English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. *14*, No. 2 Summer 2008

Negotiation and Power in a Child's Second Language Learning

Jeong-Yeon Kim
(Kyungpook National University)

Kim, Jeong-Yeon. (2008). Negotiation and power in a child's second language learning. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(2), 87-108.

This study explores a child's interactional management of negotiation process in an L2 tutoring setting. Specifically, it examines the causes of negotiation, consequences that power alignment brings to L2 learning, and the tutor's evaluations of the tutee's L2 development and participation. The data include more than 200 minutes of audio-recording of three ESL tutoring sessions which an ESL tutor and a five-year-old tutee participate in and post-tutoring interviews with the tutor. The analyses identified two types of negotiation that the participants were engaged in: didactic and conversational negotiation. The tutee was found to take more powerful position when he was engaged in the conversation-oriented, meaning-negotiation than in the didactic, linguistic negotiation. While actively managing negotiation for conversation, he was able to effectively relate the target of the negotiational interaction to his own prior knowledge as the owner of his learning. These findings indicate that effectiveness of tutoring as a learning environment needs to be addressed in terms of the effectiveness of meaning negotiation and power distribution.

[tutoring interaction/meaning negotiation/power distribution/learner autonomy]

I. INTRODUCTION

English learning is a crucial part of Korean children's everyday life. Their participations in different English learning communities, from formal classroom teaching to one-on-one tutoring with a native or a nonnative English speaking teacher, have drawn attention from parents and educators in the field of English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL). Among the different learning communities, tutoring constitutes a community in which a teacher and a student interact on an one-on-one basis unlike a classroom setting the discourse of which is based on multi-party interactions, i.e., a teacher to multiple students and a student to other students. Often times this one-on-one interactional framework has

been connected to the better outcome of second language (L2) learning and to the more learner-centered L2 learning process, thus chosen for many young children before they receive formal schooling in Korea.

As English language classroom in Korea is urged to change from predominantly teacher-centered, reading- and grammar-focused instruction to more learner-centered, speaking-focused pair or group work, English teaching professionals need to better understand the dynamics and the effects of the learner-centered L2 instruction. Studying the effects of how interaction is managed in a tutoring setting will contribute to understanding quantity and quality of learning that a student will receive in this most individualized type of L2 instruction.

EFL teaching for younger, elementary school children in Korea have been rigorously studied over the last decade. While diverse issues have been found, ranging from program development and implementation (e.g., Kim, 1998) to English teachers' proficiency levels (e.g., Jung, 2006), researchers have rarely examined EFL practices for even younger children before elementary schooling. This study examines a child L2 novice's participation in a tutoring setting. From the perspective of discourse analysis, it explores a 5-year-old Korean child's interactional management of negotiated interaction with his tutor. By looking closely at how the two participants in the tutoring deal with the process of negotiation, this study attempts to explain specifically how ESL/EFL tutoring can possibly contribute to creating effective L2 learning and establishing learner autonomy.

1. Studies of Negotiation and Tutoring Discourse

Long (1983) emphasizes negotiation as a critical factor for second language acquisition. According to him, during the negotiation, conversational modifications occur as a product of joint efforts between native and nonnative speakers. Since his suggestion, studies on negotiation have consistently attempted to answer the question of how communication contributes to language acquisition (Long, 1983; Varonis & Gass, 1985a; 1985b). The studies show that when actual and potential misunderstanding appears in interactions that include nonnative speakers, some discourse procedures, such as comprehension and confirmation checks, clarification requests, and self- and other repetition, become frequent. The input provided for L2 learners, whether from native speakers or not, is made comprehensible through these exchanges between learners and their interlocutors as they attempt to resolve communication breakdowns and to work toward mutual comprehension (Pica, Holliday, Lewis, & Morgenthaler, 1989). Active participation in meaning negotiation is thus critical in acquiring the target language.

While these researchers focused on the process in which the input was made comprehensible through these exchanges between learners and their interlocutors, Swain

(1985) maintained that the modified output provided by L2 learners should play more critical role for L2 acquisition than modified input provided to them. A good deal of subsequent research have supported her theoretical claim that nonnative speakers (NNSs) indeed adjust their output to achieve comprehension and confirmed the lasting effects of negotiation on L2 speakers' subsequent production in diverse tasks (Morgan-Short & Bowden, 2006; Pica et al., 1989; Van den Branden, 1997).

Since negotiation places in its core the interaction between speakers from different backgrounds, such as first languages, it has also been noted that L2 learners need to develop strategies to establish and maintain the necessary social rapport in the negotiation process in a classroom like in other normal conversation setting (Aston, 1986). Boulima (1999) supports this social aspect in the management of negotiation in her study on negotiation in an EFL classroom. She reports that conversational (i.e., normal conversation-oriented) negotiation is preferred over didactic (i.e., teaching-oriented) negotiation in Moroccan secondary school classrooms, which is shown statistically significant. The study concludes that the classroom setting should not hamper the occurrence of conversational negotiation.

