is evident from her Japanese utterance in lines 28-29, "not OF the house." Notice that Naomi has used *of* in line 23. Moreover, in line 32, Atsuko attempts to use metalanguage she learned earlier (specific information), but cannot come up with it. Atsuko's utterance in line 37, "*Sugoi* 'Great', Naomi," shows her respect for Naomi's metalinguistic knowledge.

What is immediately apparent in the excerpt is that the roles of expert and novice are not fixed; rather they are jointly constructed by the learners themselves through discourse in a moment-by-moment fashion as they tackle their task together (Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Ohta, 1995). This co-construction, as Ohta (1995) says, depends on personalities and L2 proficiency of the group members as well as any roles defined for use within the particular task. In the above case, Keiko can be considered as a language expert, Naomi can be considered as a content expert, and Atsuko

seems to fall in between the two. But whose knowledge is foregrounded at any given time is not predetermined.

In short, the three students have built knowledge about English articles together through discourse. This, we believe, answers the question posed earlier. Both "experts" and "novices" do benefit from social interaction--more specifically collaborative dialogues. According to Wells (1999):

> Most activities involve a variety of component tasks such that students who are expert in one task, and therefore able to offer assistance to their peers, may themselves need assistance on another task. But it can also happen that in tackling a difficult task as a group, although no member has expertise beyond his or her peers, the group as a whole, by working at the problem together, is able to construct a solution that none could have achieved alone. In other words, each is 'forced to rise above himself' and, by building on the contributions of its individual members, the group collectively constructs an outcome that no single member envisaged at the outset of the collaboration. (pp. 323-324)

Van Lier (1998a, 2000) also argues that psychological entities such as intelligence, skills, knowledge, and understanding are embedded in our social and physical environment and thus developed in a complex nexus of social interaction. Atsuko, Keiko and Naomi accomplished something which neither of them could have accomplished alone--Keiko's understanding of article usage, using each other's knowledge as well as other cultural resources available in the environment (textbooks, dictionaries, etc.).

Another important issue is the use of L1 during task performance. The input-interaction tradition views L2 learning as a matter of encoding and decoding linguistic knowledge, and thus do not seem to have much to say about L1 use (see van Lier, 2000). By contrast, Vygotskian traditions acknowledge the value of L1 use as a tool for learners to self-regulate their own performance (Brooks, Donato, & McGlone, 1997; van Lier, 1992; see also Vygotsky, 1986, for a discussion of private speech). For example, in our data, Naomi's use of L1 in lines 22-24 can be seen as private speech used to gain control over the challenging task of explaining the English article system to her peers. The Vygotskian view of L1 as a thinking tool is worth considering, because L1 use may enrich the usability of the L2 that is available for active learner participation (van Lier, 2000).

Additionally, the input-interaction tradition seems to assume that learners have adequate levels of L2 proficiency to perform communicative tasks; however, many L2 learners--especially those in EFL settings--may not be quite ready for this challenge. LoCastro (1996) states with respect to EFL instruction in public high schools that "in a great majority of cases (80-90% according to some unpublished prefectural board of education surveys), Japanese is the language of instruction in the

typically teacher-fronted, teacher-centred classes" (p. 49). In fact, the teacher of the Communicative Grammar course introduced a number of useful expressions early on in the course, because a majority of his students had never experienced communicative language teaching until they came to Victory and thus did not know how to communicate about classroom routines. This suggests that researchers should examine how beginning students reach the threshold of communicative tasks.

Finally, the negotiation of meaning in the sense of the input interaction tradition, may not always promote SLA. Let us examine the following excerpt in which students are conversing with Tony, an American teacher during a break.

Excerpt 4

40 T: How're you guys doing? - What're you doing?

41 K: We are studying THE and A. =

42 N: = And zero article.

43 K: Yes.

44 T: Zero article? What do you mean, Naomi?

45 N: Um (0.6) some nouns [nounz] are count - and others are not.

46 T: Sorry?

47 N: Some nouns, [nounz] are countable.

48 T: Oh. You mean nouns?

49 N: Yes. Nouns. - Bad pronunciation. (0.6) I don't like it.

In this example, Keiko and Naomi are explaining to Tony what they are learning in Communicative Grammar. Naomi produces the word "noun" in a non-target-like way (line 45). In the next turn, Tony makes a clarification request (Sorry?). Then, Naomi repeats her own utterance without modifying her pronunciation. But this time, from the context, Tony infers what Naomi is referring to and makes a confirmation check (You mean...?). As a result, Naomi finally *notices the gap* between the target-like pronunciation and her own (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). From an interactionist's perspective, this interaction may be interpreted as conductive to SLA. However, a closer examination of the discourse suggests the opposite. In line 49, Naomi comments that she does not like her pronunciation. Moreover, after the class, she commented that she was not very happy about and disappointed with her "poor" pronunciation. Ondarra (1997) points out that too much negative feedback can be face-threatening and demotivating to learners, making them feel as though they were incompetent speakers. LoCastro (1996) points out that in the Japanese culture, questions of clarification are viewed as a means of showing disapproval and of implying that there