Recently, some researchers began to examine negotiated interaction from the discourse-oriented, socio-cultural perspective. For example, Nakahama, Tyler and van Lier (2001) focused on discourse markers, contextualization cues, discourse management, textuality, and contingency. They criticized previous studies for overlooking these discourse features that naturally occur in interaction and for having examined repair negotiation exclusively. Through a qualitative analysis of the occurrences of different types of negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap tasks, they concluded that conversational interaction could offer substantial learning opportunities at multiple levels of interaction, not limited to learning L2 forms. Furthermore, they proposed that unstructured, conversational interaction provide language learners with a larger range of opportunities for language use learning than more controlled, goal-convergent interactions. Following their proposal, Mori (2002) investigated how negotiation was managed between an L2 instructor and her students. She demonstrated that learners of Japanese oriented to different speech exchange system from what was intended by the instructor. Bannink (2002) also noted that negotiational interactions that occurred spontaneously in advanced L2 classes included discrepancies in the goals of negotiation between a teacher and students. Furthermore, Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2003) examined how a teacher and students participated in meaning negotiation. They showed that the teacher's and the students' roles were reflected in the process of negotiation in the classroom.

The findings of these studies on negotiation encourage researchers to rethink dynamics of negotiation in different learning settings while broadening the view of L2 competence to

multiple aspects of L2. Tutoring setting, as one of L2 learning settings, is prevalent in American and Korean society and has been considered to provide a more facilitative environment for learning (Person, Kreuz, Roger, Zwaan, Graesser & Arthur 1995). Grasser and Person (1994) investigated the student questioning process during tutoring interaction and found that student achievement was positively correlated with the quality of student questions asked during the interaction. In a subsequent study on a tutoring interaction, Person and his colleagues (1995) examined the teacher's language and revealed how effective to learning the conversational rules (Grice, 1975) and politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987) employed by a tutor would be. The pragmatic rules were shown to affect a tutoring process in positive and negative ways.

2. Sociocultural Perspective of Learning and Power

The Vygotskian perspective on language and learning has special relevance to the current study. In this sociocultural approach to learning (Wertsch, 1991), learning occurs as a result of social interaction. In other words, an individual's intrapsychological development is based upon his or her socially interactional activities (interpsychological function). According to this view, speech has regulatory as well as communicative functions. When learning, individuals use language as a way of gaining control over the situation rather than just as a means of transmitting information. The emergence and development of human cognition, therefore, cannot be separated from social factors such as power, authority, emotion etc. (Wertsch & Rupert, 1993).

Among these social factors, power can create tension in a classroom. Hammer (1995) points out that classroom instructors experience tension between concerns for productive students' inquiry and active participation and those for correctness and completeness of students' understanding. When encouraged to autonomously participate in the classroom discussion, i.e., more power conferred to them, the students are found to be more interested, engaged, to take ownership of the discussion, to invoke relevant prior knowledge, and to build coherence in their understanding. Hammer suggests that the teachers not challenge 'incorrect' statements or argument, but allow the class to be diverted. Here, the teacher's role is defined as a facilitator for the students to achieve their own understanding.

In SLA research, power distribution in a classroom has been discussed as an important issue, as the classroom was described as a setting of unequal discourse with a teacher as the more competent speaker and major initiator of any negotiation (Hatch & Long, 1980). Pica (1994) explicitly noted that negotiation between a teacher and his/her students was rare in the L2 classroom and attributed the rarity to the power relations between the teacher and students, to traditions in language teaching, and to expectations about the language classroom. This feature of power asymmetry in the classroom setting has been criticized by

the proponents of interactions in a learning setting (e.g., Boulima, 1999; van Lier 1998). They pointed out that power imbalance would cause the talk in progress to be non-contingent and consequently interfere with students' participation in learning. These studies presented that equality in power and contingency in conversation should be considered as a major factor for increasing students' self-regulation and autonomy.

3. Research Questions

Although previous studies on negotiation occurring in a classroom have significantly promoted our understanding of intricacies implicit during negotiation process, few studies have investigated particular features of L2 tutoring in terms of management of negotiation process and of contributions of negotiation to L2 learning. Thus, it is difficult to draw a complete picture of specifically how negotiation can contribute to establishing and enhancing learner autonomy as well as to acquiring L2.

The present study attempts to reveal qualities of learning opportunities that the tutoring-specific negotiation offers to a child L2 learner and effects of power alignment during a negotiated interaction on a child's L2 learning. By examining qualitatively how the tutor and the student differently manage the meaning making process in their talk, this study aims to provide answers to the following three research questions.

1. What are the causes of negotiation in the ESL tutoring discourse?
2. How does the power distribution affect the child's participation in an L2 tutoring?
3. What are the tutor's evaluations of the tutee's L2 development and participation in the negotiated interactions?

II. METHOD

1. Data Collection and Analysis

The source of data in this study is the tape recording of more than 200 minutes of three tutoring sessions and post-tutoring interviews with a tutor. The data contain one-on-one conversational interaction between a five-year-old boy (Bryan) and his teacher (Sunny).[1] Bryan has Korean parents who speak Korean at home. Sunny is a Korean-English bilingual teacher whose first language is Korean. She completed elementary and secondary

[1] Although other tutors were available, the other tutoring sessions were excluded from this study because in the other sessions monolingual English speakers taught different levels of learners from other language backgrounds.

education in Korea before she went to America for college education. At the time of the recording, she was attending a graduate school to obtain a master's degree, while teaching ESL classes on a part-time basis. She had been teaching ESL classes either full time or part time for almost two years and tutoring Bryan for six months. Bryan had received ESL tutoring from a native English speaking undergraduate during the summer before receiving the tutoring with Sunny. Tutoring sessions occurred once a week as a part of ESL program offered by an elementary school located in a metropolitan city in the state of Texas, U.S.A.

Three tutoring sessions were taped with a week apart from one session to another. The three sessions aimed to teach English words, focusing on words of clothing, taste, and contrast respectively. A set of picture cards was used as the teaching material. Once the taping was complete, the researcher replayed the tape and identified occurrences of negotiation. In order to transcribe the data in a precise manner, the researcher adopted the transcription notation developed by Atkinson and Heritage (1984)[2] for the studies of conversation analysis. The transcribed data also included the researcher's informal interviews with the tutor. The excerpts for discussion were taken from the transcribed data and have been qualitatively analyzed.

2. Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study aimed to describe qualitatively the phenomena of negotiated interactions occurring in the setting of tutoring. Although this method of analysis was appropriate for addressing the research questions, some of the aspects that would have been revealed with quantitative method had to be excluded beyond the foci of this study. Among those excluded in the scope of this study was a quantitative comparison of didactic versus conversational negotiation. Although it was not impossible to see which type of negotiation occurred more frequently than the others in this study, this study did not attempt to address this aspect.

The study has a limitation within the collected data. The recorded data included only one tutor teaching one child L2 learner. Although this limitation reduces generalizability of the result to other ESL/EFL tutoring interactions, the amount and diversity of current data and the qualitative analysis of them still provide viable information of how effective tutoring can be in terms of negotiation and power. It is expected that the results will not only shed light on understanding effects of a tutoring setting which has rarely been studied by EFL researchers.

---

[2] See Appendix for the transcription notation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the three tutoring sessions has found that negotiation is the core of interaction between the tutor and the child. Two types of negotiation have been identified to be significant: didactic negotiation and conversational meaning negotiation. The following section presents the discussion of how differently power is (re)defined in the two types of negotiated interactions and the tutor's general evaluation of the tutee in terms of L2 development and other cognitive skills.

1. Didactic Negotiation

The tutor has been observed to be very conscious of how Bryan produces English in terms of the linguistic norm. Since this negotiation aims to repair errors caused by misuses of the forms or functions of the target language, it is usually initiated by the tutor, Sunny. In the following example, Sunny detects a problem in Bryan's production, and directly corrects it.

Excerpt (1) S: Sunny, the tutor, B: Bryan, the tutee[3]

1. B: Um cake and i-shee cream and juice
2. → S: Ice (.) say ice
3. B: Ice cream
4. S: mhm

In this excerpt, Bryan is naming different foods shown on the picture cards. His response contains a pronunciation error (line 1). Although this mispronunciation would not cause any communication breakdown and in a normal conversation may be ignored by interlocutors, Sunny corrects the error in a direct manner (line 2). In this example, the turns are organized in three stages: (1) student's turn with trouble; (2) the teacher's direct correction; and (3) the student's repair. This sequential organization is very didactic and the teacher's powerful position as a more knowledgeable person is clearly indicated in the turn organization and the way the error is addressed, i.e., direct correction.

In the present data, the didactic negotiation is never initiated by the student and therefore may be considered a typical teacher-initiated negotiation. The student, interacting with the tutor, does not attempt to repair the language of the tutor, nor does he try to confirm his interlocutor (the tutor)'s comprehension. The tutor assumes the powerful position to lead

[3] In this and subsequent excerpts, the turns of initiatives of negotiation are marked by an arrow (→).

the conversation, and the child's contribution to the negotiation is only minimal during the negotiation.

2. Conversational Negotiation and Power

Conversational negotiation has been the major focus of many negotiation studies (Boulima, 1999; Morgan-Short & Bowden, 2006; Nakahama, et al., 2001; Pica et al., 1989; Van den Branden, 1997). It is concerned with confirming or clarifying the meaning of an utterance or with repairing a proposition conveyed in the previous turn. The current study has found that the child tutee's participation significantly enhanced when the negotiational actions aim meaning or understanding of the messages of interlocutors than the target language forms. The increased participation, thus, created a number of occurrences of negotiation.

1) The child's initiatives of meaning negotiation

There is an asymmetrical aspect concerning who initiates negotiation. Bryan's attempt to initiate negotiation is not always recognized by the tutor, which would result in a failed initiation. The following example illustrates this power factor involved in the initiatives of negotiation.