is confrontation between co-participants. This points to the need to examine students' perceptions of negative feedback and themselves as L2 learners and users.

5. Conclusions

Over the last two decades, numerous L2 studies have been conducted on NS-NNS interactions. However, what has become of interest to researchers is the roles of NNS-NNS interactions. The intent of the present paper was to examine two influential traditions that emphasize the importance of social interactions--the input-interaction tradition and Vygotskian sociocultural tradition--in the context of an adult EFL classroom in Japan. The paper first examined what each tradition has to say about peer interaction. Researchers within the input-interaction tradition support the use of small group activities, believing that the more negotiated interaction there is, the more possibility for SLA. Researchers working within the Vygotskian tradition also believe that social interaction which encourages individuals to work together to solve problems provides rich learning opportunities. In other words, collaborative dialogues allow individuals to achieve something which they could not do otherwise.

The present paper looked at several pieces of discourse collected in an EFL classroom at a private language school and made several important points. First, as Excerpt 3 has shown, students were able to use not only each other as resources, but other cultural tools available in the environment as well, thereby co-constructing knowledge about English articles. This certainly challenges the traditional idea of testing solo performance and highlights the notion of distributed knowledge (Berwick, 1999; Coughlan & Duff, 1994; van Lier, 1998a). Secondly, the input-interaction tradition seems to presuppose that individuals have adequate proficiency to perform communicative tasks and that they are willing to use their L2 to undertake their tasks. However, some previous studies have suggested that students as active agents may opt to use their L1 for different reasons (e.g., Kobayashi, 2003; Liang, 1999). Since the input-interaction tradition draws heavily on the notion of comprehensible input and output, the use of L2 is deemed essential. In contrast, the Vygotskian sociocultural tradition acknowledges the roles of the L1 in L2 learning although they believe that excessive use of the L1 may not be desirable (e.g., van Lier, 1992). Hence, the latter view is deemed more compatible with the current state of EFL education in many Japanese classrooms.

Thirdly, too much negative negotiation can be counterproductive. As Excerpt 4 has indicated, if they were given too much negative feedback, students--especially those who have been raised in a culture where clarification requests are seen as a means of expressing disapproval--may be

discouraged to speak the target language. Van Lier (1998b) questions the special status that input-interactionists have assigned to negative negotiation, saying that "ice skaters are judged more on how they skate than on how they pick themselves up after falling on the ice" (p. 173).

In conclusion, the use of small group activities is supported by both the input-interaction tradition and Vygotskian sociocultural tradition. However, many SLA studies have defined the negotiation of meaning rather narrowly, restricting it to negative negotiation. Clearly, there is a need for researchers to expand this prevailing notion to include positive interaction (Ondarra, 1997). As previous studies (e.g., Donato, 1994, Kobayashi, 2003; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998) have indicated, there is a great deal we can learn by examining collaborative dialogues between students. Also, most studies have been carried out in laboratory settings rather than in naturally occurring classroom settings. More attention should be paid to sociocultural contexts (e.g., language classrooms), "without which language learning seems impossible and perhaps unnecessary" (Bohannon & Bonvillian, 1997, p. 302). To this end, it is perhaps desirable to conduct more qualitative studies which draw on the tradition of classroom ethnography.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Drs. Patricia Duff, Bernard Mohan, and Leo van Lier for their valuable insights. We would also thank Dr. Mary Bryson, Renee Cohen and Tammy Slater for their helpful comments. Any errors that remain are, of course, our own. Thanks are also due to our participants for their cooperation.

* Lecturer, Takasaki City University of Economics
** Lecturer, Takasaki City University of Economics

Notes

[1] Equally influential is Swain's (1985) notion of comprehensible output. She claims that SLA is facilitated whenever learners have the chance to structure their L2 output while interacting with interlocutors, especially when they fail to communicate their meaning and are "pushed" to make their output comprehensible. Her recent work draws upon both information-processing and Vygotskian perspectives (e.g., Swain, 1995, 2000).