Excerpt (2)

1. S: a baseball cap (.) they are playing baseball
2. → B: yeah I <u>love</u> play base[ball
3. S: [in the park an' these are shorts
4. (.) shorts [an'
5. → B: [hh. how abou'-how about (.)
6. S: t-shirt (.) uh:::: it's cold (.) he wears ↑
7. (0.6)
8. B: <u>co</u>at

Here, Bryan attempts to launch a conversation with his personal preference upon the talk of "baseball" (line 2). Sunny does not acknowledge his attempt and continues her turn, which generates an overlap of the utterances. He interrupts the tutor's turn (line 5) in an attempt to initiate another talk, which is ignored again. The tutor's control of the negotiation is well represented in the boy's withdrawal of his attempt and turn to the tutor's negotiation (line 8). In this respect, there exists a power discrepancy in the context of a tutoring.

One of the significant phenomena that have been observed during the analysis was the student's repetitive attempts to participate in a meaning making process, and to control the subsequent turns. Once his initiative is recognized by the tutor, he assumes a more powerful speaker, which in turn affects the turn organization. Interestingly, at the moment of power realignment, the two interactants' orientations are discrepant; Bryan is oriented to conversational negotiation while Sunny is still engaged in didactic negotiation. In this instance, the didactic negotiation, thus, is not complete until the meaning is mutually understood, as shown in excerpt (3) below.

Excerpt (3)

1. S: what are they doing ↑ they are having some presents
2. → B: yeah I think it's his birthday an' [LOOK
3. → S: [her birthday ↓ (.) yes
4. how did you know ↑
5. (0.6)
6. S: how did you know ↑
7. → B: I think. it's (0.2)
8. S: why is this not a halloween party (.) thanksgiving
9. party (-) or Christmas party (.) why is it a birthday
10. party (-) how did you know ↑
11. (-)
12. → B: but (.) but(.) his (.) uh his birthday (-)
13. → S: her birthday (.) this is she (.) her birthday
14. (-)
15. B: her birthday ↑
16. S: yeah this is a girl (-) this is not a boy (.) see ↑ she has a
17. ponytail an' she has long hair an' she has flower on
18. her T-shirt
19. (0.6)
20. S: so see ↑
21. (-)
22. B: yeah: hh. what does she have here ↑

When Bryan says "it's his birthday" (line 2), he correctly represents the event described in the picture card. Upon Bryan's production of the possessive "his," Sunny takes an initiative to correct the linguistic element (line 3), saying "her birthday." When she says, "yes," following the correction, she overtly acknowledges Bryan's correct description of

the event. Here, we should note that this corrective action is very didactic, considering that the correction occurs in the 'intra-turn position'. The tutor initiates negotiation within the boy's turn, although the comprehensibility of his utterance is not at risk. Van Lier (1998) argues that in an L2 classroom, the problems of understanding talk or content are repaired in separate turns, while assisting speaking problem occurs immediately after the trouble spot without waiting for the turn to end. In this example, the tutor, before Bryan completes his turn, assumes her role as an ESL instructor and corrects the phonetic feature of the boy's utterance. This result clearly indicates that the tutor understands her student's production of 'his' is simply an error in producing the language rather than a result from different interpretation of the picture.

While she continues her turn and asks how he knows it's a birthday party, Bryan does not respond immediately. His silence triggers Sunny to repeat her question "how did you know" (line 6). Bryan takes his turn and attempts to provide an answer, only to fail to complete his turn. Sunny rephrases her question and says "why is this not" other events, and "why is it" a birthday party, and then she repeats her question again saying "how did you know" (lines 8-10). After a pause, Bryan takes his turn, but his utterance, "but (.) but(.) his (.) uh his birthday" (line 12) is not responsive to the tutor's previous turn.

It is to be noted that Bryan's disagreement with Sunny's correction on the use of "his" versus "her" indicates his ability to differentiate the use by gender. Somehow his knowledge does not correctly match the picture description. Therefore, what appears to be a negotiation oriented to a linguistic element turns out to be the meaning-oriented negotiation. The tutor's agenda is now dismissed, and the two participants attempt to reach shared understanding of the gender of the birthday person. Sunny provides the information of why it is "her" instead of "his" birthday with details of the birthday girl's appearances.

Bryan's recurrent problematic turns, however, should not be seen as the results of his lack of L2 knowledge. Rather, in hindsight, the student-initiated moves to negotiate a tutoring conversation might have the effect of moderating the tutor's power, thus transforming the interaction more learner-centered. As shown in the example, he takes the ownership of his production, and makes efforts to clarify why he cannot agree with his teacher. According to Hammer (1995), this is an important aspect of a learner-centered instructional setting because it is the point where the learner can build his own cognition with the help of more knowledgeable person. In Vygotsky's term, it is the zone where the learner can progress to the higher level of mental functioning (Wertch, 1991). This zone of proximal development (ZPD) emerges in this entire negotiational interaction where participants are more conversationally oriented to the joint achievement of shared meaning.

Then, how the teacher deals with this emergent ZPD is a challenging area. Here the tutor does not explicitly examine the child knowledge or give a chance for the child to manifest his cognition. She moves on without the child's sign of understanding. Given the end of the

negotiation process, we might call it unsuccessful negotiation. This example clearly demonstrates that in order to address ZPD, the teacher needs to acknowledge, even temporarily, the student's attempt to hold the floor and exercise his knowledge as a powerful speaker.

2) The tutor's initiatives of meaning negotiation

When Sunny takes initiatives of meaning negotiation upon Bryan's incorrect understanding or response, she frequently switches to the participants' common first language (L1). By turning to Korean, she attempts to elicit an acceptable answer from the student. As shown below, when the tutor switches the language to Korean, the child takes only the passive role, without showing any sign that he is involved in the negotiation process.

Excerpt (4)

1. S: did you remember↑ how was the taste↑ is this sweet
2. salty↑ or sour↑
3. B: uhh:: sweet↑
4. (0.4)
5. → S: usually, lemon, uhh, well, you know remember lemon↑
6. → 레몬 먹어보면 맛이 어때요↑ lemon↑
   (lemon-(obj.) eat try-if taste-(subj.) how↑)
7. B: swee:t
8. S: 아이 셔 (-) lemon (.)
   (Ayeeh sour)
9. B: (-) arrr (.) sour
10. S: sour exactly (.) lemon's sour
11. B: sometimes we make uh sour (-) sometime make uh sweet
12. S: yeah exactly (.) lemons though usually very very ssss
13. B: um:
14. S: sour
15. B: ssss
16. S: it's very sour

Sunny modifies her question into Korean (lines 5-6), as a strategy to provide a more comprehensible input to the student. However, this modification fails to elicit the boy's correct response. The tutor accordingly provides a direct translation of 'sour' in Korean in

line 8, which finally results in the boy's correct response "sour" (line 9). However, in the subsequent turns, the child indicates that he still does not agree with Sunny. Bryan, upon Sunny's acknowledging remark "sour exactly," challenges Sunny's correction and suggests the arbitrariness of the taste of lemon, "sometimes we make uh sour (-) sometime make uh sweet" (line 11). This challenge triggers another round of conversational negotiation, because the arbitrariness of the taste would not be allowed in the activity for the didactic purpose of teaching English the taste words. The tutor, however, acknowledges the boy's comment, avoids the disagreement with him, and redirects the talk to the correctness of information, as she says, "lemons though usually very very ssss" (line 12). Her attempt to elicit "sour" fails because he still does not produce "sour" and simply copies Sunny's pronunciation "ssss" (line 15). The negotiation ends without a sign that Sunny and Bryan have reached a shared understanding.

Second language researchers have presented divergent stances regarding L2 only policy. While some researchers (e.g., Auerbach, 1993; Moore, 2002) hold L2 only instruction in a language classroom, others (e.g., Brooks, Donato, & McGlone, 1997; Hancock, 1997; Ohta, 2001) point out that the L1 can be used for supporting and sustaining interaction or for creating the accurate formation of linguistic forms. However, in the above excerpt, use of Korean as the tutor's and the tutee's L1 turns out to be hardly effective because the tutee's orientation towards his experiences with the taste of lemon is not properly addressed by the tutor. In other words, when conversational negotiation is in progress, turning to L1, as an L2 teaching strategy, would not be functional in the language instruction. Thus, it is important for an L2 instructor to consider his or her student's orientation during the process of meaning making process. The instructor and the student(s) alike, as the participants in the collaborative process of meaning, need to construct moment by moment shared understanding of the target language item.

Excerpt (4) highlights that as Bryan's initiative for conversational negotiation is not acknowledged by the tutor, he is less involved, which in turn affects how successful the meaning negotiation would be. In the following example in which Sunny deserts Bryan's attempts to contribute to a meaning making process, he simply shows no interest in the talk.

Excerpt (5)

1. S: mushrooms (.) what do you think they are ↑
2. B: this is- I think this side uh: (*)
3. → S: I think they are something like pepperoni (.) don't you think so ↑
4. B: (-) I don' know
5. S: you don' know ↑ (-) look like pepperoni (.) so this is slice
6. of piece (.) this is delicious, right?
7. (-)

8. S: pizza is delicious (.) deli:cious can you say that ↑

When asked for an opinion regarding an ingredient on a pizza shown in the picture card, Bryan properly takes his turn and presents his idea, "this side uh:" (line 2). Although his specific idea is not available to the researcher, Sunny, apparently, disregards his turn and directly offers a better answer in the next turn. Here, her initiative resembles the expression of her opinion rather than the correction. He immediately reveals disinterest in this initiative when he says "I don' know" (line 4).

This sequence reveals a difference from the classroom data of Boulima (1999). In the classroom interaction, the students frequently surrendered when they got involved in an argumentation with the teacher, certainly because of the politeness factor and also because of their limited proficiency in the target language. By contrast, the child participant in the current study did not seem to be affected by the two factors (politeness and linguistic deficiency), rather perceived himself as an equal conversational partner to his interlocutor (the tutor). When this equal partnership in the conversational negotiation was not properly addressed, he withdrew his attempt to participate in the negotiation.