[2] All names are fictional.

[3] Interview data were translated into English.

References

Arnold, J. (1999). *Affect in language learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berwick, R. (1999). Acquiring a second culture through discourse in a second language. *Polyglossia 1*, 2-19.

Bohannon, J. N., & Bonvillian, J. D. (1997). Theoretical Approaches to Language Acquisition. In J. B. Gleason (Ed.), *The development of language* (pp. 210-258). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Boulima, J. (1999). *Negotiated interaction in target language classroom discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brooks, F., Donato, R., & McGlone, J. V. (1997). When are they going to say "It" right?: Understanding learner talk during pair-work activity. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*, 524-541.

Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Same task, different activities: Analysis of SLA task from an activity theory perspective. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 173-193). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Di Pietro, R. J. (1987). *Strategic interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom: Second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duff, P. (1995). An ethnography of communication in immersion classrooms in Hungary. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 505-537.

Forman, E. A., & Cazden, C. B. (1985). Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: The cognitive value of peer interaction. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 323-347). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 1-23.

Futaba, T. (1994). *Second language acquisition through negotiation: A case of non-native speakers who share the same first language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1985). Task variation and nonnative/nonnative negotiation of meaning. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 149-161). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hatch, E. M. (1978). Discourse Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. In E. M. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 401-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 337-368.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

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

Liang, X. (1999). *Dilemmas of cooperative learning: Chinese students in a Canadian School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

LoCastro, V. (1996). English language education in Japan. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp. 40-58). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 126-141.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

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

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories*. London: Arnold.

Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ochs, E. (1990). Indexicality and socialization. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder & G. Herdt (Eds.), *Cultural psychology: essays on comparative human development* (pp. 287-308). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the Zone of Proximal Development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*, 94-121.

Ondarra, K. J. (1997). *Collaborative negotiation of meaning: A longitudinal approach*. Amsterdam: Rodopis.

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

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Salomon, G. (Ed.). (1993). *Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational consideration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1999, September). *Language production in SLA: From social to cognitive and back again*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Second Language Research Forum, Minneapolis, MN.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, *82*, 320-337.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). New York: Cambridge University Press.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.

van Lier, L. (1992). Not the nine o'clock linguistics class: Investigating contingency grammar. *Language Awareness*, *1*, 91-108.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Essex: Longman.

van Lier, L. (1998a). The relationship between consciousness, interaction and language learning. *Language Awareness*, *7*, 128-145.

van Lier, L. (1998b). Constraints and Resources in Classroom Talk: Issues of Equality and Symmetry. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship* (pp. 157-182). New York: Modern Language Association of America.

van Lier, L., & Matsuo, N. (2000) Varieties of conversational experience: Looking for learning opportunities. *Applied Language Learning*, *11*, 265-287.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University Press.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental function. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in soviet psychology* (pp. 144-188). Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Task Sheet

The following is a native-speaker's account of the episode you just viewed. Complete it by filling in the blanks with the appropriate articles and give reasons for your choices.

OK. This is ( )[1] little penguin. And he has ( )[2] teddy bear. And he is rocking it back and forth in this stroller and having ( )[3] fun time. Apparently his brother or sister comes by and makes ( )[4] circle around him or her with his scooter. And ( )[5] little penguin gets mad. And uh - So it's the- ( )[6] older sibling leaves. Now someone comes by with ( )[7] bigger scooter type of thing. It's more ( )[8] adult. And uh - ( )[9] little penguin gets on it. Seems to like it. But ( )[10] adult runs over ( )[11] stroller and ( )[12] teddy bear in ( )[13] process. ( )[14] little penguin starts crying and won't stop. So ( )[15] older penguin goes to ( )[16] parents' house to dis- to discuss ( )[17] situation. But ( )[18] little penguin keeps crying. And each parent tries to cheer up ( )[19] little penguin. But nothing seems to work. First, ... Finally, uh - ( )[31] older - sibling gets ( )[32] idea of getting ( )[33] scooter that was introduced originally in ( )[34] story and brings ( )[35] scooter in to ( )[36] little penguin. And ( )[37] little penguin takes ( )[38] liking to it. And likes it very much and stops crying. He rides out ( )[39] front door and crashes into ( )[40] snowman. And everyone laughs and everyone's happy.