Given the finding, we may easily bring to the discussion the age factor of the child participant; He has not acquired L2 conversational principles and hierarchy of power in a learning context. Our interest, then, is in how L2 instructors teaching this age group in a one-on-one framework can possibly facilitate student's participation in negotiation and build learner autonomy while optimally incorporating rules of L2 conversation, such as performing social roles in a learning context, into the lessons. The balanced approach to this issue should be challenging to be taken by L2 instructors. However, it is certain that success of interactive L2 teaching is dependent upon how much understanding L2 instructors have regarding this issue. The following session highlights the positive outcomes from the cooperative management of meaning negotiation.

3) Cooperative management of meaning negotiation and power

The data contain several incidences in which the two participants cooperate to sustain meaning negotiation. The next example demonstrates that when Bryan's attempt to present his experience with the topic is recognized by the tutor, he shows more involvement in the talk and produces more relevant talk in a longer turn, i.e., holds the floor.

Excerpt (6)

1. B: I have [a:
2. S: [had (.) I [had

3. → B: [had (.) had on the birthday uhh. pp (.)
4. → people like a triangle (.) but I (.) my hat was a little different
5. → S: (-) you had a birthday hat ↑
6. B: mhm
7. S: triangle shape ↑
8. B: mhm. (-) like this(.) not like this (.) this is a birthday
9. hat but my hat was different
10. S: okay (.) now (.) how abo:ut (-) look at this picture

Sunny's corrective action of the use of tense, "have," indicates that she is engaged in a didactic, linguistic negotiation. However, Bryan, again, appears to be interested in describing his own previous birthday party. He relates his current learning situation to his own experience, which Hammer (1995) indicates as an important factor for a learner to be autonomous. The child also holds the floor to describe his birthday hat. Upon Sunny's direct correction of his tense use, he incorporates it into the utterance, i.e., uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), and continues his turn to construct a sentence. However, he does not complete the sentence with the suggested subject and verb "I had" but initiates a clause with the new subject "people" (line 4). Then he indicates that he had a different hat from other people. Here, Sunny's refinements of the boy's turn, "you had a birthday hat?" (line 5) and "triangle shape" (line 7) not only initiates conversational negotiation, but also seems to provide a finely-tuned input for Bryan. However, he does not uptake the input but only acknowledges her understanding by producing "mhm" (lines 6 and 8). He only concerns his interlocutor's understanding, when he elaborates the difference between the hat in the picture and the one he had on his birthday. It is to be noted that he produces "is" and "was" correctly to English tense while describing the difference. Although he has not mastered the past tense forms of "have," he certainly is able to use the past tense forms of the 'be' verbs, i.e., "is" as the present tense versus "was" as the past tense. Thus, in this example, the child's knowledge of the target language norms on tense emerges when he holds the floor and assumes the powerful position in talk.

It is to be noted that when meaning negotiation occurs in a cooperative manner, the participants' turns include conversational continuants, e.g., "yeah" and "mhm." In excerpt (6), Bryan produces "mhm" in his turns to acknowledge immediately preceding turns of the tutor's (lines 6 and 8). The following example also showcases how the participants cooperate to sustain the conversation by inserting the conversational continuants in the utterances.

Excerpt (7)

1. B: cake (-) uh:[uh:

2. S: [yeah chocolate cake (.) candles on it
3. → B: yeah I like the flower an' (*light*)
4. → S: yeah
5. B: look at that dove
6. S: this is so pretty
7. → B: mhm
8. S: you think so ↑
9. B: yeah

In this dialog, the participants are exchanging their descriptions of a chocolate cake in the picture. They are in agreement in the evaluation of the picture. Bryan's acknowledgement in line 3 contains additional description of the picture, which prompts the tutor's conversational continuant, "yeah" (line 4). He also turns to another object, "the dove," which elicits the tutor's affirmative response. While cooperatively building meaning, both of the participants are playing the encouraging role for each other. They seem to assume the equal responsibility to sustain the conversation. Bryan not only cooperates in constructing the meaning with the tutor, but also draws attention to another relevant object in the same picture when he says "look at that dove" (line 5). He is involved in the talk and explicitly establishing his own cognition.

The momentary discrepancy in understanding can turn into a successful negotiation when Sunny allows Bryan to hold the floor and to reveal his current level of understanding. As Sunny properly addresses Bryan's current level of understanding of an L2 item in a contingent manner, power appears to be realigned. As shown in the following example, Bryan's powerful speakership helps Sunny grasp better understanding of Bryan's level of knowledge. As a result, she can handle the problematic understanding efficiently in the meaning making process.

Excerpt (8)

1. S: what is it ↑
2. B: it is a pumpkin bread
3. S: uh-uh this is doughnut
4. B: (-) doughnut
5. T: yeah dough[nut
6. → B: [doughnut (.) doughnut's not orange it's uh:
7. (.) it's a brown
8. S: (-) it's brown ↑ (.) we:ll it's light brown
9. → B: (-) but, it's a orange

10. S: (-) well there's many kinds of doughnuts (.) this kin'of
11. dou (.) doughnuts is like light brown
12. B: (-) okay↓ mmm
13. S: okay now

The negotiation is triggered by the difference in the prior knowledge of the color of a doughnut between the participants. He challenges the tutor's corrective feedback (line 6), indicating that the color of the doughnut should not be the orange color. This initiative prompts the tutor's elaborate description of the color, which may be a more comprehensible input for the boy. However, the boy does not accept the tutor's explanation and argues that the color is orange, not brown. He has prior knowledge of a particular type of bread and "regular doughnut." Based on this schema, he initiates a negotiational action. This initiative and the following utterances entail what appears to be close to an argument occurring in everyday conversation due to a schema difference between speakers. It is important to note that Sunny accepts his rejection as a possible response when she says "well there's many kinds of doughnuts (.) this kin'of dou (.) doughnuts is like light brown" (lines 10-11). Bryan now aborts his disagreement and accepts the tutor's turn (line 12).

Given these examples, the student, despite his very restricted linguistic repertoire, should be seen not as a passive receiver of the information provided by the more competent speaker (the tutor), but as an active participant in this face-to-face interaction. Therefore, in contrast to previous studies on classroom interaction and negotiation, the results of this study indicate that the young tutee takes a significant part in sustaining and controlling the conversation. Furthermore, the data show that the power discrepancy is not defined by the relationship between the tutor and the student, but by ongoing process of conversational negotiation. Once his speakership is properly launched in the turn organization, his prior knowledge surfaces to the talk as an explicit knowledge, and new knowledge can be added to the repertoire in an explicit and autonomous manner.

3. Sunny's Evaluation of Bryan

The interview with the tutor provided useful information of Sunny's assessment of her tutee, Bryan. She assessed Bryan's development of L2 in a positive way as shown in the following transcript.

Excerpt (9) Interview with Sunny

1. S: I think um he is making progress (.) when I first met him
2. he spoke Korean half↑ well more than half of the time
3. huhuhuhuhuh. his parents are very interested in their kid's

4. lessons (.) an' always ask me if he's doin' alright hhh.
5. I think he likes to come to my class too... he never misses
6. homework although there's not bunch of homework in my
7. sessions you know....

Sunny, while comparing Bryan's "progress" during the past six months, expresses satisfaction with his progress in L2 learning. She mentions Bryan's parents' interest and Bryan's performance which have helped him improve his L2 development. However, she expresses concerns regarding Bryan's attention in latter part of the interview, as revealed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt (10) Interview with Sunny

1. S: he could be uh:: ve (.) (-) a little annoying (.) sometimes he
2. doesn't (-) he can't stop talking an' (.) well I have to (.) kin' of
3. make him focus on what 's before us huhuh even just five
4. year-old (.5) Bryan gets distracted all the time did you
5. notice that ↑ ... he likes (.) he wants to put things under his control

Sunny considers Bryan's attention problematic, which could be "annoying" (line 1). She points out his lack of attention and tendency to control their interaction during tutoring. Her evaluation directly relates to Bryan's initiatives to launch conversation-oriented meaning negotiation, which, according to Sunny, often distracts their talk off the L2 items to be taught. His powerful speakership is represented in Sunny's evaluation, "he wants to put things under his control" (line 5). Conjoined with Bryan's lack of attention, power realignment appears to be a problematic part of tutoring interaction.

Interestingly, her evaluation on Bryan's attention concerns only the moments in which she redirects Bryan's attempts to initiate meaning negotiation to the words or pictures used for teaching L2 items. In the interview data, she does not mention the successful, cooperative negotiation processes and its contributions to Bryan's L2 development. Contrary to her positive evaluation of Bryan's progress in L2 learning, how Bryan participates in the tutoring is addressed as an area that needs to be enhanced. This excerpt clearly shows that the student' initiated meaning negotiation is not considered as a facilitating element for this tutoring interaction.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the discussion of process of meaning negotiation in a tutoring discourse between the tutor and the student, the meaning-oriented, conversational negotiation was found to afford more initiatives from the student. His initiatives for the negotiation not only prompted his participation in the conversation, but also, more importantly, appeared to have positive effects on the L2 development. As Swain (1985) claimed, his initiation provided opportunities for the meaningful uses of his linguistic resources in the subsequent turns of the tutoring interaction. Thus, the L2 tutoring gained the quality of contingency, which, as van Lier (1998) presents, is a crucial element for enhancing learner autonomy as well as L2 acquisition.

This student-initiated negotiation implies that the interaction has to be jointly managed between the tutor and the student. Like in other normal conversations, joint management includes moments in which participants' power is incessantly in tension and thus redefined. Therefore, power in a tutoring interaction is not as predetermined as in a classroom interaction, but rather it is constructed in collaboration between the tutor and the student. During the joint construction, the student takes his ownership of the talk for meaning negotiation. He frequently holds the floor by taking longer or multiple turns in order to make the topic in hand more relevant to his past experiences. In the meantime, the power relationship seems to be redefined such that the tutor takes a less powerful position and receives the tutee's turns. The child also was able to redirect the target of negotiation from didactic to rather conversationally oriented meaning negotiation in the turn organization. Interestingly, the tutor's initiative to negotiate meaning, unless acknowledged and associated with the student's prior knowledge and current state of interest, seemed to be nonfunctional. The interaction progressed without both of the participants' shared understanding.

The interview with the tutor provided information of how the tutor assessed her tutee concerning the ways the tutee participated in the entire meaning making process. Contradictory to her general, positive evaluation of her tutee's L2 development, she produced rather negative comments on the tutee's initiatives for meaning negotiation, i.e. something distracting or annoying. The functional aspects of successful cooperative meaning negotiation were excluded in the evaluation.

The findings of this study have a critical implication for the L2 pedagogy. First, since a tutoring for a child English L2 learner is effective to addressing his ownership of L2 learning, the functional aspects of meaning negotiation need to be properly and explicitly understood by L2 instructors. Also, the power distribution, as an important factor associated with the initiation of the negotiation, needs to be positively connected to the more facilitative learning environment. While coordinating traditional learning goals with providing a learning environment for an autonomous, responsible and interested learner, instructors should consider more proactively their role as a facilitator than as corrector of

their students' problematic productions. It is important to note that the child's initiatives, unless properly addressed along with L2 development, may vanish from the picture of L2 learning. In order for truly learner-centered L2 instruction to occur in different L2 learning contexts, L2 educators need to understand facilitative effects of L2 negotiation that allows power to be redefined in a dynamic manner even from this early stage of L2 development.

REFERENCES

Aston, G. (1986). Trouble-shooting interaction with learners: the more the merrier? *Applied Linguistics, 7*, 128-143.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 9-32.

Atkinson, M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bannink, A. (2002). Negotiating the paradoxes of spontaneous talk in advanced L2 classes. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 266-288). London: Continuum.

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

Brooks, F. B., 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.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graesser, R. A., & Person, N. K. (1994). Question asking during tutoring. *American Educational Research Journal, 31,* 104-137.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Hammer, D. (1995). Student inquiry in a physics class discussion. *Cognition & Instruction, 13*(3). 401-430.

Hancock, M. (1997). Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 217-235.

Hatch, E., & Long, M. H. (1980). Discourse analysis: What's that? In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language researchh* (pp. 1-40). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Jung, S. (2006). Teaching English as a dominant international language: A case of Korean

elementary English program. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 12*(4), 1-29.

Kim, H. G. (1998). English teaching in the elementary school of Korea: Programs and remedies. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 4*, 131-178.

Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the research. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 359-81.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37-66.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan, and development talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*, 323-347.

Moore, D. (2002). Case study: Code-switching and learning in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 5,* 279-293.

Morgan-Short, K., & Bowden, H. W. (2006). Processing instruction and meaningful output-based instruction: Effects on second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 31-65.

Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 377-405.

Ohta, A. (2001). *Second language acquisition process in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Person, N., Kreuz, K., Roger J., Zwaan, R., Graesser, A., & Arthur. C. (1995). Pragmatics and pedagogy: Conversational rules politeness strategies may inhibit effective tutoring. *Cognition & Instruction, 13*, 161-188.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*, 493-527.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 63-90.

Swain, M. K. (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. 236-244). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Van den Branden, K. (1997). Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning, 47*, 589-636.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985a). Non-native/ non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 71-90.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985b). Miscommunication in native/non-native conversation.

Language in Society, 14, 327-343.

van Lier, L. (1998). Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second language* (pp. 157-182). New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). A sociocultural approach to socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine & S. D. Behrend (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 85-100). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Wertsch, J. V., & Rupert, L. J. (1993). The Authority of cultural tools in a sociocultural approach to mediated agency. *Cognition & Instruction, 11*(3), 227-239.

Appendix

Transcription Notation (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984)

1. Intonation
   - Rising intonation: ↑ Falling intonation: ↓
   - Stress: text
2. Temporal features
   - Pause: (tenths of a second) Short untimed pause: - - -
   - Spoken slowly: <text> Spoken rapidly: >text<
   - Lengthened syllable: : Word cutoff: -
   - Latched talk: = Overlapping speech: [ ]
3. Intensity
   - Spoken softly: °text° Spoken loudly: TEXT
4. Breathing
   - Audible breathing: H In-breath: .h
   - Out-breath: h
5. Transcriber's comments
   - Paralinguistic behavior: ((behavior))
   - Unclear or unintelligible speech: (*)

Examples in: English/Korean
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: preschool/elementary

Jeong-Yeon Kim

Dept. of English Education
Kyungpook National University
Daegu-shi Puk-gu Sankyuk-dong 1370
Daegu, Korea
Tel: 82-53-950-5829
Email: jykim07@hanmail.net

Received in April, 2008
Reviewed in May, 2008
Revised version received in June, 2008